This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600050820L

399 d. 14

ENCYCLOPÆDIA METROPOLITANA;

OR,

UNIVERSAL DICTIONARY OF KNOWLEDGE,

On an Original Plan:

COMPRISING THE TWOFOLD ADVANTAGE OF

A PHILOSOPHICAL AND AN ALPHABETICAL ARRANGEMENT,

WITH APPROPRIATE ENGRAVINGS.

EDITED BY

THE REV. EDWARD SMEDLEY, M.A.,

LATE FELLOW OF SIDNEY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;

THE REV. HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.,

PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON;

AND

THE REV. HENRY JOHN ROSE, B.D.,

LATE FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

VOLUME X.

[HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, VOL. 2.]

LONDON:

B. FELLOWES; F. AND J. RIVINGTON; DUNCAN AND MALCOLM; SUTTABY AND CO.; E. HODGSON; J. DOWDING; G. LAWFORD; J. M. RICHARDSON; J. BOHN; T. ALLMAN; J. BAIN; S. HODGSON; F. C. WESTLEY; L. A. LEWIS; T. HODGES; AND H. WASHBOURNE; ALSO J. H. PARKER, AND T. LAYCOCK, OXFORD; AND J. AND J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE.

1845.

399. d. ...

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET.

CONTENTS TO VOL. X.

	PAGE
Aratus	1
Cleomenes	10
Philopœmen	17
CHAPTER XVII. History of the Jews	24
Judas Maccabeus	26
Jonathan	29
Simon	32
John Hyrcanus	33
Aristobulus	35
Alexander Jannæus	36
Queen Alexandra, Hyrcanus II., Aristobulus II.	37
Antigonus	41
CHAPTER XVIII. Rome	43
CHAPTER XIX. Syria	57
Perseus, King of Macedon	68
Plato	72
Aristotle	91*
Tiberius Gracchus	91
Caius Gracchus	97
CHAPTER XX. Rome	104
Sylla	113
Persia, Mithridates	120
Sylla, Part I.	139
Julius Cæsar, Part I.	156
CHAPTER XXI. Spain	179
CHAPTER XXII. Ancient Gaul	190
CHAPTER XXIII. Parthia	204
Julius Cæsar, Part II.	210
Cicero, Roman Philosophy	277
Augustus Cæsar, Part I.	295
Ægypt, Ptolemy Soter	337
Cleopatra	346
Augustus Cæsar, Part II.	355
Horace, Latin Poetry	383
CHAPTER XXIV. Herod the Great	417
Tiberius	425
Caligula	434

	PAGE
Claudius	441
Nero	452
CHAPTER XXV. Parthia	469
Seneca—The Stoics	487
Galba	491
Otho	497
Vitellius	503
Vespasian	515
CHAPTER XXVI. History of the Jews from the Death of Herod to the Capture of Jerusalem	525
Historians of Rome	538
Decline of Latin Poetry	555
CHAPTER XXVII. Rise of Christianity, Religion of the Gentiles	580
CHAPTER XXVIII. Religion of the Jews	590
CHAPTER XXIX. Ministry of Christ	597
Titus	607
Domitian	612
Apollonius Tyanæus.—Miracles	619
Nerva	645
Trajan	649
Hadrian	664
Antoninus Pius	677
Marcus Aurelius	680
Commodus	684
Pertinax	685
CHAPTER XXX. Literature of the Age of the Antonines	687
Sextus Empiricus—The Pyrrhonists	698
CHAPTER XXXI. Apostolic Age	705
CHAPTER XXXII. Apostolic Age, Preaching to the Jews	714
CHAPTER XXXIII. Apostolic Age, Preaching to Jews and Devout Gentiles	726
CHAPTER XXXIV. Apostolic Age, Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters	731
CHAPTER XXXV. Apostolic Age, early Heresies	756
CHAPTER XXXVI. Age of the Apostolical Fathers	768
CHAPTER XXXVII. Age of the Apostolical Fathers	779

CONTENTS TO VOL. X.

ARATUS. CLEOMENES. PHILOPŒMEN. PERSIA. MITHRIDATES. ANCIENT GAUL. CALIGULA. CLAUDIUS. The Rev. JACOB HENRY BROOKE MOUNTAIN, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.

CHAPTER XVII. CHAPTER XXIV. CHAPTER XXVI. The Rev. Archdeacon HALE.

CHAPTER XVIII. TIBERIUS GRACCHUS. CAIUS GRACCHUS. SYLLA, PART I. II. JULIUS CÆSAR, PART I. II. AUGUSTUS CÆSAR, PART I. II. HISTORIANS OF ROME. TRAJAN. The Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School.

CHAPTER XIX. PERSEUS, KING OF MACEDON. CHAPTER XXI. CHAPTER XXIII. EGYPT. PTOLEMY SOTER. CLEOPATRA. NERO. CHAPTER XXV. GALBA. OTHO. VITELLIUS. VESPASIAN. TITUS. DOMITIAN. NERVA. The Right Rev. Bishop RUSSELL.

PLATO. SENECA—THE STOICS. WILLIAM LOWNDES, Esq., M.A., Brazen Nose College, Oxford.

ARISTOTLE. The Rev. J. W. BLAKESLEY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

CICERO—ROMAN PHILOSOPHY. APOLLONIUS TYANÆUS. MIRACLES. The Rev. JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford.

HORACE—LATIN POETRY. DECLINE OF LATIN POETRY. The Rev. HENRY THOMPSON, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.

TIBERIUS. ANTONINUS PIUS. MARCUS AURELIUS. COMMODUS. PERTINAX. CHAPTER XXX. The Rev. J. B. OTTLEY, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford.

HADRIAN. Major A. S. H. MOUNTAIN.

SEXTUS EMPIRICUS—THE PYRRHONISTS. The Rev. JAMES AMIRAUX JEREMIE, M.A., Christian Advocate, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

CHAPTER XXXI. CHAPTER XXXII. CHAPTER XXXIII. CHAPTER XXXIV. CHAPTER XXXV. CHAPTER XXXVI. CHAPTER XXXVII. The Rev. SAMUEL HINDS, D.D.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA METROPOLITANA;

OR, THE

UNIVERSAL DICTIONARY OF KNOWLEDGE.

Third Division.

BIOGRAPHY,

CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED.

ARATUS.

FROM A. M. 3736. B. C. 268. TO A. M. 3791. B. C. 213.

Biography. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213.

THERE is, perhaps, nothing in the whole compass of literature which so violently distracts the feelings of the reader between admiration and disgust, as the history of the Grecian republics. The patriotism, the courage, the enterprising genius, the consummate ability which distinguished them in war; the activity and acuteness, the industry and taste displayed by them in all the arts of peace, have established them as the subjects of panegyric, and the models for imitation among all succeeding nations; while discord, rapine, and violence of every kind, proscriptions the most unjust, and revolutions the most bloody, continually occurring, excite a just horror in every virtuous mind, and reconcile to their lot those people who enjoy a less splendid reputation and less cultivated faculties, under the peace and security of more settled governments.

Constitution of the Grecian republics.

The miserable prevalence of sedition and domestic warfare, which was the scourge and the disgrace of Greece, is unquestionably attributable to the defect of its political constitutions; it is the inevitable result of a number of small independent states, in close contact with each other, yet united, for the most part, by no perceptible common interest; and stimulated to hostility by the predatory habits of the age, and by jealousies respecting the purity of their descent from the founders of the Hellenic family. Federalism is the only system which can, in any degree, bind the restless and savage spirit of democracy; and so far was this system from being generally understood or desired in Greece, that the fundamental laws of almost all its republics tended directly to prevent its adoption. The ξενηλασία of the Spartans was, more or less, the recognised principle of every state; and all connection, by marriage or by the possession of property, with any adjoining city, was forbidden under severe penalties.

The evil was seen and deplored by the wisest and best men of all ages; and great pains were taken, at various periods, to compose the jarring interests of the petty towns, by including them all under the supreme direction of two or three powerful states, with the title of allies. But the continual efforts of these greater powers to seduce or to compel the smaller republics from their allegiance to their rivals, and the violent political dissensions which thence arose in every town between the advocates of the opposing interests, proved a source of mischief no less extensive and fatal than the jealousies themselves of the independent villages; and at length satisfied the impartial and reflecting portion of the people, that nothing but a confederacy on equal terms could ever produce lasting peace, and unite the whole Grecian name in one invincible league against foreign enemies. This liberal policy was of course opposed, and its success, in a great measure, defeated, by those overbearing states, which had long exercised an oppressive empire over the smaller republics, and which regarded with indignation every attempt to deprive them of their supremacy. The Olynthians, whose project for a free confederation appears to have been ably and generously planned, were almost immediately suppressed by the vigilant and ambitious power of Lacedæmon; and the Achæans had long been labouring to unite the interests of all Peloponnesus, before they could succeed in completing the celebrated League which bore their name. They met with determined opposition from Sparta, and still more from Macedon, now

Project for its amendment.

Biography. openly aspiring to the empire of Greece; and they had no statesmen among them of sufficient talents and courage to surmount these formidable obstacles.

From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213.

Achæa was first reduced to the form of a kingdom by Tisamenus, the son of Orestes, who was expelled from Sparta on the return of the Heraclidæ. The crown descended regularly in the same family to Gyges, whose sons, according to Polybius,* aiming at absolute power, instead of being contented with the constitutional monarchy of their forefathers, occasioned a revolution, in which the government became democratical, and so continued, during all the changes in its foreign relations, until the power of Philip and of Alexander overwhelmed the freedom of Greece.

Origin of the Achæan League. B. C. 371.

The commonwealth comprised twelve towns, named Patræ, Dyme, Pharæ, Tritæa, Leontium, Ægira, Pellene, Ægium, Bura, Ceraunia, Olenum, and Helice, the last of which was swallowed up by the encroachment of the sea. "They were governed by the same laws, administered by magistrates, counsellors, and judges elected in common; they used the same weights, measures, and coins; and, in short, might all have passed for one city, had they been contained by the same wall."†

Its constitution.

The supreme power of the League resided ultimately in the general assembly of deputies from each of the constituent states, which met twice every year, in the spring and in the autumn, and as often, at other seasons, as the exigency of affairs demanded. In this assembly was vested every function both legislative and executive, as well as the appointment of all the officers of state. The first of these has been called the Prætor, General, or *Stadtholder* of the League; he was elected annually, and could not hold his office more than twelve months consecutively. He was assisted by a cabinet of ten members, entitled δημιουργοὶ, without whose advice he could lay nothing before the assembly, and who formed a council of regency during his absence on military service. A similar constitution, on a smaller scale, was established in every town of the League, to administer its individual government, and to provide for the due execution of the laws.

It appears probable that these laws did not essentially differ from those of the "twelve tables," in their general spirit; but of their particular provisions we have only very vague and uncertain intimations. Some of those which regulated foreign relations and matters of state, appear to have been judiciously contrived to expedite business, and to preserve the purity of the administration. Among other ordinances it was provided, that if any person or city included in the League should accept a bribe, or enter into a negociation, or contract an alliance with any foreign potentate without the consent of the general assembly, the offender should be excluded from the confederacy; that no state should be admitted a member of the League without the unanimous approbation of the several cities; that the general assembly should not be specially convened to receive any embassy which had not been previously approved by the Stadtholder and the Council of Ten; that no special meeting of the assembly should be competent to deliberate upon any business besides that for which it was convened; that every speaker in the house should furnish an abstract of his arguments in writing, that they might be reconsidered the next day; and that no discussion should be prolonged beyond three days.

Aratus. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213.

The civil constitution of Achæa was not formed at one period only, nor were all its provisions the result of a comprehensive general plan; it arose, like other useful and permanent systems, rather from circumstances than from design, and it was changed and modified as occasion required, or as inconveniences presented themselves. Its beneficial results were not so much produced by its form and regulations, as by that spirit of liberality and moderation with which it was long administered; and when, after the death of Alexander, the Achæans became tainted by the spirit of mad ambition which desolated Greece, the union of their cities was speedily dissolved by the factions which prevailed among them. Some were garrisoned with Macedonian troops, and became dependent upon a foreign power; others were seized by a succession of military despots, who imitated, on a small scale, the ambitious schemes of the Macedonian tyrants. Under these unhappy circumstances the Achæans looked back, with bitter regret and repentance, to the peace and security of the ancient republic; and in the 124th Olympiad, four of the principal towns, Dyme, Patræ, Tritæa, and Pharæ, formed a combination to restore it. About five years afterwards, the Ægeans seized an opportunity of expelling their foreign garrison, and joined the League. The Burians, having risen upon their Tyrant and put him to death, followed the example. Iscas, the despot of Carynia, observing the signs of the times, made a virtue of necessity, and abdicating his sovereignty, united his city with the federalists; and thus the original constitution of Achæa was partially restored, and continued unchanged for five and twenty years, governed by one civil magistrate, called the γραμματεὺς,* (town clerk) and two military commanders, elected by the people for a limited period. At length some inconveniences having arisen from dissensions between the civil and military officers, the Achæans determined to lodge the whole power of the state in the hands of one chief magistrate, who should preside over all their affairs, both in peace and war; and their first choice fell upon Marcus of Carynia, who had been chiefly instrumental in inducing Iscas to lay down his usurped power.

Its extention. B. C. 281. — OL. 124.4. B. C. 259.

It was about nine years before this event, that during the troubles which agitated and almost destroyed the city of Sicyon, Abantidas, a popular demagogue, having assassinated Clinias, the chief of the aristocratical interest, and made himself master of the republic, endeavoured to confirm his power by extirpating the family of his rival. But, in the confusion which ensued, the son of Clinias, by Aristodama, a child seven years old, made his escape into the house of Soso, his uncle's widow, who was the sister of the usurper, but who espoused the political party of her late husband. Through her kindness the young Aratus was safely conveyed to Argos, to be there educated by the friends of his family, who took care to imbue him early with a rooted detestation of the opposite faction, and of monarchical government; and to form him by all those athletic and active exercises which might qualify him to become a formidable avenger of his father's blood. And such was his youthful reputation for vigour and hardihood, for high spirit and love of enter-

B. C. 268. Birth and childhood of Aratus.

* Lib. ii. 41. † Polyb. lib. ii. 37.

* Polyb. ii. 43.

Biography. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213.

prise, that the exiled Sicyonians of the aristocratical party began to entertain hopes of his ultimately achieving their restoration; and Nicocles, who had become tyrant of Sicyon, kept a watchful eye upon his movements.

His first design was to engage in his cause the states which had been the allies of his father's administration; and he found means to apply to Antigonus Gonatas of Macedon, and to Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, for assistance. But though these princes entertained him with specious promises, they showed no disposition to take any active part in his restoration to his country; and he gave up the negociation in disgust, not without shewing some symptoms of juvenile petulance.

He resolved, therefore, to depend upon his own resources, and upon the disaffection which was known to exist in Sicyon towards the government of Nicocles, who appears to have been of a weak and suspicious character, though, probably, not guilty of all the vices which historians, attached to the opposite faction, have thought fit to impute to him. In every state of Greece there was always a party ready to assist in effecting a revolution at home or abroad; and Aratus found no difficulty in engaging a considerable number of Argians in his service. With the exiles of Sicyon he had not equal success. They were principally persons of rank and family, who were unwilling hastily to commit their cause to an adventurer, scarcely twenty years of age, who had been, from his childhood, a stranger to his country. Of nearly 600 Sicyonians who lived in banishment, one only, of any note, appears to have joined him, and his example was followed by few even of the lower orders.

Conquest of Sicyon.

The genius of Aratus was more adapted for surprise and stratagem than for open warfare; and the present exigency of his affairs was calculated to exhibit his talents to the greatest advantage. With the trifling force at his disposal, of which slaves armed for the occasion formed the greater part, he resolved on a daring attempt; no less than that of scaling the walls of Sicyon by night, and of proclaiming liberty to the citizens in the morning; trusting to the favourable disposition of the populace, and to the panic which would be excited among the troops and in the palace. The circumstances of the expedition detailed by Plutarch* are so improbable and puerile that it is a matter of astonishment how any writer could be induced to repeat them after him. Aratus must have had better assurance of co-operation within, and more friends among the guards of the city, than his biographer has chosen to acknowledge; and by these means he succeeded in introducing his followers into the town during the darkest portion of the night, and disarmed the household troops of the tyrant without resistance. At day break all was bustle and confusion; the citizens scarcely knew what had happened, or how to act; all rushed eagerly for information to the places of public resort; while Aratus was busy in proclaiming, "Liberty to Sicyon—Liberty achieved by Aratus, the son of Clinias—Liberty to the citizens!" Nicocles hearing this cry repeated, and observing that his guards were withdrawn from their posts, hastily quitted the palace, and by some subterranean passage effected his escape.

B. C. 255.

The success of Aratus was now decided. No opposition was offered to him; and, if we may believe Plutarch,* not a life was lost. The fire which had been thrown into and had partly consumed the palace was speedily extinguished, and the plunder of the royal abode rewarded the enterprising followers of the expedition; but the wealth accumulated in the treasury was declared to be public property, and was preserved inviolate; the statues, paintings, and all other decorations of tyranny, were doomed to destruction; and among these are said to have been some specimens of art so exquisite that Aratus, who was a lover of painting, hesitated to order them to be defaced, whilst his friend Nealces the painter, implored him with tears to spare them: but the spirit of party prevailed, and the pictures were destroyed.

Aratus. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213.

The exiles were of course immediately restored to their country, but not to their property, which had passed into other hands, and could not be recovered from them without violence. The task of reconciling these discordant claims imposed such difficulties upon Aratus, to whom all looked for satisfaction, that he found his situation becoming every day more embarrassing. Discontent and faction prevailed in the city, and threatened a counter-revolution; whilst Antigonus, offended by the subversion of the monarchy, fomented these disorders, and watched for an opportunity to make himself master of the liberties of Sicyon.

B. C. 251. — OL. 132. 2.

In this perplexity Aratus resolved to withdraw himself, for a time, from Sicyon, and to endeavour, by awakening Ptolemy's jealousy of the designs of Antigonus, to engage him to provide for the distresses of the citizens. But, previously to his departure, he was anxious that his country should become a member of the Achæan League, in order that if any attempt should be made upon it, in his absence, means of defence might be at hand. The Sicyonians, being of Doric origin, entered readily into his views, and the cities of the league were glad to increase their strength, in order to protect their independence against the encroachments of Antigonus, whose power in Greece, and especially in Peloponnesus, was daily becoming more formidable. Having carried this important measure without opposition, Aratus, previously to his departure, enrolled himself in the Achæan cavalry, and took an opportunity of shewing his skill and discipline in a subordinate capacity, that he might lay a solid foundation for future power upon a reputation for military prowess, which his natural temper, rather delighting in intrigue than in personal conflict, little qualified him to maintain. Conceiving that he was now in no danger of being forgotten in his absence, he prepared for a voyage to Egypt, in order to solicit for his countrymen the liberality of Ptolemy, with whom, as a lover of the fine arts, he had held some intercourse concerning paintings and statues, which had led to warm professions of mutual regard.

Aratus retires into Egypt.

His misfortunes and captivity.

His voyage to Egypt was attended with unforeseen difficulties: he narrowly escaped being shipwrecked; and was near falling into the hands of the Macedonian garrison at Andria, which, he was apprehensive, might detain him till the pleasure of Antigonus should be known. After various delays, however, he at length landed safely in Egypt, and succeeded in obtaining from the liberality of the king a hundred and

* *Vita Arati.*

* *Vita Arati.*

Biography. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213.

fifty talents, (about thirty thousand pounds) for the settlement of the claims of the Sicyonian exiles. Upon his return, he was appointed sole commissioner for the decision of all the numerous and perplexing causes arising out of claims, some of which were of fifty years' standing; but he declined to undertake singly so heavy a responsibility, and associated with himself, as assessors, fifteen of the most independent and popular citizens, with whose assistance he adjusted all the disputes between the contending parties to their entire satisfaction. Plutarch* asserts that, in addition to the vote of thanks bestowed on him in the national assembly, the restored exiles honoured him with a statue† of brass, bearing the following incription:—

He returns to Sicyon.

Βελαὶ μὲν καὶ ἄεθλα, καὶ ἃ ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάδος ἀλκὰ,
Τῶδ' ἀνδρὸς στάλᾳ πλάθεται Ἡρακλέος·
Ἄμμες δ' εἰκόν, Ἄρατε, τεὰν νόστοιο τυχόντες,
Ἵστάσαμεν, αντ' ἀρετᾶς ἠδὲ δικαιοσύνας,
Σωτῆρος, σωτῆρσι θεοῖς, ὅτι πατρίδι τᾷ σᾷ
Δαίμον' ἴσον, θείαν τ' ἄπασας εὐνομίαν.‡

Difficulties of chronology.

It is confessedly impossible completely to reconcile the loose chronology of Polybius with the narrative of Plutarch; and the attempt would only lead to interminable confusion. The Achæan historian compiled that portion of his history, which relates to the affairs of the League, from the *Commentaries* of Aratus himself; and he is remarkable for that accurate fidelity, in matter of fact, in which the biographer is so peculiarly deficient. From Polybius we learn that Aratus liberated Sicyon in the fourth year from the election of Marcus as sole General of the united states, that is, twenty-nine years after the restoration of the commonwealth; and that eight years afterwards he was "elected General the second time;" from which it has been hastily inferred that eight years intervened between his first and second election; whereas Plutarch§ asserts that he was chosen two years consecutively. There is, however, nothing in the short sentence of Polybius‖ which necessarily contradicts the assertion of Plutarch; for the historian's meaning may be that Aratus was chosen General of the League for the second time, eight years after the expulsion of Nicocles; and if it be true that he served that office the first time in the year in which the Ætolians defeated the Bœotians at Chæronea, and the second time, eight years subsequently to the liberation of Sicyon, it will appear that the biographer is not in this instance at variance with the historian.

B. C. 248.

B. C. 247.

Nor is it probable that the union of Sicyon with the League, the voyage to Egypt, the settlement of the exiles' claims, and the correspondence which ensued with Antigonus and Ptolemy, could all have occurred in so short a space as one year; or that so young a man as Aratus should have been elected to preside over the League, before his character as a statesman and general was known beyond the walls of his own city. It seems more likely that the accession of Sicyon to the Achæan confederacy took place B. C. 251,* four years after the expulsion of Nicocles; and that Aratus, whose reputation became, in consequence of that event, greatly extended, was chosen General, for the first time, three years afterwards.

Aratus. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213. — B. C. 243. — OL. 134. 2.

However this may be, it is admitted that the first year of his command was distinguished by no achievement of any importance. In the second he formed the bold and fortunate design of surprising the Acropolis of Corinth, at that time occupied by a strong Macedonian garrison, and guarded by Antigonus with that vigilance, which its importance, as the key of Peloponnesus, merited. Having corrupted the fidelity of some soldiers of the garrison, who had accidentally resorted to Sicyon, he prevailed upon one of them to accompany him as a guide, and setting out by night with four hundred men, who were kept in ignorance of the object of their march, he commanded the main body of the army to bivouac at a convenient distance from the scene of action.

Surprise of the Acropolis of Corinth.

The enterprise was unquestionably attended with extreme hazard. It was necessary first to scale the walls of the lower town; and, after passing through the streets, to ascend, (by a steep, narrow, and winding path among the rocks) the height on which stood the strong fortifications of the citadel. Aratus, whose chief military excellence was in the conduct of nocturnal expeditions, surmounted all these difficulties with extraordinary address. He posted three hundred men at the temple of Juno which stood near the eastern gate of the city; and as soon as the sea fog had obscured the brightness of the moon, he applied his ladders to the wall, and directed the party with him to ascend barefooted, in order to avoid noise, and to prevent them from slipping. In the meantime the confederates within had secured the guard of the gates and the patrol of the lower town, so that the whole party passed unobserved to the foot of the rock. At this moment they perceived four of the garrison patrol advancing towards them with a light; upon which Aratus concealed his men under the shadow of a wall, and suffered them to pass, intending to strike them down as they went by; but one of them, not being mortally wounded, escaped into the city as soon as the Sicyonians had passed on, and gave the alarm. Instantly the town was in an uproar, lights glanced in all directions, men half-armed ran to and fro, inquiring what had happened, women fled screaming to the temples, trumpets sounded to arms, but no one knew the extent of the danger, nor the place in which the enemy was to be found. The three hundred men, meanwhile, who were posted at the Heræum, had been admitted into the city by the conspirators, and were making their way after the General, when the alarm, suddenly given, placed them in a situation of extreme difficulty and danger. They contrived, however, in the general confusion, to screen themselves from observation under the shelter of a projecting rock, where they waited, in anxious suspense, for some intimation which might direct their advance or retreat. Nothing could have proved more fortunate than their accidental position; for as Archelaus, the captain of the guard,

---

* *Vita Arati.*

† This statue, with that of Philopœmen, fell afterwards into the possession of Polybius. *Excerpt.* xxxi.

‡ The wisdom, and achievements, and valour of Greece
Are inscribed on the column of Hercules.
But we, O Aratus! restored to our country, erect
Thine image in remembrance of thy virtue and justice.
The image of our preserver, thou who, by divine providence,
Hast conferred on thy country blessings like the gifts of heaven.

§ *Vita Arati.*

‖ Ὀγδόῳ δὲ πάλιν ἔτει στρατηγὸς αἱρεθεὶς τὸ δεύτερον. Polyb. ii. 43.

* Lempriere's *Chronological Table.* Lempriere, however, as well as Langhorne, places the reduction of the Acropolis B. C. 243.

Biography. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213.

passed hastily by, in pursuit of Aratus, without observing them, they fell upon his troops as from a concerted ambuscade, and routed them with considerable slaughter. Aratus was consequently enabled to pursue the craggy and intricate path which his guide pointed out to him, and ascended without interruption to the fortifications above, which, however, there could no longer be any hope of taking by surprise; the garrison had been roused by the tumult in the town below, and a severe action took place upon the low part of the wall, which Aratus attempted to scale. He instantly despatched his guide to order the remainder of his party to come up, which flushed with its recent good fortune, and animated by the warlike cries of its comrades on the citadel, hastily climbed the rock, and joined in the combat. The garrison, astonished at this accession of numbers, and pushed with redoubled vigour by the assailants, gave way on every side; and "the first rays of the morning sun," says Plutarch,* "gilded the victory of Aratus," who obtained possession of the citadel at the same moment that the main body of the army, arriving according to his orders at the gates of the lower town, was admitted, and thus prevented the escape of the fugitives.

This is perhaps one of the most brilliant exploits of the kind recorded in history; and the Corinthians were fully sensible of the merit of the General, and of the value of their deliverance from a foreign yoke. They overwhelmed him with tumultuous applause; and it was long before he could obtain a hearing in the theatre, on which the whole body of the people had assembled to see him. As soon as order was, in some measure, restored, he gave up to the popular assembly the keys of their city, of which they had not been possessed for nearly a century, and earnestly recommended that they should unite themselves to the Achæan League. The proposal was readily adopted by all the parties concerned, and an Achæan garrison took possession of the Acropolis.

Advantages resulting from it to the League.

The consequences of this success were immediately felt throughout Greece. Megara, throwing off its connection with Macedon, joined the confederacy; Trœzene and Epidaurus made overtures of alliance; and the isthmus being commanded by Aratus, he was enabled, at pleasure, to ravage the territory of the adverse states, and to extend the connections of the League, both on the main land, and in the Peloponnesus. The spirit and energy of the Achæans rose in proportion as they felt emancipated from the narrow boundaries to which the jealousy of Antigonus had confined them; and the General was so popular that they resolved to elect him every alternate year.†

Aratus, thus in effect at the head of the League, though Ptolemy, king of Egypt, was for some time complimented with the title of patron or protector, exerted himself to comprise in it as many of the states of Greece, and especially of Peloponnesus, as could be prevailed upon to dismiss their petty tyrants, and to adopt a popular form of government. He was particularly desirous to effect a revolution in Argos; but it is evident, even from the admissions of Plutarch, that the Argians were by no means generally disaffected to their existing government, and that the zeal of Aratus prompted him to very unjustifiable measures in order to subvert the monarchy. In the war which ensued with Aristippus, the sovereign of Argos, Aratus, though ultimately victorious by means of a successful stratagem, still lost considerable reputation by his want of personal courage, and of presence of mind in danger; and the confidence of his troops in his ability fell in proportion. In negociation he had better fortune. The city of Cleonæ was added to the confederacy; and Lysiades, Tyrant of Megalopolis, observing that he was likely to become the next object of attack, voluntarily abdicated his power, and associated the Megalopolitans with the League; in consideration of which good example he was thrice chosen General; and by his ill-timed ambition involved the united states in hostilities with Sparta, by which his own country was inevitably the greatest sufferer.

Aratus. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213. B. C. 232. — OL. 137. 1.

Ætolian invasion.

The restless spirit of the predatory Ætolians, at this time, afforded an opportunity to Aratus of recovering his military reputation. The enemy having marched towards the isthmus in a strong body, he was earnestly pressed by his own officers, and by his allies, to engage before Peloponnesus was entered; but he was resolved, since the harvest was nearly over,* to suffer the invaders to divide their strength and relax their discipline in pursuit of booty, and then to attack them at advantage. Accordingly, having learned that they were engaged in sacking Pellene, he hastened thither with extraordinary expedition, and arriving before they had time to close the gates against him, put seven hundred of them to the sword, and restored the town to the inhabitants. The prudence, vigour, and activity which he displayed in this enterprise have been highly and justly commended,† and the exploit formed the subject of one of the finest pictures of Timanthes.

Attempts on Athens.

Repeated attempts had been made, both by negociation and by force, to induce Athens to throw off the Macedonian yoke, and to become one of the united states. Aratus, in his *Commentaries*,‡ dwells upon the hazards and fatigues which he underwent in endeavouring to surprise the Piræus, and acknowledges that the Athenians seemed to rejoice in his discomfiture. At length he discovered that the Macedonian governor was accessible by bribery; and he induced that venal officer to suffer the democratic party at Athens to seize the fortifications, by a douceur of a hundred and fifty talents (about £30,000) of which the greater part was paid by Aratus himself, who had already incurred large expenses in the reduction of Corinth.

After the death of Demetrius, who had succeeded his father Antigonus on the throne of Macedon, Antigonus the Third (being declared protector of the kingdom during the minority of his nephew Philip, the son of Demetrius) married the queen dowager and usurped the crown. The influence of the Macedonian court being weakened by these changes, the petty

B. C. 243. — OL. 134. 2.

* *Vita Arati.*

† From this arrangement it appears that there must have been a revival of the ancient law that no Stadtholder should continue in power more than twelve months. On what particular occasion it was revived does not appear; but that it had been for some time disregarded is clear form Polybius, who states that Marcus was in office four years.

* Plutarch, *Vita Agidis.*

† Polyb. lib. iv. 8. Plutarch, *Vita Arati.*

‡ Plutarch, *Vita Arati, et Cleomenis.*

tyrants of Greece, who had depended upon Demetrius to support them in power, became alarmed for their safety; and Xenon of Hermione, Cleonymus of Phlius, and even Aristomachus of Argos, were induced to follow the example of Lysiades, and to unite their several cities to the Achæan League. The last of these princes, however, availed himself of the first opportunity which offered to resume his power, and to renew his former political connections; for which offence he, some years afterwards, suffered a cruel and ignominious death by the order of Aratus.

Intrigues against the League.

This rapid progress of the League, and the power and prosperity which the united states enjoyed under their present administration, began to excite a very extensive feeling of jealousy, not only throughout Greece, but among the adjoining nations. The Ætolians, who, during the life of Demetrius, had been in close alliance with the Achæans, and were indebted to them for prompt and effectual assistance at the time of the Macedonian invasion, began now to be apprehensive that the peace and good order introduced by the federal principle might prove an obstacle to those predatory excursions to which they were peculiarly addicted; and though the memory of recent services kept them from acts of open hostility, they are said* to have negociated with Cleomenes, king of Sparta, and with the young prince Antigonus, with a view of forming an extensive combination for the suppression of the confederacy. In order to open a way for this negociation, the Ætolians not only suffered the violation of their frontier by the troops of Cleomenes without remonstrance, but even yielded to him three most important places, Tegea, Mantinea, and Orchomenus, that he might be better prepared to cope with Aratus.

Measures of Aratus for its support.

These circumstances were not likely to escape the sagacity of so profound a politician as Aratus, who felt the importance of the conjuncture, and endeavoured to provide against the danger. He saw that, notwithstanding the recent accession of several states to the League, the Achæans were by no means strong enough to contend against so many enemies at once; and he could not but be aware that, in the event of hostilities with Sparta, the local situation and the interests of Megalopolis would, in all probability, detach it from the confederacy, and throw the power of that state into the scale of the enemy.

Alliance with Antigonus.

He resolved, therefore, if possible, to throw the Achæans into the arms of Antigonus; and to persuade that young prince that his interest plainly required him to forget family feuds, and to check the avaricious temper of the Ætolians, and the still more dangerous ambition of the Spartan king, which otherwise would not fail to drive him entirely out of Greece. Many reasons, however, concurred to render Aratus unwilling that overtures towards an alliance with Macedon should appear to originate with himself; and he had recourse to that indirect policy, for which his wily nature peculiarly fitted him. He prevailed upon two young Megalopolitans of rank, with whom he was intimately acquainted, to move the authorities of their own city to send them as deputies to the general assembly of the Achæans, with instructions suited to his purpose; and, upon their arrival, he so contrived with the leading men of the League, that the same persons were despatched, with permission to treat with the Macedonian court for the protection of Megalopolis. Tutored by Aratus, they found little difficulty in gaining over Antigonus to their wishes, and they returned, charged by him to assure the Achæans, and Aratus in particular, of his eagerness to cultivate their friendship. Having secured this important point, Aratus felt less unwilling to encounter the bold and enterprising genius of Cleomenes, who, having a design to restore the ancient Spartan discipline, and to recover the original prerogatives of the crown, was making rapid strides towards the re-establishment of the former supremacy of Lacedæmon in Peloponnesus. Among other unequivocal marks of determined hostility to the Achæans, he had seized and fortified the temple of Minerva near Bilbina, in the territory of Megalopolis, for the avowed purpose of annoying that people, in retaliation for their having joined the League; and Aratus was prevailed on by Aristomachus, at this time General of the Achæans, to support a resolution of the assembly for declaring war against Sparta. The Megalopolitans moved that Antigonus should immediately be requested to send an army into Peloponnesus; but Aratus, who knew that the Macedonian prince would require terms extremely humiliating to him, and injurious to the honour and interests of the League, was anxious to dissuade them from so hasty a measure; and he represented to them that, since they had succeeded in detaching Macedon from the coalition against them, they had no longer the same reason to distrust their own resources; and that it would be impolitic to expose themselves to the ambition of their new ally, till they should find that they were unable to defend themselves without his assistance.

Defeats of the Achæans.

But, notwithstanding all this caution and duplicity, it could not be concealed from Ptolemy that the Achæans, while they affected to honour him with the title of their patron, had, in effect, placed themselves under the protection of a rival power; and he was consequently induced to send succours and supplies to Cleomenes, which enabled him to take the field with a more numerous and well appointed army than Aratus had anticipated. The result was such as might have been expected. Aratus proved no match for Cleomenes in open war. The Achæans were everywhere defeated. At Lycæum they were so completely routed that Aratus was missing, and reported among the killed; but, with his usual adroitness, he took advantage of this circumstance to collect a few troops, and to surprise Mantinea; of which, however, Cleomenes did not long suffer him to retain possession. In a pitched battle, which occurred soon afterwards, in the Laodician district of Megalopolis, he refused to support Lysiades, who had commenced a successful attack upon the enemy's camp, and who was in consequence cut off with the whole of his detachment, and fell, fighting gallantly to the last, while his superior officer looked on without attempting to relieve him. In a third action, at Hecatombæum in the Dymæan territory, the Achæans, who had brought their whole force into the field, were entirely cut to pieces, and left without an army. Aratus incurred great odium on account of these miscarriages, and especially for having suffered the destruction of Lysiades, which was attributed to private pique as well as to personal cow-

* Polyb. ii. 45.

Biography. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3791. — B. C. 213.

Aratus. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to 3791. — B. C. 213.

ardice; and Plutarch * asserts that a strong vote of censure was passed in the assembly upon his conduct.

The time had now arrived for calling in the aid of Antigonus; but Aratus felt extreme unwillingness to acknowledge that the condition upon which it must be obtained was the surrender of the citadel of Corinth, the taking of which from the Macedonians, had been the most glorious achievement of his life. Whilst he was hesitating to propose this measure to the assembly, he sent his son, the young Aratus, into Macedonia, to assure the king of his readiness to comply with his terms, and to give hostages for the fidelity of the Achæans. In the meanwhile, the people of Corinth took the alarm from the recollection of the former tyranny of the Macedonians, and having hastily ordered the Achæans to march out of their city, they invited Cleomenes to take the command of their fortifications. On this occasion, according to Plutarch,† Aratus effected his escape, not without difficulty, (so incensed were the Corinthians, by what they deemed his treachery) and his property was protected from plunder only by the generous interference of the Spartan king. Afterwards, when the people ascertained that the young Aratus had remained as a hostage in Macedonia, they insisted upon confiscating this property, and making a grant of the estate to Cleomenes.

Indignation of the Corinthians

The Spartans, meanwhile, partly by force, and partly by the reputation of their splendid success, had become masters of several of the most important places in the confederacy. Caphyæ, Pellene, Phenens, Phlius, Cleonæ, Epidaurus, Hermione, Troezene, and even Argos, had submitted to the conqueror; who having, besides, gained possession of the lower town of Corinth, and having blocked up the Achæan garrison in the citadel, was in a condition to give laws to the whole of Peloponnesus. The political sagacity of Aratus, however, prevented the consolidation of that power which seemed threatening to overwhelm Greece; by his advice, Antigonus, who had been refused permission to march through Ætolia, embarked his army in transports, and sailing by Eubœa,‡ landed unexpectedly near the isthmus, whilst Cleomenes was laying siege to Sicyon.

Power of Sparta.

Advance of Antigonus.

Aratus is severely censured in this place by his biographer,§ first, for declining the office of General which he had been in the habit of filling every other year, and secondly, for not conferring it upon Cleomenes, who, by this expedient, would have become the ally and protector of the League. But upon reflection, the impartial historian must acquit him of blame, in having declined to contend with a rival who had, in every rencontre, been an overmatch for him. To have made the king of Sparta General of the united states, would have been to restore at once the ancient supremacy of that domineering power, and would have given an irrecoverable blow to the liberties of Achæa, which Antigonus could never feel it his interest entirely to destroy, as long as the Achæans continued at enmity with Lacedæmon.

When Cleomenes was informed that the Macedonians were advancing towards the isthmus, he instantly raised the siege of Sicyon, and marched to defend Corinth; but Aratus, though inferior to him in the field, was enabled to atone for this deficiency by his vigilance and skill in negociation. He made overtures to the democratical party at Argos, offering to depose Aristomachus, who had been restored to the tyranny, if they would admit a Macedonian garrison into their city; and the scheme was so well concerted with Aristoteles, the leader of the party, that the Lacedæmonian garrison was besieged in the citadel, and fifteen hundred Macedonians, under Aratus, were transported by sea to Epidaurus, on their way to Argos, before Cleomenes was aware of his danger. His operations against Antigonus had, upon the whole, been attended with considerable success; but, by this masterly manœuvre of Aratus, he found himself in danger of being completely surrounded, and of having all his communications cut off, and his supplies intercepted. With his characteristic promptitude he quitted his lines, and hastened to relieve his garrison at Argos. By a forced march he arrived there before Aratus, and obtained some advantage over him; but perceiving that Antigonus hung upon his rear, he was under the necessity of retiring to Mantinea; where, finding his troops greatly disheartened by his failure, he broke up his camp and marched home. Antigonus left without an opponent, placed a garrison in the Corinthian citadel, and proceeded to Argos; and every thing having succeeded to his wish he led his army into Arcadia, and storming the Lacedæmonian fortresses recently erected there, delivered them up to the Megalopolitans. Thence he hastened to attend the convention of the general assembly at Ægium, and by his eloquence and liberal sentiments he gained so much popularity with the Achæans, that he was chosen commander-in-chief of all their forces; upon which he drew his troops into winter quarters at Sicyon and at Corinth.

Recapture of Corinth.

Antigonus chosen General of the League.

As soon as the season for action commenced, the Macedonian troops were led into the field, and joining the Achæans at Tegea, compelled that city to surrender. Antigonus, leaving a garrison to secure the Tegeans in obedience, advanced by rapid marches into Laconia, (where Cleomenes was expecting his approach) and avoiding a general action, he harassed the Spartan army by continual skirmishes, with the view, according to Polybius,* of ascertaining what impression could be made upon it by his Macedonians. Having learned, in the midst of these operations, that Cleomenes was assisted by the Orchomenians, this active general marched to surprise Orchomenus, and took it by assault.† Encouraged by this success, he laid seige to Mantinea,‡ which surrendered, after a short resistance; and he then proceeded to invest Herea and Telphusa, the inhabitants of both which cities opened their gates at his approach. The autumnal assembly of the states was now at hand, and Antigonus returned to Ægium to be present at their meeting. So great was the confidence produced by his late achievements, and by the recovery of so many cities to the League, that he dismissed his Macedonian army, and ordered them home for the winter, whilst he remained to conduct the deliberations of the Achæan council, and to command their troops.

His continued successes.

* *Vita Arati.* † *Vita Arati.* ‡ Polyb. ii. 52.
§ Plutarch, *Vita Arati.*

* Lib. ii. 54.
† Of this city and of Corinth he retained possession as long as he lived.—Polyb. iv. 6.
‡ From this period called Antigonea.

No sooner was it known that the Macedonians were gone, than Cleomenes prepared to surprise Megalopolis, which, from its great extent and reduced population, was generally ill-guarded. In this bold attempt he succeeded, though not without great difficulty and danger; and whilst the impression of so unexpected an event was fresh on the minds both of the Spartans and of the enemy, he pushed forward almost to the gates of Argos, where Antigonus resided, and ravaged the country, hoping to provoke him to an engagement on very unequal terms. But his own prudence, or the cautious counsels of Aratus, preserved the Macedonian king from falling into the snare, and he suffered the Lacedæmonians to return home unmolested, having gained little real advantage by their hazardous expedition. In the spring the Macedonian troops returned in great force, and being joined by the Achæans from their various winter quarters, Antigonus put himself at their head, and defeated Cleomenes in the celebrated battle of Sellasia, where the power and glory of Sparta were for ever extinguished, and all the apprehensions of the Achæans from that quarter were finally set at rest.

Battle of Sellasia. B. C. 222. — Ol. 139. 3.

This gallant and high-minded prince, to whom they were so deeply indebted, appears to have entertained no designs hostile to their liberty. He was too candid to conceal his prepossessions in favour of monarchical government, or his ardent admiration of some of those brave and enlightened princes, whose statues, destroyed by the republican zeal of Aratus, he took pleasure in restoring. But, though these differences of sentiment created some temporary uneasiness, Antigonus left Greece, carrying with him the sincere esteem of Aratus, and the grateful attachment of all his allies.* Unhappily for all parties he carried with him also the seeds of a mortal distemper, which he too rashly disregarded; and soon after his return, cheering his men in a victorious charge against the Illyrians, he ruptured a large vessel in the lungs, and died from the effusion of blood.

Character of Antigonus III.

His death.

On the death of Antigonus, his nephew Philip succeeded to the throne of Macedon; but no immediate change took place in the political relations of Greece. This prince had been intimately connected with the younger Aratus, and had professed for him the warmest regard;† but he had always entertained a distrust of the father, whose republican principles offended his pride, and whose tergiversation excited his suspicion. On his accession he became cold toward his Achæan friends, who had accustomed themselves to place too much reliance on foreign protection; and the Ætolians, who had been compelled to sue for peace after the defeat of Cleomenes, now ventured to resume their predatory habits, and to make incursions into the territories of the neighbouring states. They began by seizing Clarium, a fortress in the Megalopolitan country, which they made their head-quarters, and thence infested the neighbourhood with perpetual robberies; but Timoxenus, the General of the League, with the assistance of Taurio, who had been appointed lieutenant by Antigonus, stormed the place and dispersed the garrison. After this commencement of hostilities, Dorimachus and Scopas, who commanded the Ætolian forces, thought fit to suspend their operations till the term for which Timoxenus held his office, was nearly closed: intending to take advantage of that inactivity which usually prevailed in the army while the command was passing into new hands. Accordingly, a few days before Timoxenus resigned his staff, they commenced a violent and sudden attack upon the lands of Patræ and Pharæ, and extended their ravages to the precincts of Messene; the inhabitants not venturing to offer any resistance. When the states assembled as usual at Ægium, deputies from all these towns attended to complain of the injuries they had received; and the assembly issued orders to their General to repress the insolence of the Ætolians. Timoxenus, unwilling to hazard, on the event of a battle at the close of his year, the reputation which he had previously gained, declined to march against them; but Aratus, who was appointed to succeed him, indignant at the conduct of the enemy, and commiserating the sufferings of the Messenians, anticipated, by five days, the legal period of his command, and taking the staff of office from Timoxenus, issued his orders to the Achæan troops and their allies to assemble at Megalopolis.

Coldness of Philip towards the League.

B. C. 220. — Ol. 140. 1.

The Ætolians renew their incursions.

As soon as he found himself at the head of a considerable army, he sent a herald to Dorimachus and Scopas, desiring them to quit the territory of the united states, on pain of being treated as enemies. The Ætolian generals, perceiving that Aratus was in great force, sent for their vessels, and prepared to embark the booty they had collected; and Aratus, after waiting only two days, became the dupe of appearances, and disbanding the main body of his army, marched, with three thousand infantry, three hundred cavalry, and the detachment under Taurio, for Patræ. The Ætolians, who instantly perceived their advantage, marched in pursuit, and pitched their camp at Methydrium. Upon this Aratus inconsiderately altered his route, and encamped at Caphyæ, and upon seeing the enemy advance towards Orchomenus, he drew up his line in order of battle upon the bank of a river in a strong situation. The enemy, not daring to assail his position, endeavoured to gain some high ground in the neighbourhood; an advantage which Aratus despatched his cavalry and light infantry to prevent: an action ensued, in which the Achæans were defeated with severe loss, and escaped entire destruction only by taking refuge in the neighbouring fortified places. The Megalopolitans, who arrived the next day to their assistance, were employed in burying the dead; and the Ætolians pursued their march through Peloponnesus in triumph, plundering the country as they passed.

They defeat the Achæans.

Upon the news of this disaster the states were convened, and several charges were preferred against Aratus for conduct unworthy of a General. First, that he had assumed the command of the army before he was legally entitled to it. Secondly, that he had disbanded his troops in face of the enemy. Thirdly, that he had risked an action with so small a force, when he might easily have withdrawn into Orchomenus or Caphyæ, and waited for succours. The last and weightiest charge was, that in the battle he had neglected to advance his heavy-armed troops, of whom the enemy stood in dread, and had trusted the event of the day to his cavalry and light infantry, whom he sent into action upon unfavourable ground.

Trial of Aratus.

* Polyb. ii. 70.

† Plutarch intimates that their connection was of a nature unhappily not disgraceful in Greece.—*Vita Arati.*

To these charges he replied generally, that whatever might have been his errors of judgment, he was free from criminal intention or negligence; and he concluded by reminding the states of his past services, and entreating that they would not judge him in a vindictive spirit. The assembly, sensibly touched by this appeal, acquitted him of blame, and again intrusted the direction of their affairs to his guidance.

During several seasons which followed, the Ætolians continued to make incursions into Peloponnesus; and though the assembly of the states sent for succours to Philip, and to their other allies, and enabled Aratus and other generals to appear at the head of very formidable armies, nothing effectual was done to repress the invaders.

Conduct of Philip.

At length Philip, ashamed of this inactivity, came in person to Corinth to take the command of the allied army. He found Peloponnesus much divided into parties, and Sparta, which had been reduced, after its capture by Antigonus, to the form of a republic, torn by intestine faction; the Ætolians, professing the most peaceable dispositions, omitted no opportunity of plundering the allies; and the Achæans were more willing to purchase the assistance of Macedonian troops by disgraceful concessions, than to undergo the fatigues and dangers of an irregular campaign. The young king exerted himself with great spirit to remedy these disorders, and exhibited many indications of vigour and generosity; but he failed to produce any permanent change in the state of affairs. His inexperience and his evil counsellors led him to distrust Aratus, whose prudence and sagacity would have extricated him from many of the difficulties in which he became involved; he openly quarrelled with the younger Aratus, recently chosen General of the League, whose wife he had basely corrupted;* and he entered into the schemes of interested persons, in order to make himself absolute throughout Greece.

Intrigues of his minister Apelles.

Matters were in this situation, when the two Arati determined to seek an explanation with the king, in which, after a violent altercation with Apelles, his prime minister, they succeeded in opening his eyes to the falsehood and treachery of the party by whose advice he had acted; and Aratus had the satisfaction of persuading him to dismiss his Macedonian army, and to spend the winter with his Grecian friends at Argos.† A cordial reconciliation was the result; and preparations were made for active operations in the ensuing spring. Eperatus was chosen General of the League; but he was a man of no talents nor energy of character, and the whole resources of the states were placed at the disposal of Philip, who, assisted by the experience and sagacity of Aratus, conducted the campaign with distinguished address and courage, and obtained a decisive advantage over the Ætolians, the Eleans, and the Lacedæmonians, who were combined against him. His success would have been more brilliant, had it not been in part frustrated by the cabals of Apelles and his faction, whose jealousy of Aratus at length led them to such outrageous behaviour, that their deep-laid treachery was discovered, and the principal authors of the mischief were put to death.

Frustrated.

The next year Aratus was again elected to the command. For some time all things succeeded to his wish, and the states of the League enjoyed comparative security under the protection of Macedon; but as Philip advanced in age, his ambitious passions became developed, and his pride could not brook the unpolished manner of Aratus, who frequently offended him by the freedom with which he expressed his opinions. Men not unusually profit by the admonitions which they resent; and though the king was for some time dissuaded from his impolitic intention of making war against Rome, he never forgave Aratus for having predicted his final overthrow in that contest. On one occasion Philip was advised by Demetrius of Pheræ,* to place a garrison in Ithomè, a fortress belonging to the Messenians; and having sacrificed to Jupiter, he held the entrails of the victim in this hand, and turning to Aratus, who was present, asked his opinion of the will of heaven. Demetrius, interrupting him, exclaimed scornfully, "If you have the soul of a priest, lead away your troops; but if you have the spirit of a king, keep possession of the citadel; for you will never have such another opportunity of getting hold of the bull by both horns." By the bull, says Polybius,† he meant Peloponnesus, and by the two horns the citadels of Corinth and Ithomè. Aratus remained silent; but the king pressing for his opinion, after some hesitation, he said, "If you can hold this fortress without violating your oath to the Messenians, it is unquestionably expedient. But if, in taking possession of it, you should lose that best guard of all your fortresses, the faith of treaties, which you inherited from Antigonus, it would be incomparably better to be true to your allies, and to relinquish the present object." Philip felt the force of the appeal, and yielded to it; but he felt also the censure which it conveyed, and his temper was irritated.

Jealousy of Philip.

The ambition which he entertained to make himself master of Messenia, now became the source of frequent altercations with Aratus and with his son; and produced at length so much mutual dislike, that Philip desired nothing more than to be freed from their importunities; but there does not appear sufficient ground for the suspicion expressed by Aratus, and apparently believed by Polybius,‡ that the death of the Achæan Prætor, which happened not long afterwards, was occasioned by a slow poison administered to him by Taurio at the instigation of the king. He died of a lingering distemper, accompanied with hæmoptoe, at Ægium, in the sixty-second year of his age, having served the office of General of the Achæan League seventeen times. The states vied with each other in evincing their sense of his merits and his services, by the respect which they displayed for his memory; and his countrymen, according to the preposterous custom of the times, paid him divine honours as a saviour, and instituted annual games and solemnities,

Death of Aratus.

B. C. 213 — OL. 141. 4.

* Livy, xxvi. 31. Plutarch, *Vita Arati.* † Polyb. iv. 87.

* In Thessaly. † vii. 3.

‡ Lib. viii. 9. Plutarch, not content with this story, adds that the younger Aratus was also drugged with potions which deprived him of his intellect and inflamed his passions, so that his early death was counted an happy deliverance. But Polybius states that Aratus, son of Aratus, the Sicyonian, was joined with his father, Lycortas, and himself, in an embassy from the Achæan states to king Ptolemy, on account of the ancient friendship which had existed between his family and the Ptolemies. *Excerpt.* Polyb. lvii. Livy makes Aristænus say, that Philip murdered both father and son, xxxii. 21.

Biography. From A. M. 3786. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3891. — B. C. 213.

which were celebrated near his tomb in the most public part of the city. Some vestiges of these festivals remained in the time of Plutarch.

Polybius, who was himself an Achæan, and intimately acquainted with the friends and family of Aratus, has left a very impartial judgment of his talents and character. He represents him as superior to all the statesmen of his day in sagacity, penetration, and application to affairs, and singularly expert in concerting stratagems, or planning a surprise; but in the field tardy and irresolute, apt to be deceived, and easily intimidated. His virtues and his vices were those of the age in which he lived. He was disinterested, patriotic, and generous, liberal to his friends, and faithful to his allies; but he was withheld by no scruples from the pursuit of his favourite political objects, and he deemed nothing cruel nor unjust which could be effected against Tyrants. As an historian his reputation stood high with his contemporaries; and the reliance which Polybius places on his fidelity and accuracy, renders the loss of his *Commentaries* a subject of profound regret to the lovers of history.

Aratus. From A. M. 3736. — B. C. 268. to A. M. 3891 — B. C. 213.

CLEOMENES.

FROM A. M. 3769. B. C. 235. TO A. M. 3785. B. C. 219.

Biography. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

THE institutions of Lycurgus, which had rendered Sparta at one time the most powerful state in Greece, were scarcely compatible with any considerable advancement in civilisation, or any extended views of foreign policy. In the long wars with Persia, which ensued from the impolitic ambition of the court of Sardis, the kings and the soldiers of Lacedæmon necessarily spent much of their time in Asia, and gradually acquired that taste for luxury and expense which distinguished their companions in arms. The insufficiency of their own resources obliging them to cultivate the alliance of Greeks and barbarians, and to employ mercenary troops, brought upon them the necessity of raising a revenue, and taught them the value of property and the uses of money. The consequences were a relaxation of ancient discipline both at home and abroad, neglect of the laws, and a contempt for those simple habits, and that independent poverty, which had once been the boast and the glory of Sparta. The corruption was not at first rapid, nor were there wanting men of virtue and abilities who strenuously resisted its progress; but the result was inevitable. The Agrarian law, which long preserved the aristocracy of Sparta distinct from the servile classes, as a proud armed nobility disdaining mechanical employments or mercantile speculations, was repealed by the influence of Epitades, one of the Ephori, who is said to have been actuated by some private motive.* The habits of expense which had been introduced, immediately occasioned many of the nobles to avail themselves of the power thus acquired to alienate their family estates, which were purchased by others, who had been enriched by plunder in war, or by foreign connections. Property became engrossed by a few enormously wealthy families, whose sons were enervated by refinement; whilst the descendants of the impoverished aristocracy were confounded with the inferior classes, and were excluded, by the necessity of earning a livelihood, from the liberal pursuits and the warlike exercises of their forefathers. When young Agis † came to the throne, there were, according to Plutarch,‡ no more than seven hundred families of the ancient Spartan race remaining, and of these scarcely a seventh part retained their patrimonial estates. The discontent and faction, inseparable from such a state of affairs, occasioned violent commotions, and crimes formerly unknown to Lacedæmon; and the constitution was so much impaired, that the Kings had lost even the shadow of regal power, and were insulted and deposed, banished and recalled, at the pleasure of the Ephori,* (overseers) who exercised the whole authority of government. Agis, who was himself among the richest individuals of Lacedæmon, and whose family enjoyed even larger possessions than himself, was inspired, from his early youth, with a noble ambition to distinguish himself by restoring the laws and the discipline of former times; and upon coming to the throne, he instantly began the work of reformation, and set the example not merely of a plain appearance and diet, and of hardy habits of life, but proposed to throw into the common stock the vast sums of money possessed by himself and his relations, and to give up his land to be divided according to the provisions of the Lycurgan law. In this design he was frustrated, and lost his life by the intrigues of the Ephori and the opposition of Leonidas, his partner on the throne, who had imbibed, during a long residence in Asia, sentiments more suited to the corruption of the age.

State of Sparta at the accession of Agis.

Murder of Agis.

The Ephori having murdered Agis in prison, his brother Archidamus saved himself by flight from the designs which Leonidas entertained against his life. His wife Agiatis, scarcely yet recovered from her confinement, was seized in her own house, and conducted to the palace of the king, who had resolved upon forcing her to marry his son Cleomenes, at that time not eighteen years of age. Agiatis was a woman of true Spartan spirit, full of courage and generosity, but at the same time capable of the most tender conjugal affection. She resisted, by every means in her power, the will of Leonidas, and desired nothing more than to be permitted to cherish the memory of her

Marriage of his widow Agiatis with Cleomenes

Cleomenes. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

* Plutarch, *in Agide.* † Son of Eudamidas. ‡ *Vita Agidis.*

* The office of the Ephori was instituted to prevent warlike princes and great commanders from erecting a military despotism at home. It existed, under the same name, in other states besides Sparta, and produced similar effects,

Biography. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

late husband; but her great fortune was too splendid an object to be relinquished, and the king insisted upon her obedience. Her beauty and her misfortunes soon made a powerful impression upon the young prince, he entered with great delicacy into her feelings, and endeavoured to engage her in conversation. This circumstance induced her to hope that, by complying with the commands of Leonidas, she might lay a foundation for carrying into effect the reformation begun by Agis, and for restoring the ancient glory of her country; and she consented to become the wife of Cleomenes that she might wean him from the principles of his father.

Influence acquired by Agiatis.

In this design she was completely successful. The young prince, naturally romantic, generous, and ambitious of glory, was at an age when the character is easily moulded by the influence of a beloved female. His imagination was fired, and his feelings were touched by the descriptions which his wife delighted to give him of the character and conduct of Agis; and he was animated with an enthusiastic desire to imitate, and, if possible, to surpass him, that he might fill his place in the affections of Agiatis. Such an attachment was happily calculated to soften that severity of character which he derived from the Stoic philosophy, instilled into him by Spherus, the disciple of Zeno, who had been the preceptor of his early years; and was the source of that amiable temper in domestic life, which Polybius* seems to think inconsistent with the ardour and vehemence so conspicuous in his public conduct.

Accession of Cleomenes. B. C. 235.

Upon his accession to the throne on the death of his father, Cleomenes resolved to lose no time in commencing the great work of reformation which he had so long been meditating; and for this purpose he held frequent consultations with his friend Xenares, and desired to be informed by him of the steps taken by Agis, and of the causes of his failure. Xenares, suspecting his design, and averse from its execution, withdrew himself from his intimacy; and Cleomenes, perceiving the danger of having his intentions prematurely discovered, resolved to form his plan with no adviser besides his wife, whose talents, fidelity, and fascinating manners had deeply rooted his early prepossession. The great obstacle to reform was removed by the death of Eucidamides, his colleague, which occurred so seasonably, that it has been attributed to poison administered by Cleomenes. But the Ephori, who, in time of peace, possessed the entire executive power of the state, still stood in his way, and held in complete subjection the friends whose support was indispensable to his success. Observing, therefore, that Agis had failed by engaging in an unequal contest with these magistrates, he determined to rid himself of them before he should attempt the restoration of the laws and discipline of Lycurgus.† For this purpose it was necessary to involve the country in war, that the command of the army might give him power, and that a successful campaign might gain popularity among the people. Besides these reasons, he was eager to make war upon the united states of Achæa,‡ conceiving them to have usurped in Peloponnesus the supremacy so long exercised by Lacedæmon: for, by the able negociations and military manners of Aratus, the whole peninsula, excepting Laconia, Elis, and a few inconsiderable towns of Arcadia, had joined the League; and, upon the death of Leonidas, he had made some hostile attempts against the Arcadian cities remaining in the Lacedæmonian interest, which, though not successful, formed a justifiable ground for commencing a system of reprisals.

Cleomenes. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

With these views Cleomenes listened willingly to the invitation of the Ætolian Ephori to join with them and with Macedon in an extensive combination against the united states; and he accepted from them the possession of three important fortresses, Mantinea, Tegea, and Orchomenus, at that time not merely in alliance with the Ætolian republic, but actually members of the confederacy.* The Achæan General, alarmed at this turn of affairs, exerted himself to detach Antigonus from the new allies, and made an attempt to surprise Tegea and Orchomenus by night, a mode of warfare in which he had been singularly successful. But the conspirators, who had undertaken to assist him in the enterprise, were secured by the vigilance of Cleomenes; who exulting in having disappointed the wily veteran, sent him a jocular note,† inquiring, "Whither he had been rambling about the country by night?" Aratus replied that his last movement had been designed to prevent the fortification of Bilbina, a post in the Megalopolitan territory, which the Ephori had commanded their king to occupy, and to fortify the Athenæum which stood near it. Cleomenes, who knew the real object of the nocturnal expedition, returned for answer, that "he was perfectly satisfied with the account which the General had given of his own movement, but begged to be informed where all the scaling ladders and lanterns had been marching." Aratus was disposed to laugh at this sally; but an old Lacedæmonian in his army, who knew the character of Cleomenes, gravely observed, "If you have any great design in hand, make haste and complete it before the spurs of this cockerel are grown."

War against the Achæans.

The Ephori of Sparta, meanwhile, always vacillating in their councils, became apprehensive of the consequences of a war, and recalled the King home; upon which Aratus immediately seized Caphyæ, and was preparing to extend his success, when the same magistrates sent Cleomenes against him with five thousand men. The command of the Achæan army, consisting, according to Plutarch,‡ of twenty thousand infantry and a thousand cavalry, had, in the interim, devolved upon Aristomachus, lately Tyrant of Argos, who having abdicated his sovereignty, and united his city with the League, was, for this service, chosen general. Notwithstanding the great disproportion of numbers, Cleomenes offered him battle, gaily reminding his troops of the saying of an ancient Spartan King, that "the Lacedæmonians do not ask the numbers of the enemy, but where they are." Aristomachus was eager to accept the challenge; but Aratus, intimidated by the daring spirit of the young King, refused his consent, and prevailed upon him to retire

The Achæan army then moved to attack Elis, which was in alliance with Lacedæmon; but Cleomenes, marching hastily to its relief, overtook and

* *Excerpt.* ix. † Polyb. ii. 47. ‡ Id. eod.

* Polyb. ii. 46. † Plutarch *in Vitâ Cleomenis.* ‡ *Vita Cleomenis.*

defeated them with great slaughter at Lycæum; and Aratus himself escaped with so much difficulty, that he was for some time missing, and reported to be slain. Taking advantage of this error, he found means to surprise Mantinea; and the Ephori were so alarmed by the loss of that important place, that they refused Cleomenes the means of continuing the war. Upon this, he resolved to attempt the restoration of the royal authority, and proposed to supply the place of his late colleague by sending for Archidamus, the brother of Agis, to share the throne. The Ephori dared not oppose a measure so agreeable to the constitution and to justice; but they took care to defeat it by procuring the assassination of Archidamus immediately upon his arrival.* The King, finding himself unable to contend against their power, was compelled to resort to bribery; and being largely supplied with money by his mother Cratesiclea, who was an enthusiast in reform, he purchased the consent of the Ephori to the renewal of hostilities.†

Defeat of the Achæans.

Having gained this point, he marched out with the intention of seizing Leuctra,‡ a town belonging to Megalopolis. Aratus hastened to its relief, and was joined by Lysiades with a body of Megalopolitans. A brilliant action was fought on the Laodician plain, near the walls of the city, in which the Achæans had, at first, the advantage; but Aratus, either envying the glory of Lysiades, or infatuated by timidity, refused to support the pursuit which had commenced, and the eagle eye of Cleomenes, instantly catching the moment of advantage, turned upon his pursuers. Lysiades and his light troops, entangled in the enclosures, were cut to pieces, the Spartans returned to the charge, and the whole Achæan army fled in disorder. The slaughter was very great; and Aratus was glad to obtain a truce with permission to bury his dead; but Cleomenes, admiring the gallantry of Lysiades, who had lately abdicated the sovereignty of Megalopolis and united it with the League, insisted upon doing honour to the corpse; and arraying it in royal robes, with a diadem on the head, he conducted it with military honours to the gates of Megalopolis.

Removal of the Ephori, and revolution in Sparta.

Conceiving that by this success he had established his military character, Cleomenes returned to Sparta, and having communicated with some of his friends, and engaged them to assist him, he determined, since no other means had proved successful, to remove the Ephori by violence, and to restore at once the power of the crown, and the laws of Lycurgus. Plutarch§ details, with amusing minuteness, the circumstances which attended the destruction of these corrupt magistrates, and the very speech which Cleomenes made to the people afterwards. But a strenuous advocate for the system of Lycurgus was not likely to have imitated the orators of Athens; and nothing can be so improbable as that one of the Ephori should relate to Cleomenes a dream, of which the obvious interpretation was, that heaven had decreed their removal by his hand. The revolution appears to have excited little commotion; the richest of the citizens were prepared to approve it, and followed the example of the king, who resigned his whole property to the public; and the poor were little inclined to question the legality of a transaction by which they alone were to be the immediate gainers. The vacancy on the throne was filled by Euclidas, the brother of Cleomenes, the only instance, it is said, in which the two Kings were from the same branch of the Heracleid tree. The next measure was, to put in force the Agrarian law; and Cleomenes generously commanded that eighty lots of land should be set apart for those citizens whom the exigency of the moment compelled him to banish, but whom he declared that he would recal to their country as soon as tranquillity should be established. He had now leisure to enforce the restoration of the ancient simple and hardy mode of life, which he had himself uniformly practised; and in this he was greatly assisted by his former tutor, the Stoic philosopher Spherus, who, having long held his school at Sparta, possessed great influence among the younger nobility. The example of the King himself was, however, the most prevailing argument. Cheerful and affable in his manners, liberal in his conduct, and peculiarly agreeable and entertaining in conversation, he won the affections of all who approached him, and every one who was ambitious of being thought fashionable imitated the King. The same severity of discipline was carried into the camp, and soon became popular among the soldiers, who were delighted with the frank familiarity of behaviour which Cleomenes knew how to combine with the most absolute authority. That the enemy might not suppose his attention wholly engrossed by his plan of reform, he made repeated incursions into their territories, and extended his ravages as far as Argos; by means of which his troops became accustomed to their new discipline, and were prepared for more serious encounters.

Renewal of hostilities.

An opportunity was not long wanted for proving the effect of these changes. The Mantineans, dissatisfied with Aratus, made overtures to Sparta; the King, marching by night, entered the town, and, with the assistance of the inhabitants, dislodged the garrison from the citadel with so much expedition that he withdrew the next morning into Tegea. After refreshing his troops, he passed through Arcadia without interruption, and made a demonstration against Pheræ, a city of Achæa, belonging to the League. Hyperbatus, at this time General of the states, encamped the whole force* under his command at Hecatombæum, near Dymæ, so that Cleomenes could not advance upon him without leaving that city in his rear, and exposing himself to a sally of the garrison. This secure position is strongly characteristic of the cautious tactics of Aratus, who, in effect, guided all the operations of the campaign; but the Spartan King, relying upon the rapidity of his movements, instantly attacked the Achæan lines, and put the entire army to the sword,† with scarcely any loss of his own men.

Aratus, after this defeat, which was attributed to his want of conduct, refused to take his turn as General during the ensuing season, not caring to meet Cleomenes again in the field; but he still retained so much influence in the Achæan councils, that he directed all

* Polybius, somewhat inconsistently, imputes this infamous action to Cleomenes. Lib. v. 37.

† Plutarch, *Vita Cleomenis.* ‡ Al. Leuctrum. § *Vita Cleomenis.*

* Παυδημεὶ κινδυνεύοντες. Polyb. ii. 51.

† Ὁλοχερῶς ἔπταισαν. Id. eod. which Casaubon renders, "universam pubem amisissent."

From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

the negociations which ensued, in which Cleomenes offered, upon being declared General of the League, to restore the places he had taken during the war, and to set at liberty all his prisoners without ransom. But Aratus, who foresaw that these conditions would not only eclipse his own glory, and annihilate his power, but would also at once restore Lacedæmon to the empire of Peloponnesus, and eventually of Greece, preferred taking refuge under the protection of Macedon, even at the price of surrendering to Antigonus the citadel called the Acrocorinthus, the scene of his most celebrated exploit.

The discussion was interrupted by the illness of Cleomenes, which obliged him to return suddenly to Sparta; and, upon his resuming the negociation, he was so rudely treated by Aratus, that, after a good deal of mutual recrimination, all hope of peace was at an end, and the Lacedæmonians, having sent a herald to declare that the war was renewed, soon made themselves masters of nearly all Peloponnesus. Cleomenes, encouraged by the extraordinary success of his arms, came suddenly upon Argos, while the Achæans were there assembled to celebrate the Nemæan games, and, with little resistance, obtained possession of that city, (of all others the first object of Spartan ambition) compelling the Argians to receive a garrison, and to give hostages for their fidelity to the Lacedæmonian alliance. The Corinthians now became eager to follow the example of their neighbours, and sent deputies to invite Cleomenes to enter their city, while they commanded Aratus and the Achæans to quit the frontier. The General, mounting his horse, made his escape; but the Achæan garrison kept possession of the citadel, and it was found impracticable to dislodge them.

Successes of Cleomenes.

The Spartan King drew a line of circumvallation round the Acrocorinthus, which completely prevented all communication between the garrison and their commander; and he then again tried the effect of negociation, and offered liberal terms to Aratus if he would surrender Corinth, and make an alliance with Lacedæmon: but the General sent an evasive and churlish reply, that "he was not master of events, but events of him;" and pressed Antigonus to hasten his march that he might save the citadel from being taken. In retaliation of this affront, Cleomenes ravaged the territories of Sicyon, and laid siege to its capital.

Operations of the Macedonians.

In the meanwhile, the Macedonians, having been refused permission to march through Pylæ by the Ætolians, arrived by sea near the isthmus, and passing mount Gerania, prepared to enter Peloponnesus. Cleomenes, who saw the impossibility of meeting Antigonus in the field with the force then under his command, threw up a line of fortification connecting the Acrocorinthus with the Oneian range,* and made his position so strong that the Macedonian king dared not attempt to force it; and in an attempt to get into his rear by the port Lechæum, one of the harbours at Corinth, he was repulsed with considerable loss. But the artifices of Aratus achieved what appeared impracticable to the force of Antigonus. A revolution was unexpectedly brought about in Argos, and means were contrived for sending a large body of Macedonians, commanded by Aratus, to support the insurgents, who were besieging the Lacedæmonian garrison in the citadel. Cleomenes, upon being apprised of the revolt, detached Megisthonus, in great haste, to relieve his garrison; but that general was killed in attempting to enter the town, and his men were dispersed and slain. The Lacedæmonians in the citadel were now severely pressed, and despatched messenger after messenger to the King, imploring him to come to their assistance. His situation was extremely perplexing; for if he should leave his lines, Antigonus was certain to gain possession of Corinth, and to open a way into Peloponnesus; or, if he should lose Argos, the enemy would be in his rear, and might either force his lines, or march into Laconia without opposition. The latter danger, at length, determined him to abandon his post, which fell immediately into the hands of the Macedonians; but Cleomenes made so rapid a march to Argos, that he arrived there before Aratus, and finding the walls of the city too well guarded to be scaled, he broke open some vaults under the suburbs, and, by subterranean passages with which he was acquainted, introduced a division of his army into the citadel, and joined the garrison. Aratus, in the meantime, arriving at the gates, was admitted into the city; but Cleomenes, by means of his archers and slingers, so galled the Macedonian troops that they dared not appear in the streets, and the Spartans were rapidly gaining possession of the city. At this moment the vigilant eye of the Lacedæmonian king saw the numerous army of Antigonus pouring down from the isthmus; and, aware of the impossibility of contending against such superiority of numbers, under the conduct of so able a commander, he made a timely and masterly retreat; and, conducting his men along the walls of the city, joined the main body of his army, and retired in good order to Mantinea. On the road he was met by a messenger, who informed him of the sudden death of his wife Agiatis, to whom he was most ardently and tenderly attached; but though this event, occurring at so inauspicious a moment, clouded all his hopes of consolation under reverses, he neither forgot the duties of a General, the dignity of a King, nor the manliness of a Spartan; but having calmly provided for the security of the outposts, he withdrew his army into Sparta. Here, in the privacy of his own family, he gave vent to the bitterness of his feelings, deprived as he was, in a few days, of the fruit of all his glorious achievements, and, of what he valued still more, of his domestic happiness. But though his own heart was shut against hope, he felt all that he still owed to his country; and rousing himself from despair, he looked around him for the means of defending Lacedæmon against the expected invasion. In preparing to meet this danger, fresh trials awaited him. Ptolemy Evergetes, at this time king of Egypt, jealous of the progress of Antigonus in Greece, was easily induced to promise succours and supplies to Cleomenes; but it was upon condition that his mother and his son should be sent to Egypt as hostages for his fidelity. The heroic descendant of Hercules hesitated not to deprive himself of his last treasure to save Sparta; but though resolved to sacrifice his own affections, he could not command resolution to break the business to his mother. Cratesiclea, however, perceived that a

From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

Death of Agiatis.

Alliance of Cleomenes with Ptolemy Evergetes.

* Polyb. ii. 52.

Biography. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

secret weight hung upon the mind of her son, and with some difficulty drew from him the cause of his uneasiness. No sooner was it explained, than the Spartan spirit of this noble lady prevailed over every other sentiment, and she exclaimed with generous enthusiasm—"Is this all?—let me embark without delay; and thank the gods that, old and helpless as I appear, I may yet be of service to Sparta!"

Cleomenes immediately prepared for her departure, and conducted her, with a train suitable to her rank, to the port of Tænarus. But when he was about to part with her and his child, his emotion overcame even his hereditary firmness, and he began to weep aloud. Cratesiclea, who had resigned herself to her fate, as a victim sacrificed to her country, remained calm, and leading her son aside into the temple of Neptune, she said, "King of Sparta, when we go out hence, let no man see a tear, nor any weakness unworthy of that exalted title. This is in our power. Events are in the hands of God." Ashamed to be thus surpassed in resolution by a woman, Cleomenes suppressed his grief, and led his mother, with the child in her arms, on board the ship, with a firm step, and a kindling countenance, appearing, in the eyes of his followers, to realize the proudest visions of Spartan virtue. He soon afterwards received intelligence of the safe arrival of the hostages, and their favourable reception at the court of Alexandria. Cratesiclea wrote to him in a cheerful manner; but at the same time laid her commands upon him to act, on all occasions, for the honour and advantage of his country, without regard to the safety of an useless old woman and a child in the hands of Ptolemy.*

Fortitude of Cratesiclea.

Successes of Antigonus.

Antigonus remained during the winter in quarters at Corinth and Argos; but early† in the spring he led his forces to Tegea, and besieged it with those warlike engines, in the use of which the Macedonians were singularly expert. The Tegeans, seeing little expectation of relief from Cleomenes, who was in no condition to take the field against so powerful an enemy, surrendered after a very slender resistance. Antigonus, upon this, advanced to the frontier of Laconia, where the Lacedæmonians were encamped, with a desperate resolution to defend their country from invasion. He was too prudent to put the advantages he had gained to the hazard of a battle under such circumstances; but, by frequent skirmishes, he tried the strength of both armies, and kept the attention of Cleomenes employed, whilst he made himself master of Mantinea and Orchomenus, and of almost all the places which lay between Lacedæmon and Argos. In the autumn, he retired to [illegible], and dismissed his Macedonian troops for the winter.

When the Spartan King was informed of this conduct of Antigonus, he conceived hopes of being enabled [illegible] Megalopolis,‡ which was now distant three [illegible] from the enemy's head-quarters, and had [illegible] of the flower of its own population in the battle of Lycæum and of the Laodician [illegible] gained over to his interest some Messenians who resided in the city, he entered it [illegible] night, and took possession of all the [illegible] within the walls. In the morning, however, the Megalopolitans, hastily assembling their men, made so gallant an attack upon the Lacedæmonian forces, that the King himself was exposed to imminent hazard, and the contest appeared long doubtful. Numbers at length prevailed, and the inhabitants, hastily collecting their most valuable property, decamped with their women and children to Messene, the armed party effectually covering their retreat. Megalopolis was thus left to the conquerors.

Cleomenes. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

In his account of the events which followed, Polybius* is at great pains to prove that the historian Phylarchus, from whom Plutarch† appears to have borrowed his narrative, wrote more in the character of a dramatist, whose object was to panegyrize Cleomenes, than in that of a sober and authentic historian. He represents the Spartan King as having acted with great violence and inhumanity. "And I think," he adds, "that he was induced to this, because at no time, in his extremest need, could he ever find any one among the Megalopolitans, who would espouse his cause, or become a traitor for his sake."‡ The simple fact admitted on all sides is, that Cleomenes being in possession of the city, sent a herald to the Megalopolitans, who had taken refuge in Messene, proposing to restore them their town and the property within it uninjured, and to abstain from plundering the country, on condition that they would enter into an alliance, offensive and defensive, with Lacedæmon, would admit a Spartan garrison into their citadel, and give hostages for their fidelity to their engagements. Among the citizens, to whom this offer was addressed, was the celebrated Philopœmen, afterwards general of the Achæans, who had, from his childhood, nourished the strongest prejudices against the Spartan yoke. By his representations these unfortunate people were induced not only to reject the terms proposed to them, but to insult Cleomenes, by committing a most unwarrantable outrage upon his herald and attendants.

Destruction of Megalopolis.

The King, highly incensed, sold all that remained in the city and neighbourhood for slaves, seized the property of the citizens, gave up the country to plunder, and entirely demolished the city, which is said to have been one of the finest in Peloponnesus. It was built by Epaminondas as a check to the power of the Spartans, and had been the object of their unceasing enmity to the hour of its fall.

The amount of the plunder was considerable; (though Polybius§ has shewn that it could not equal the sum mentioned by Phylarchus, which exceeds all the wealth at that time in the peninsula) and it was a most seasonable supply to the exhausted resources of Lacedæmon. The news occasioned the utmost consternation at Ægium. Plutarch|| affirms that it was communicated to the assembly of the states by Aratus, who appeared before them overwhelmed with grief, hiding his face in his cloak; and, being entreated to inform them of the cause of his sorrow, could only utter, "Megalopolis is ruined by Cleomenes!" Antigonus would instantly have marched to avenge its fall; but his troops were all in winter quarters, and his impatience served only to increase the alarm of his allies. Cleomenes having laid waste the lands about Argos, and having offered the

† Polyb. ii. 53.
[illegible] similar attempt.—Vid. Polyb. ix. 17.

* Polyb. ii. 55 to 64.
‡ Polyb. ii. 55.
|| *In Cleomene.*
† *Vita Cleomenis.*
§ *Loco citato.*

Epaphy. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

enemy battle before its gates, dislodged some small garrisons in Arcadia, and returned home with his army in high spirits, leaving a formidable impression of his genius and resources upon the minds of the Achæans.

But with the approach of spring Antigonus drew together his formidable and well disciplined army, to the number of twenty-eight thousand infantry and twelve hundred cavalry; of which ten thousand were heavy-armed Macedonians, trained to form that irresistible heavy phalanx, so destructive to the smaller bodies of Grecian troops. Cleomenes had endeavoured to provide against the impending storm by fortifying all the passes into Laconia, by constructing trenches, felling trees, and posting guards in commanding situations.* Himself, with all the forces he could raise, about twenty thousand men, encamped near Sellasia, a frontier town, by which, as he rightly conjectured, Antigonus would attempt to force his way to Sparta. Two hills, called Eva and Olympus, command the vale through which flows the river Æonus,† along whose bank runs the road to Lacedæmon. Cleomenes drew a trench in front of each eminence, and posted the allies upon Eva, under the command of his brother Euclidas, while the Lacedæmonians and the mercenaries, commanded by himself in person, occupied Olympus. In the plain below, on both sides of the stream, was stationed the cavalry, supported by a small body of light infantry. Antigonus, having reconnoitred his position, was struck with admiration; and admitted that the King of Sparta had evinced the most consummate knowledge of military tactics, and the most minute attention to every point both of attack and defence. After some deliberation, he resolved that it would be imprudent to attack him in his present situation, and withdrawing to a convenient distance, pitched his camp behind the river Gorgylus, in face of the enemy, where he remained several days on the watch for some opportunity to surprise Cleomenes, or to get into his rear. But the unremitting vigilance and the able dispositions of that consummate general defeated his expectations, and convinced him that he must hope for success only from the superiority of his army.

B. C. 222.

Positions of the Macedonians and Spartans.

Never, perhaps, were two generals more equally matched, or more dependent, for all their future prospects, upon the event of a battle. As for Cleomenes, he knew that the security, if not the very existence, of Sparta hung upon the fate of that day: and though Antigonus was not informed, till after the action, of the full extent of the danger to his government in Macedonia, (for if he had received the intelligence ‡ two days earlier he would have marched home, and would have left the Achæans at the mercy of the enemy) he was sufficiently aware of the state of affairs in the north to feel that a defeat, at this juncture, might be attended with the most ruinous consequences. He prepared, therefore, to exert all his skill and courage, and to decide the contest by one decisive blow. The disposition of his line evinced that he had, during the time of his inaction, successfully studied the nature of the different troops of which the enemy's army was composed. To the allies under Euclidas, posted upon mount Eva, he opposed the Macedonian corps called Chalcaspidi, (brazen-shields) alternating between their companies bodies of Illyrians, commanded by Alexander (son of Acmetus) and Demetrius of Pheræ;* the light troops, Acarnanians and Cretans, were ranged behind this front; and a reserve of two thousand Achæans were stationed in the rear. His cavalry were drawn up opposite the enemy's horse, on each side of the Æonus, having the right flank covered by a body of a thousand Megalopolitans, and the left by an equal number of Achæans. The King, in person, took the command of the heavy-armed Macedonians and mercenaries, who were to attack Cleomenes on mount Olympus. The Illyrians had crossed the Gorgylus during the night, and had taken up a position at the foot of mount Eva, and they had received orders to open the attack upon seeing a white flag hung out in the opposite wing of the army; the cavalry and the light troops, who supported them, were to wait till a red one should be elevated.

Cleomenes. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

The signal being given, the Illyrians advanced boldly up the hill, and by this movement too great an interval was interposed between them and the Achæan reserve in their rear; upon which Cleomenes, whose keen sight instantly detected the error, detached the light infantry, which he had posted with his cavalry on the plain, to take them in the rear, while Euclidas bore down upon their front. Antigonus did not perceive what had happened, and the Illyrians would, in a few minutes, have been cut to pieces, had not Philopœmen, who was among the Megalopolitans, but who held no command, prevailed upon his countrymen to fall upon the enemy's horse, thus deprived of their light troops, without waiting for the King's signal. By this manœuvre, the Illyrians were delivered from the enemy in their rear, who returned to their post in order to support their own cavalry, and were enabled to bear up against Euclidas, who (instead of taking advantage of the hill to break the enemy's line as they advanced, and to keep the higher ground behind him, in the event of his being partially repulsed) chose to await the attack on the very summit, so that the enemy ascended the steep in good order, and having made an impression upon his line, they gained the higher ground, and drove him down the declivity on the other side. The horse, meanwhile, were furiously engaged on the plain below; the Achæan cavalry did good service, and the Lacedæmonians were thrown into confusion.

Battle of Sellasia.

On the other wing a smart action had commenced between the light infantry and mercenary troops, who were nearly equal on both sides, and who fought, under the eye of their commanders, with animated valour. But Cleomenes, seeing his brother driven down the hill in disorder, and his cavalry on the plain ready to give way, resolved, if possible, to retrieve the fortune of the day by one decisive blow. Breaking down one side of his fortification, he led through it the whole of his heavy-armed troops, formed in phalanx, directly towards Antigonus. The sound of the trumpet now recalled the light troops on both sides, and the charge of the phalanx was tremendous. The Macedonians at first yielded to the desperate valour of the Spartans, and were driven back to some

* Polyb. ii. 65, *et seq.* † Al. Æonus, Liv. xxxiv. 18.
‡ Plutarch, *in Vitâ.*

* Al. Pharæ, in Thessaly.

secret weight hung upon the mind of her son, and with some difficulty drew from him the cause of his uneasiness. No sooner was it explained, than the Spartan spirit of this noble lady prevailed over every other sentiment, and she exclaimed with generous enthusiasm—"Is this all?—let me embark without delay; and thank the gods that, old and helpless as I appear, I may yet be of service to Sparta!"

Cleomenes immediately prepared for her departure, and conducted her, with a train suitable to her rank, to the port of Tænarus. But when he was about to part with her and his child, his emotion overcame even his hereditary firmness, and he began to weep aloud. Cratesiclea, who had resigned herself to her fate, as a victim sacrificed to her country, remained calm, and leading her son aside into the temple of Neptune, she said, "King of Sparta, when we go out hence, let no man see a tear, nor any weakness unworthy of that exalted title. This is in our power. Events are in the hands of God." Ashamed to be thus surpassed in resolution by a woman, Cleomenes suppressed his grief, and led his mother, with the child in her arms, on board the ship, with a firm step, and a kindling countenance, appearing, in the eyes of his followers, to realize the proudest visions of Spartan virtue. He soon afterwards received intelligence of the safe arrival of the hostages, and their favourable reception at the court of Alexandria. Cratesiclea wrote to him in a cheerful manner; but at the same time laid her commands upon him to act, on all occasions, for the honour and advantage of his country, without regard to the safety of an useless old woman and a child in the hands of Ptolemy.*

Fortitude of Cratesiclea.

Antigonus remained during the winter in quarters at Corinth and Argos; but early† in the spring he led his forces to Tegea, and besieged it with those warlike engines, in the use of which the Macedonians were singularly expert. The Tegeans, seeing little expectation of relief from Cleomenes, who was in no condition to take the field against so powerful an enemy, surrendered after a very slender resistance. Antigonus, upon this, advanced to the frontier of Laconia, where the Lacedæmonians were encamped, with a desperate resolution to defend their country from invasion. He was too prudent to put the advantages he had gained to the hazard of a battle under such circumstances; but, by frequent skirmishes, he tried the strength of both armies, and kept the attention of Cleomenes employed, whilst he made himself master of Mantinea and Orchomenus, and of almost all the places which lay between Laconia and Argos. In the autumn, he retired to Ægium, and dismissed his Macedonian troops for the winter.

Successes of Antigonus.

When the Spartan King was informed of this confident measure, he conceived hopes of being enabled to seize Megalopolis,‡ which was now distant three days march from the enemy's head-quarters, and had been deprived of the flower of its own population in the bloody battles of Lycæum and of the Laodician plain. Having gained over to his interest some Messenian exiles, who resided in the city, he entered it unperceived by night, and took possession of all the strong posts within the walls. In the morning, however, the Megalopolitans, hastily assembling their men, made so gallant an attack upon the Lacedæmonian forces, that the King himself was exposed to imminent hazard, and the contest appeared long doubtful. Numbers at length prevailed, and the inhabitants, hastily collecting their most valuable property, decamped with their women and children to Messene, the armed party effectually covering their retreat. Megalopolis was thus left to the conquerors.

In his account of the events which followed, Polybius* is at great pains to prove that the historian Phylarchus, from whom Plutarch† appears to have borrowed his narrative, wrote more in the character of a dramatist, whose object was to panegyrize Cleomenes, than in that of a sober and authentic historian. He represents the Spartan King as having acted with great violence and inhumanity, "And I think," he adds, "that he was induced to this, because at no time, in his extremest need, could he ever find any one among the Megalopolitans, who would espouse his cause, or become a traitor for his sake."‡ The simple fact admitted on all sides is, that Cleomenes being in possession of the city, sent a herald to the Megalopolitans, who had taken refuge in Messene, proposing to restore them their town and the property within it uninjured, and to abstain from plundering the country, on condition that they would enter into an alliance, offensive and defensive, with Lacedæmon, would admit a Spartan garrison into their citadel, and give hostages for their fidelity to their engagements. Among the citizens, to whom this offer was addressed, was the celebrated Philopœmen, afterwards general of the Achæans, who had, from his childhood, nourished the strongest prejudices against the Spartan yoke. By his representations these unfortunate people were induced not only to reject the terms proposed to them, but to insult Cleomenes, by committing a most unwarrantable outrage upon his herald and attendants.

The King, highly incensed, sold all that remained in the city and neighbourhood for slaves, seized the property of the citizens, gave up the country to plunder, and entirely demolished the city, which is said to have been one of the finest in Peloponnesus. It was built by Epaminondas as a check to the power of the Spartans, and had been the object of their unceasing enmity to the hour of its fall.

Destruction of Megalopolis.

The amount of the plunder was considerable; (though Polybius § has shewn that it could not equal the sum mentioned by Phylarchus, which exceeds all the wealth at that time in the peninsula) and it was a most seasonable supply to the exhausted resources of Lacedæmon. The news occasioned the utmost consternation at Ægium. Plutarch‖ affirms that it was communicated to the assembly of the states by Aratus, who appeared before them overwhelmed with grief, hiding his face in his cloak; and, being entreated to inform them of the cause of his sorrow, could only utter, "Megalopolis is ruined by Cleomenes!" Antigonus would instantly have marched to avenge its fall; but his troops were all in winter quarters, and his impatience served only to increase the alarm of his allies. Cleomenes having laid waste the lands about Argos, and having offered the

* Plutarch, *Vita Cleomenis.* † Polyb. ii. 53.
‡ He had before failed in a similar attempt.—Vid. Polyb. ix. 17.

* Polyb. ii. 55 to 64. † *Vita Cleomenis.*
‡ Polyb. ii. 55. § *Loco citato.*
‖ *In Cleomene.*

From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

enemy battle before its gates; dislodged some small garrisons in Arcadia, and returned home with his army in high spirits, leaving a formidable impression of his genius and resources upon the minds of the Achæans.

But with the approach of spring Antigonus drew together his formidable and well disciplined army, to the number of twenty-eight thousand infantry and twelve hundred cavalry; of which ten thousand were heavy-armed Macedonians, trained to form that irresistible heavy phalanx, so destructive to the smaller bodies of Grecian troops. Cleomenes had endeavoured to provide against the impending storm by fortifying all the passes into Laconia, by constructing trenches, felling trees, and posting guards in commanding situations.* Himself, with all the forces he could raise, about twenty thousand men, encamped near Sellasia, a frontier town, by which, as he rightly conjectured, Antigonus would attempt to force his way to Sparta. Two hills, called Eva and Olympus, command the vale through which flows the river Æonus,† along whose bank runs the road to Lacedæmon. Cleomenes drew a trench in front of each eminence, and posted the allies upon Eva, under the command of his brother Euclidas, while the Lacedæmonians and the mercenaries, commanded by himself in person, occupied Olympus. In the plain below, on both sides of the stream, was stationed the cavalry, supported by a small body of light infantry. Antigonus, having reconnoitred his position, was struck with admiration; and admitted that the King of Sparta had evinced the most consummate knowledge of military tactics, and the most minute attention to every point both of attack and defence. After some deliberation, he resolved that it would be imprudent to attack him in his present situation, and withdrawing to a convenient distance, pitched his camp behind the river Gorgylus, in face of the enemy, where he remained several days on the watch for some opportunity to surprise Cleomenes, or to get into his rear. But the unremitting vigilance and the able dispositions of that consummate general defeated his expectations, and convinced him that he must hope for success only from the superiority of his army.

B. C. 222.

Positions of the Macedonians and Spartans.

Never, perhaps, were two generals more equally matched, or more dependent, for all their future prospects, upon the event of a battle. As for Cleomenes, he knew that the security, if not the very existence, of Sparta hung upon the fate of that day: and though Antigonus was not informed, till after the action, of the full extent of the danger to his government in Macedonia, (for if he had received the intelligence ‡ two days earlier he would have marched home, and would have left the Achæans at the mercy of the enemy) he was sufficiently aware of the state of affairs in the north to feel that a defeat, at this juncture, might be attended with the most ruinous consequences. He prepared, therefore, to exert all his skill and courage, and to decide the contest by one decisive blow. The disposition of his line evinced that he had, during the time of his inaction, successfully studied the nature of the different troops of which the enemy's army was composed. To the allies under Euclidas, posted upon mount Eva, he opposed the Macedonian corps called Chalcaspidi, (brazen-shields) alternating between their companies bodies of Illyrians, commanded by Alexander (son of Acmetus) and Demetrius of Pheræ;* the light troops, Acarnanians and Cretans, were ranged behind this front; and a reserve of two thousand Achæans were stationed in the rear. His cavalry were drawn up opposite the enemy's horse, on each side of the Æonus, having the right flank covered by a body of a thousand Megalopolitans, and the left by an equal number of Achæans. The King, in person, took the command of the heavy-armed Macedonians and mercenaries, who were to attack Cleomenes on mount Olympus. The Illyrians had crossed the Gorgylus during the night, and had taken up a position at the foot of mount Eva, and they had received orders to open the attack upon seeing a white flag hung out in the opposite wing of the army; the cavalry and the light troops, who supported them, were to wait till a red one should be elevated.

Cleomenes. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

Battle of Sellasia.

The signal being given, the Illyrians advanced boldly up the hill, and by this movement too great an interval was interposed between them and the Achæan reserve in their rear; upon which Cleomenes, whose keen sight instantly detected the error, detached the light infantry, which he had posted with his cavalry on the plain, to take them in the rear, while Euclidas bore down upon their front. Antigonus did not perceive what had happened, and the Illyrians would, in a few minutes, have been cut to pieces, had not Philopœmen, who was among the Megalopolitans, but who held no command, prevailed upon his countrymen to fall upon the enemy's horse, thus deprived of their light troops, without waiting for the King's signal. By this manœuvre, the Illyrians were delivered from the enemy in their rear, who returned to their post in order to support their own cavalry, and were enabled to bear up against Euclidas, who (instead of taking advantage of the hill to break the enemy's line as they advanced, and to keep the higher ground behind him, in the event of his being partially repulsed) chose to await the attack on the very summit, so that the enemy ascended the steep in good order, and having made an impression upon his line, they gained the higher ground, and drove him down the declivity on the other side. The horse, meanwhile, were furiously engaged on the plain below; the Achæan cavalry did good service, and the Lacedæmonians were thrown into confusion.

On the other wing a smart action had commenced between the light infantry and mercenary troops, who were nearly equal on both sides, and who fought, under the eye of their commanders, with animated valour. But Cleomenes, seeing his brother driven down the hill in disorder, and his cavalry on the plain ready to give way, resolved, if possible, to retrieve the fortune of the day by one decisive blow. Breaking down one side of his fortification, he led through it the whole of his heavy-armed troops, formed in phalanx, directly towards Antigonus. The sound of the trumpet now recalled the light troops on both sides, and the charge of the phalanx was tremendous. The Macedonians at first yielded to the desperate valour of the Spartans, and were driven back to some

* Polyb. ii. 65, *et seq.* † Al. Æonus, Liv. xxxiv. 18.
‡ Plutarch, *in Vitâ.*

* Al. Pharæ, in Thessaly.

distance, but recovering themselves, by their superior weight and strength, they made a stand, and the Spartans wavered. At this moment Antigonus * ordered the Macedonians to serry their spears, and to form in double phalanx; and the Lacedæmonians, unable to resist the weight of the enemy, were driven from their trenches with prodigious slaughter. The rout became complete. Euclidas was surrounded and slain, after displaying more personal courage than generalship; the light troops fled in all directions; of the heavy-armed phalanx scarcely two hundred, out of five, or, according to others, out of six thousand, survived; Cleomenes himself, with a small party of horse, reached Sparta in safety.†

Flight of Cleomenes.

Having assembled the citizens, and having informed them that all was lost, he advised them to make no farther resistance, but to open their gates to the conqueror, and to surrender themselves to his discretion; for himself, he said, life and death were alike indifferent to him, and he would embrace that which should appear best for Sparta. So saying, without disarming, or taking either rest or refreshment, he set out with a few friends for Gythium,‡ (at which port he had previously ordered some vessels to be in readiness against the chances of war) and embarked for Alexandria. "So fortune delights," observes Polybius, "to balk the expectations of mankind! for if Cleomenes had delayed the battle a few days, or, even after he was beaten, had he remained in Greece, he would not have lost his kingdom. For Antigonus, very soon after the action, received intelligence which compelled him to hasten homewards with all possible expedition."§ These circumstances induced Antigonus to conclude his arrangements at Sparta in as summary a manner as possible, and to avoid giving offence to any party in Greece. Polybius and Plutarch agree that he restored to Lacedæmon its ancient constitution; and other writers have said, that he bestowed freedom upon the Lacedæmonians and Tegeans, meaning, no doubt, that he established the democracy in power. But whatever he might do in passing through Tegea‖ on his return, it is evident from Polybius¶ himself, that the Spartans were left at liberty to make their own domestic arrangements. From attachment to Cleomenes, they declined, as long as he lived, to elect any King, and the supreme power was administered by the Ephori; but no sooner was the intelligence of his death received at Lacedæmon, than both the people and the council of regency,** became anxious to supply the vacancy of the throne, and chose Agesipolis and Lycurgus Kings of Sparta.

Retreat of Antigonus.

Cleomenes, if we may believe his biographer, did not proceed direct to Egypt, but landed on several islands for refreshment. On one of these occasions his friend Therycion, in a set speech, exhorted him to die by his own hand rather than to become a captive and an exile. But the hero reminded him that there is more fortitude and virtue in enduring life from a sense of duty, than in fleeing from misfortune by a voluntary death; and declared that he would live as long as there remained any hope of serving his country.

This story, (which bears strong marks of having been got up for the school disputations) may, perhaps, be thought to derive some confirmation from the manner in which Polybius * eulogizes Cleomenes for "his patience under the evils of life, while the least shadow of hope remained; and for his manly resolution at last rather to die like a warrior than to live like a slave."

Upon his arrival at Alexandria, he was received by Ptolemy Evergetes with great professions of kindness, and a liberal pension† was assigned for his maintenance. But the old King did not live to fulfil these promises, and he was succeeded by Ptolemy Philopater, who was so far from taking any interest in the affairs of Greece, that he could scarcely be induced to attend to the most urgent business of his own kingdom; so absorbed were the slender faculties with which nature had endowed him in every species of luxury and debauchery.‡ Cleomenes, impatient of delay, having in vain urged the king to supply him with men and money, at length solicited permission to depart with only his own family and friends; but he found it impossible to obtain an answer to his request; for though Ptolemy entirely neglected every thing but his pleasures, Sosibius, his minister, was a keen and wily politician, and was perfectly aware of the change which must take place in the politics of Greece after the death of Antigonus. He saw that it was no longer an object for the king of Egypt to break the power of Macedon; but that great danger might ensue if a prince, of such abilities as Cleomenes, were to become master of Greece, after gaining a perfect knowledge of the defenceless state of Ptolemy's dominions; and he perceived also that to send him away without providing him with the supplies so long promised would only be to ensure his enmity. So much terror did the talents and intrepidity of one man, deprived of all other resources, inspire into the councils of a mighty monarchy, at that time, probably, the richest in the world!

Treatment of Cleomenes in Egypt.

An incident occurred, about this period, which raised still higher the opinion that had been formed of Cleomenes, and which drew a declaration from Ptolemy that to keep him in Egypt was little better than to pen a lion in a sheepfold. The administration was extremely desirous to destroy Magas, the king's brother, and the celebrated queen-dowager Berenice, whose spirit and popularity with the army rendered her formidable to the court. Sosibius, who apprehended that the mercenary troops were devoted to the prince and to the queen-dowager, consulted Cleomenes, and desired his advice. The Spartan, imagining that the scheme for assassinating these royal persons originated simply in a dread of their influence with the military, replied, "Make yourself perfectly easy, and fear nothing; the mercenary troops will never act against you; but will, on the contrary, support you. Do you not observe that three thousand of them are Peloponnesians, and a thousand Cretans, who, upon the least signal from me, will take any part that I may direct? Being secure of these, why should

* Casaubon's translation of this obscure passage is singularly loose.

† Plutarch's account of the battle, slight as it is, differs considerably from that of Polybius, which is here principally followed.

‡ Al. Gytheum, a seaport at the mouth of the Eurotas.

§ Lib. ii. 70. ‖ Polyb. ii. 70. ¶ Lib. iv. 35.

** Το των Εφορων αρχειον. Eod.

* Lib. xvii. 34.

† Plutarch says twenty-four talents, above 4500*l.*

‡ Polyb. v. 35. *et seq.*

Biography. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

you stand in awe of a set of Syrian or Carian soldiers?"*

But the encouragement afforded by Cleomenes operated otherwise than he had intended it. Sosibius, freed from his apprehensions, resolved on the death of Berenice; and conceived, at the same time, a still greater dread of the extraordinary power which the Spartan exile possessed over the soldiers; so that he only waited for a favourable opportunity to imprison or to destroy him.

Intrigues of Sosibius.

Such an occasion was not long wanted. A Messenian horsedealer, who had formerly been employed by Cleomenes, happened to land at Alexandria with a cargo of horses for the king. Cleomenes, meeting him upon the quay, recognised him as an old acquaintance, and said, in a jocular strain, "You would have found a better market at the palace for a cargo of strumpets and rope dancers, than for these warlike animals." The sarcasm was reported to the minister, who easily prevailed upon the merchant, by some trifling presents, to enter into his views, and to act any villainy he thought fit to dictate. Whilst Ptolemy was still out of humour with Cleomenes for his jest, a letter arrived from Nicagoras, the horsedealer, who had left the port, stating that, during his stay at Alexandria, he had discovered a plot formed by the Spartans for effecting a revolution in Egypt. Upon no better evidence of a tale so incredible, was Cleomenes confined by an order of council within the walls of a castle, sufficiently spacious indeed, but strongly and vigilantly guarded. Being thus treated like a criminal, he felt himself released from all the obligations of hospitality, and resolved to attempt a most daring exploit, rather with the hope of meeting a glorious death, than with that of extricating himself from the difficulties with which he was surrounded. In the absence of the king, who had gone to Canopus, he intimated to his guards that he had received a promise of being liberated, and intended to hold a festival on the occasion, in which he desired that they would partake. Provisions, wine, and garlands were accordingly sent them in abundance; and, believing that it was no longer necessary to watch their prisoner, they indulged in the grossest excess, and lay senseless from intoxication and sleep. Cleomenes, with his little band of faithful adherents, then sallied from the castle; and each with his drawn sword rushed into the town, proclaiming "Deliverance from the tyranny of the Ptolemies!" The captain of the guard, who met them at the gate, was so startled by their audacity that he fell from his chariot; and while his attendants, in the utmost consternation, shifted for themselves, he was trampled to death. The same panic prevailed among the citizens, none of whom either joined or opposed the conspirators; though Polybius* insinuates, that they wished well to the design of overthrowing the reigning dynasty. Cleomenes and his friends, finding no support in the city, hastened to the citadel with the intention of breaking open the prison, and reinforcing their party with the criminals confined in it; but the prefect of the watch, hearing a tumult, had manned the approaches to the walls, and this last desperate hope vanished. Nothing now remained for Cleomenes but to die, as he had lived, like a true Spartan. He fell upon his own sword, and all his attendants followed his example.†

Imprisonment of Cleomenes.

Cleomenes. From A. M. 3769. — B. C. 235. to A. M. 3785. — B. C. 219.

His death. B. C. 219.

* Polyb. v. 36.

* Polyb. v. 36.

† Ibid. v. 39. Plutarch, who delights to fill up the scenery in historical painting, adds many romantic circumstances respecting Cratesiclea and her grandchildren, and the ladies of the exiled Spartans; and concludes the whole, as usual, with a prodigy.

PHILOPŒMEN.

FROM A. M. 3751. B. C. 253. TO A. M. 3821. B. C. 183.

Biography. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

In the celebrated battle of Sellasia, in which a mortal wound was inflicted on the power and glory of Lacedæmon, Antigonus, king of Macedon, commander-in-chief of the allied forces, committed a capital error. He ordered his left wing to cross the Gorgylus and attack the enemy's position, whilst the reserve remained posted behind the river; and the Spartan King instantly took advantage of this fault to fall upon their unprotected rear with a corps of light infantry, which attended his cavalry in the centre. The consequences which must have ensued were perceived by no one in the allied army, except by a young Megalopolitan knight, who held no command, but who felt justified by the imminent danger to which his country was exposed, in quitting his ranks, to expostulate with the officers near him. Finding his remonstrances disregarded, he returned to his place, and urged his companions to charge the enemy's horse, without waiting for orders, that they might oblige the corps of light troops, detached by Cleomenes, to return from their attack upon the rear of the left wing, in order to support their own cavalry. Without farther hesitation he spurred his horse to the charge, and was followed by most of his countrymen. The other Achæan horse would not be left behind; Alexander, who commanded the centre, yielded to necessity, and the action became general. The young man, who had occasioned it, displayed uncommon personal strength and courage, and when his horse was killed under him, he fought on foot till he was pierced through both thighs with a javelin.*

Skill displayed by Philopœmen at the battle of Sellasia.

When the action was over, Antigonus, who had

Philopœmen. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183

* Plutarch relates that the javelin having a thong attached to it could not be extracted; but that Philopœmen broke it by a violent motion of his legs, drew out the pieces, and continued to fight with unabated activity. (*Vita Philopœmenis.*) Polybius, whose account is less romantic, is here followed. Lib. ii. 67, 68.

Biography. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

observed the effect produced by the unauthorized charge of the cavalry, and was highly pleased with their gallant behaviour, called Alexander, and, in order to sound him,* asked, "How he had presumed to engage without the appointed signal?" The general replied, "that it was not his fault; that it had been occasioned by the rashness of a young Megalopolitan, whom nobody knew, notwithstanding his efforts to prevent it."—"Then," said the king, "that youth played the part of an able commander, and you of a raw recruit."

Family and education of Philopœmen.

The victory, in effect, was, in a great measure, to be attributed to the fortunate impetuosity of Philopœmen; for he it was who thus early distinguished himself, by remedying the oversight of one great general, and counteracting the keen promptitude of another not less celebrated. He was, by birth, as has been stated, a Megalopolitan; and Polybius† informs us that he was descended from one of the noblest families in Arcadia. He was brought up, in his childhood, by Cleander,‡ a Mantinean nobleman of the highest rank, and the intimate§ friend of his deceased father,‖ who was then an exile from his country, and had taken up his residence at Megalopolis. But when he ceased to be a child, he was placed under the care of two guardians, Ecdemus and Demophanes,¶ who were disciples of that philosophy termed the middle academic, which they took great pains to instil into the young Philopœmen, together with the practical and political principles derived from it. They were natives of Argos, banished for their opposition to the tyranny of Aristodemus: they had taken an active part in the revolution, both in their own country and at Sicyon; and they had shewn their readiness to interfere in any state in which there was a plot against monarchical government.** Under their tuition, Philopœmen early imbibed what were called the principles of liberty, and became an enthusiastic admirer of Aratus; but the great object of his imitation was Epaminondas, whom he regarded, not without reason, as the finest model of virtuous patriotism afforded in history. He was early accustomed to frugal habits, active bodily exercises, and a contempt of all sensual indulgences: for his preceptors held that no man can be a good public servant whose private life is not irreproachable; and that habits of luxurious expense are incompatible with integrity in administration.†† When he became his own master, he is said to have adhered rigidly to the same system; and though possessed of large property, he fared no better than his own labourers; accustoming himself to lie on a pallet, and to support every kind of fatigue and exposure, to which the severest campaign might subject him.‡‡ In intellectual cultivation he does not appear to have been equally assiduous. He selected such parts of the writings of poets and philosophers as tend to inspire a love of warlike achievements, and a contempt of danger; and he studied with attention the best books on military tactics; but even in this pursuit he preferred practical illustrations of the theory of war, amid the bold and rough features of the surrounding country, to maps and plans executed on parchment.* He is said† to have been obstinate and violent in temper, implacable in his resentments, and disdainful of all the arts of peace, and of the refinements of civilized life; so that he was generally thought better qualified to fight than to negociate. In person he was rather athletic than graceful; and his countenance was vulgar and forbidding.‡

Philopœmen. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

His biographer§ asserts that he was thirty years of age when Cleomenes surprised Megalopolis, the year before the battle of Sellasia, which was fought in the third year of the hundred and thirty-ninth Olympiad; but the term "stripling,"‖ applied to him by his commander in that action, seems to imply that he was considerably younger. He was old enough, however, to take a leading part in the desperate defence of that city, as well as in the brave and able conduct of the retreat to Messene; and he had sufficient influence with his fellow citizens to procure the rejection of the liberal terms offered by the Spartan king, who would have restored them their town and territory uninjured, if they would have entered into alliance with Lacedæmon. When peace was re-established in Greece, Philopœmen resolved to improve his military experience in foreign service; but he declined the proposal made him of a command under Antigonus, from that republican stubbornness of temper which rendered him as unwilling to obey, as he was imperious in the exercise of power; and he preferred a petty warfare in Crete, where he was certain to have no competitor. After having seen considerable service in that island, the prospect of a war with the Ætolians induced him to return to his own country; and he brought home a reputation which obtained for him the command of the Achæan army; though Plutarch mentions him, in this place, not as Prætor of the League, but simply as General of the cavalry. His first care was to reform the discipline and accoutrements of his men. The cavalry was formed entirely of young men of fortune, who submitted unwillingly to control, and were more studious of ease than ambitious of glory.¶ They were excessively attentive to the fopperies of dress at their feasts and public assemblies, but appeared on parade in imperfect and rusty armour; with insufficient horses, of mean growth, little better than ponies; and they displayed as much awkwardness in their evolutions, as indifference to the advantage of the service.**

B. C. 222.

B. C. 221.

He reforms the military discipline of the Achæans.

Philopœmen, who was *point-de-vise* in all his accoutrements, and whose only expensive habit was an excessive fondness for costly armour and fine horses,†† resolved, before he should undertake any enterprise of importance, to inspire the men under his command with a similar taste; and he possessed that stern unbending spirit which alone could have accomplished such a change. In a few months, the young nobility of Achæa learned to place their chief pride in being well mounted, and to bestow that care on burnishing their weapons which had before been employed at the toilet; they became emulous to excel each other in riding and in the exercise, and

* Φασὶ καταγελάσαντα τοῦ λόγου εἰπεῖν. Polyb. ii. 66.
† *Excerp.* x. ‡ Al. Casmander § ξένος. Polyb. *loc. cit.*
‖ Crangis sive Crassis. Plutarch. Pausanias.
¶ Polyb. *loc. cit. Ecdelus et Megalophanes.* Pausanias.
** E. g. at Cyrene. Plutarch, *in vitâ.* Polyb.
†† Polyb. *Excerpt.* x. ‡‡ Plutarch, *in vitâ.*

* Plutarch, *in vitâ.*
† Ibid. *Flaminius and Philopœmen compared*
‡ Ibid. *in vitâ.* § Id. eod. ‖ Polyb. ii. 68. μειράκιον.
¶ Polyb. *Fragmenta,* xxiv. ** Plutarch, *in vitâ.*
†† Polyb. xi. 7.

they obeyed the word of command with alacrity; even the ladies, says Plutarch,* caught the infection, and spent their time in working crests for helmets, or in embroidering gorgets. The General had observed the great superiority of the Macedonian heavy-armed horse, formed in close phalanx, over the light cavalry of Greece fighting in square battalions, of which the form could not be varied according to circumstances, and was easily penetrated and broken. He therefore taught the Achæans to adopt the complete armour and serried file of the north; and he exercised them incessantly in changing from the spiral, or orbicular, to the wedge-shaped phalanx, till it was remarked that they moved like one compact and well-jointed machine.

He was now anxious to meet the enemy in the field; and his success was answerable to his exertions and his hopes. The allied army of the Ætolians and Eleans was defeated with prodigious loss near the banks of the Larissus; and the victory was principally achieved by the bravery and discipline of the Achæan cavalry. In this action the Elean general of horse, jealous for the equestrian reputation of his country, challenged Philopœmen to single combat, and fell by his hand. His troops, who regarded him as the mirror of chivalry, fled in consternation; and the Achæan horse, instead of wasting their strength in fruitless pursuit of the racers of Elis, fell upon the rear of the infantry, threw them into confusion, and literally cut them in pieces. Thus, in the short space of a few† months, by the energy and talent of one man, the character and even the physical powers of the Achæans seemed to have undergone a total change; and they were considered among the most efficient troops in Greece.

But Sparta did not acquiesce in her degradation without some efforts to regain her ascendency, at least in Peloponnesus. Machanidas, who had succeeded to the throne, was a prince of great ambition and courage, and by no means wanting in ability. He had so far repaired the ruined resources of his country as to be at the head of a numerous and well-appointed army; and he was on the watch to seize every occasion of acting against the Achæan interest in Peloponnesus. Opportunities could not fail to occur between parties jealous of each other's growing power, and mutually desirous of hostilities. Philopœmen, chosen general against Lacedæmon, assembled his forces at Mantinea. Machanidas, not sufficiently aware of the improvement which had taken place in the Achæan discipline, nor of the advantages which always attend the popular cause in a warfare among petty states, conceived that he had the enemy completely in his power, and led his army from Tegea in battle array, promising it an easy victory. The King himself commanded on the right wing of the Spartan main body, having his flanks protected by detachments of mercenaries, and his baggage and *materiel* thrown into the rear. The allied troops advanced from the town‡ to meet him in three divisions; Aristænetus of Dyme, had the command of the Achæan cavalry on the right, while the mercenaries on the left, formed in platoons, were led by Philopœmen in person, who addressed them in a short characteristic speech,* setting forth the glory and divine protection which attended the defenders of liberty, and the eternal disgrace of their enemies, who fought in support of tyranny and oppression. Machanidas, in the meantime, advanced, as if to attack the right of the allies; but when at a convenient distance from their line, by a skilful evolution, he changed the form of his phalanx, and falling back upon his own right wing, discovered a tremendous park of artillery, ranged between platoons of mercenaries. The Achæan General saw that if he gave these formidable projectiles time to take effect, his whole army must be thrown into disorder: he therefore immediately ordered his Tarentine soldiers to dislodge the spearmen who guarded the artillery. These mercenaries, however, not only kept their ground, and repulsed the attack, but advancing against the left of the allies, threw them into disorder, and chased them to the gate of the city; the young King incautiously joining in the pursuit, with the whole of the mercenaries on his right wing. Philopœmen was not slow to improve this unexpected advantage. He sent Polybius† of Megalopolis, to collect such of the scattered fugitives as had escaped the general rout, and with them to watch the return of the pursuers; while he himself led the Achæan infantry to charge the Lacedæmonian main body, whose flank was left exposed. The Spartans, flushed with the apparent success gained by their mercenaries, without waiting for orders, eagerly advanced to meet him, not being aware of a deep and uneven ravine which lay between them and the allies. Philopœmen, who had formed his line with reference to this obstacle, moderated his pace, so as to allow the enemy to reach the ravine first, into which, as the declivity was not steep, and the bottom was nearly dry, they rushed impetuously, and they fell into disorder. The Achæans coming up at this moment, and descending carefully with their spears in the rest, completed the confusion; and the Lacedæmonians, after sustaining severe loss, fled in all directions.

Battle of Mantinea. B. C. 208. — Ol. 143. 1.

The King, returning from his rash pursuit, saw the victory snatched from his hands, and his own person in danger of being surrounded and taken. In this emergency, he retained all his courage and presence of mind, and exerted himself to retrieve the error he had committed. Forming the mercenary troops around him into a wedge-shaped phalanx, he made for a bridge, which crossed the ravine, in order to rejoin his main body, and, if possible, to rally it; but finding the passage already in possession of the enemy, who were anxious to secure so important a captive, he rode along the ravine to find a convenient place for crossing it. Having reached a spot where the bank was low, he spurred his horse forward, and was in the act of gaining the other side, when Philopœmen, leaving the bridge to the care of his attendants, rushed to oppose his landing. Both parties stood in breathless expectation of the result; but the Achæan General, keeping the level ground, wounded Machanidas with the point of his javelin, whilst his horse was leaping, and, instantly turning his hand,

Defeat and death of Machanidas.

* *In vitâ.*

† Polyb xi 8. Polybius does not agree with Plutarch in this part of the history.

‡ Polvb. xi. 9. Plutarch's account is somewhat different.

* Polyb. xi. 7. 10.

† He was probably grandfather of the historian Polybius.

Biography. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

knocked him down with the but-end.* He fell into the ditch, and his head and armour, raised upon a long spear, displayed to both armies the fate of the day. His attendants were all cut to pieces; and his men, without a leader, and entirely broken, made no farther resistance. The loss of the allies was trifling; that of the Lacedæmonian army is stated by Polybius† to have amounted to four thousand slain, and a still greater number of prisoners. Philopœmen, advancing to Sparta, pitched his camp on the banks of the Eurotas.

Measures of his successor Nabis.

The consequence of this brilliant and complete victory was the accession of Sparta, for a time, to the League: but Nabis, who succeeded Machanidas, entertained the most rooted hostility to the democratic party, and was resolved, at all hazards, to reassert the ancient supremacy of his country in Peloponnesus. For this purpose, having collected a considerable body of mercenaries, he took the opportunity, when Philopœmen went out of office, and Cycliadas‡ a man of no talent, was General of the League, to ravage the territories of the Achæans, and even to threaten some of their towns, which lay near to Laconia. Among other places, he endeavoured to surprise Messene, where, according to Plutarch,§ he was favoured by the treachery of Dinocrates, and admitted within the walls; but by the timely, though unauthorized appearance of Philopœmen, who came with a body of Megalopolitans to its relief, the town was saved. On the other hand, Philip, king of Macedon, who had renewed the war with Rome, was extremely anxious to get the Achæans on his side;|| and he attended in person the assembly of the states at Argos, to offer his assistance against Nabis, whom he undertook to keep in check, on condition that the Achæans should, in the meanwhile, reinforce his garrisons to the north of Peloponnesus, hoping, by these means, to involve the united states in hostilities with the Romans. But Cycliadas, who had hitherto been considered as of the Macedonian party, alarmed at the consequences which he foresaw, affirmed that it would be unconstitutional to discuss any proposal except that upon which the states were summoned to deliberate, and dismissed the assembly.

B. C. 201.

Plutarch,¶ who omits no opportunity of heaping odium upon Kings, asserts that Philip had attempted to pave the way to this measure by the assassination of Philopœmen. But Polybius** has clearly shewn that the party of Philopœmen was constantly in opposition to the friends of Aristænus,†† who were in the Roman interest; and consequently that nothing could be more important to the king of Macedon at this juncture than to strengthen the hands of the very man whom he is accused of designing to murder. It appears that the friends of Aristænus had not only sufficient interest, at this time, to procure the rejection of Philip's proposal, but to make Aristænus himself General of the League, when Cycliadas went out of office.* Philopœmen, who would never consent to serve in any subordinate capacity, was again induced to accept a command in Crete: and his countrymen were so much offended by his deserting them in the present exigency, Megalopolis being more than any other state of the League exposed to incursions from Sparta, that they were disposed to pass a sentence upon him equivalent to banishment for life, with confiscation of property; but Aristænus generously interfered to prevent a decision so injurious to the welfare of the states.†

Philopœmen. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

This state of things afforded an opening for the Romans to interfere in the affairs of the united states, which that wily and ambitious people was not likely to overlook. Their fleet now lay at Cenchreæ,‡ with the allied forces of Attalus and of the Rhodians, for the purpose of taking Corinth from Philip; and they thought it a fit opportunity for detaching the states from the alliance of Macedon, by the tempting offer of putting that key of Peloponnesus into their hands. Ambassadors were accordingly sent from the allied powers, and an assembly of the League was convened at Sicyon to deliberate on their proposal.§ The deputies were, at this period, very much divided in sentiment. Some of them, those especially from the southern states, were chiefly influenced by apprehension of the Spartan arms; others, among whom were the Megalopolitans, Dymæans, and Argives, were bound, by many obligations and strict friendship, to Macedon; an equal number, with the Prætor Aristænus, saw no prospect of safety but under the protection of Rome, and were willing to purchase it on any terms.|| The debate was prolonged to the third day, and the Council of Ten was equally divided: but when it appeared that violent measures had been adopted to procure a majority in favour of the Roman alliance, the deputies on the other side left the assembly; and it was deemed unconstitutional to enter into a formal treaty without their concurrence. Measures, however, were taken which answered all the purposes of the party. Attalus and the Rhodians were declared allies of the united states; the Achæan army was ordered to march towards Corinth, and to co-operate with them; and it was resolved to despatch ambassadors to Rome as soon as the forms of the constitution would permit.¶ In the meantime a friendly intercourse was kept up with the Roman general by three *chargés d'affaires*, who attended in his camp.

Offers of the Romans to the States.

Fall of Philip.

The first operations of the allies were unsuccessful.** They failed in their attempt upon Corinth; and the Argives, always strongly in the Macedonian interest, massacred the Achæan garrison placed in their city, and delivered the citadel to Philocles, the Macedonian general, who admitted Nabis to take possession of it, and to levy contributions on the inhabitants.†† But the hopes which Philip entertained of expelling the Romans from Greece were soon found to have arisen from erroneous calculation of the vast resources of that growing empire; and when Philo-

B. C. 197.

* Polyb. lib. xi. 16. † Ibid. ‡ Livy, xxxi. 25.
§ *Vita Flaminii.* || Id. eod.
¶ *Vita Philopœmenis.* ** *Excerpt.* Leg. xli, &c.
†† Plutarch calls him Aristænetus. Livy Aristænus. Polybius mentions Aristænetus of Dymæ in the action with Machanidas, (xi. 10.) in a passage, which may perhaps have misled Plutarch; but he agrees with Livy in the name of the Prætor Aristænus

* Livy seems to imply that Cycliadas was turned out of office before his time and banished by the Roman party, to make room for Aristænus. *Cycliadem, principem factionis ad Philippum trahentium res, expulerant.* xxxii. 19. 32.
† Plutarch, *Vita Philopœmenis.* ‡ Now Kenkri.
§ Livy, xxxii. 19. || Polyb. *Excerpt.* xxi.
¶ Livy, xxxii. 25. ** Polyb. *Excerpt.* li. †† Livy, xxxii. 40.

Biography. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

pœmen returned, three years afterwards, from his command in Crete, in which he had earned great military glory,* he found the King of Macedon reduced to the most abject condition, having been defeated at Cynocephalæ, by Titus Quintius Flamininus, and compelled to sue for peace; the Achæan states declared free under the protection of the senate and people of Rome; and Nabis still maintaining his ground in an unequal contest with almost the whole power of Italy and of Greece.

Philopœmen, now in his sixty-fourth year, was immediately elected General of the League, and received directions to prosecute the war against Lacedæmon; the Romans having committed to the Achæans the protection of all the maritime towns of Peloponnesus,† which were infested by the emissaries of Nabis. To effect this he manned a fleet, equal in number to that of the enemy, and made Tiso‡ of Patræ his commodore, putting him on board the flag-ship, an old§ decayed man of war, utterly unfit for service. Tiso advanced to meet an experienced admiral, in a new ship, with all the rashness of a man confident in his own powers, and ignorant of the difference between naval and military tactics. The result was such as might have been anticipated; the flag-ship was sunk, and all hands on board captured; the rest of the fleet was dispersed, as each thought best for his own safety; and Philopœmen himself, in a light pinnace, with great difficulty escaped, and landed at Patræ.

Naval defeat of the Achæans.

But he had seen too many reverses to be easily discouraged; and finding himself unequal to conduct the war by sea, he immediately set about the relief of Gythium, then besieged by the enemy on the land side. The Spartan King, trusting to the effect of his naval victory, had withdrawn part of his troops from the siege, and had thrown up intrenchments at Elia‖ with a design of reducing Leucæ and Acriæ, which were both commanded by the eminence on which he had encamped. Few of his men being accommodated with tents, the greater number contrived to shelter themselves from the heat of the sun by constructing sheds with reeds gathered from the adjacent meadows. Philopœmen, having recommoitred their position, procured some small craft in the neighbourhood, and embarking his light troops, arrived by night at the foot of the promontory on which the camp was pitched. Ascending the hill, by well-known paths, he surprised the guards asleep, and set fire to the combustible dwellings of the soldiers, many of whom perished in the flames, and more fell unarmed by the weapons of the assailants; a very small party reached Gythium, and took refuge under cover of their main body. Philopœmen hastened to Tripolis, and, laying waste the country, made an immense booty of cattle and captives, and retired in safety before succours could arrive from the camp at Gythium, for the protection of the Laconian territory.¶

Attempted relief of Gythium.

The siege, however, was not raised; and Philopœmen resolved to assemble his army at Tegea, and make a demonstration upon Lacedæmon, in order to draw Nabis from his lines. That this might be effected without the previous knowledge of the enemy, he despatched couriers to those towns of the League which were situated farthest from the rendezvous, bearing sealed packets addressed to the chief magistrate, in which directions were given for assembling the militia, and for conducting them, with five days' rations, to the town next on the road to Tegea; where they were to be left under orders of the chief magistrate of the place, with a sealed letter which had been enclosed in the former. This letter commanded the magistrate to forward the men, together with his own, in a similar manner, to the next town, and it contained a similar enclosure; so that the whole military force of Achæa was gathering towards Tegea, and actually arrived there, before any person, besides the General, knew either their destination, or the object of the expedition.*

Philopœmen. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

Advancing from Tegea, he pitched his camp at Caria, in the enemy's territory, and on the same day, Gythium surrendered; but intelligence of this event not reaching the Achæan head-quarters, Philopœmen marched the next day to mount Barbosthenes, only ten miles from Lacedæmon.† In the meanwhile Nabis, having left a garrison in Gythium, passed by forced marches through Sparta, and arrived at a place called the Camp of Pyrrhus, which he rightly conjectured would be the first object of the Achæan General. By this movement Philopœmen was completely surprised; for he had not only calculated upon reaching the Camp without difficulty, but was marching along a ravine, with his troops formed in column, and his principal strength in the rear, in which he expected to be attacked, when he suddenly saw the enemy about half a mile in front of him, threatening to fall upon his heavy troops, embarrassed in uneven ground, without the protection of light infantry or cavalry. It was in situations of this kind that the genius of Philopœmen became most conspicuous; his eye saw, at a glance, all the advantages afforded by an unequal surface; and he availed himself of his skill in the present emergency, to protract his manœuvres till darkness precluded both parties from action. During the night he prepared an ambush; and in the morning, after a smart conflict, by a feigned retreat, he drew the enemy into the snare, and defeated them with very great loss.‡ They fled to their camp; and such was the ardour of the Achæans, that had not the General prudently sounded a recal, they would have attempted to force the lines. In the evening, he sent a pretended deserter with false intelligence, to alarm the King and to hasten his retreat to Sparta, which was attempted the next morning in so much confusion, that the Achæan light infantry and the Cretan archers harassed their rear the whole way, and at last, falling upon them as they descended a narrow road between two hills, created so general a panic that great part of the army threw away their accoutrements, and sought safety in separate flight among the woods and fastnesses. Nabis, with his body guard, and a few only of his heavy-armed mercenaries, arrived at Sparta. Philopœmen advanced to the Eurotas, and there

Brilliant generalship and success of Philopœmen.

* Plutarch. *in vitâ Philopœmenis.*

† Livy, xxxv. 13.

‡ Livy, *loco citato*, says eighty years old, Plutarch forty, the old copies of Livy read eight.

§ Ibid. xxxv. 26.

‖ Ibid. xxxv. 27. Al. Pleim. Vide Polyb. v. Strabo, viii.

¶ Ibid. xxxv. 27.

* Polyb. xvi. 20. † Livy, xxxv. 27, &c.

‡ Livy, xxxv. 28, 29. Polyb. xvi. 21. Plutarch, *in loco*.

Biography. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

pitching his camp for the night, he ordered his men to light their fires and cook their suppers. Himself, meanwhile, singling out a small corps of active and daring young men, armed only with falchions, occupied the paths which led from the mountainous country towards the city. The disarmed fugitives, as soon as they saw the lights in the Achæan camp, began to descend from their hiding places, and to seek the road home; but so completely was their return intercepted by the swordsmen, that not a fourth part of them ever returned to Sparta. Philopœmen spent a month in plundering the country, and then led his forces home, where he was received with unbounded applause, and his achievements were extolled even above those of Flamininus;* a preference which, according to Plutarch, proved extremely mortifying to the Roman general.†

It was never the policy of the Roman Senate to suffer any one state in Greece to preponderate over the rest so as to consolidate the whole into one empire; on the contrary, by taking part with the weaker, they contrived that every contest should contribute to wear out both parties, without giving a decided ascendency to either.‡ No sooner was Nabis sufficiently humbled, than Flamininus hastened to conclude a peace with him on terms rather favourable to Lacedæmon than agreeable to the Achæans: but Philopœmen, shortly afterwards, took advantage of a sedition, in which Nabis was murdered and the city plundered by a party of Ætolians, to persuade the Spartans to unite themselves with the League, and to adopt the constitution of the other united states. In the management of this delicate business he displayed so much diplomatic talent, that it is surprising to find Plutarch and even Polybius representing him as inferior to Aratus and Aristænus in negociation, as much as he was their superior in the field. And it deserves remark, that while the policy of one of these statesmen preserved the states from ruin at the expense of making them subservient to Macedon,§ and the only resource of the other was to submit implicitly to all the decrees of Flamininus,|| Philopœmen alone was enabled to maintain their independence without any derogatory concession to a foreign power; for though he was too prudent to involve his country in hostilities with so irresistible an enemy as Rome, he always contrived to set aside every measure, however strongly supported, which militated against the laws and constitution of the Achæan League. When Dinocrates, a worthless and intriguing Messenian, had formed a plan for withdrawing his native city from the union, and for restoring the Lacedæmonian exiles who were of the seditious party, and Flamininus, like a true Roman, was ready to promote any scheme for sowing the seeds of division among the allies,¶ Philopœmen, by his temperate and judicious adherence to the ancient laws of the League, which forbade an assembly of the states to be summoned unless the precise nature of the proposal to be laid before them were previously stated, entirely defeated the design of the Roman general, who, having no authority from the senate to act in the affair, dared not hazard a premature disclosure of his intentions.

Sparta unites with the Achæan League. B. C. 191. — OL. 147. 2.

* Livy, xxxv. 30. † Plutarch, in *loco*. Livy, xxxv. 47.
‡ Prideaux, part ii. lib. iv. § Plutarch, in *loco*.
|| Polyb. *Excerpt.* xxi. ¶ Polyb. *Excerpt.* leg. xlvii.

During the war which followed between the Romans and Antiochus, the Achæans, though occasionally called upon for inconsiderable reinforcements,* enjoyed comparative repose; and Philopœmen was contented to remain quietly in a private station, watching, however, with an anxious eye, every turn of fortune, and providing, by every means in his power, against the overwhelming ascendency of Rome.† During this time, Plutarch‡ relates that the Lacedæmonians shewed symptoms of disaffection to the League; and Diophanes, who had studied the military art with great success under Philopœmen, in the former war with Nabis,§ and who was now Prætor of the League, marched with the Roman General to reduce them by force. Philopœmen, who had in vain endeavoured to dissuade him from so hasty a proceeding, threw himself into the city, shut the gates against a Roman Consul and an Achæan General, and, by his able negociations, restored order and reconciled all differences.

Philopœmen. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

The Spartans renounce the League.

But the Lacedæmonians could not brook being deprived of all their seaport towns, which, by order of the Consul, were garrisoned with Achæan troops; and, after the expulsion of Antiochus from Greece, and the subjugation of the Ætolians, they were so imprudent as to seize upon Las, a small maritime port within the borders of Laconia. Philopœmen was, at this time, again Prætor of the League, and he immediately issued his order to the Lacedæmonians to deliver up to justice the authors of this violence, and all the persons concerned in the transaction.|| Fired at the imperious tone of this mandate, the Spartans seized and executed the leaders of the Achæan faction in their city, renounced the League, and sent deputies to the Consul¶ at Cephallenia, offering to put him in possession of Lacedæmon, and to become subjects of the Roman empire if he would march to their assistance. The Achæan council, upon this, declared war against Sparta; and though the season prevented the immediate marching of the troops, so violent was the animosity excited, that predatory incursions and reprisals threw the whole peninsula into confusion. These disorders brought the Consul into Peloponnesus, who appointed a meeting at Elis to hear both parties; but, after studiously fomenting their mutual discontent, he peremptorily commanded a cessation of hostilities, and referred the adjudication of the cause to Rome. The ambassadors of the Achæans, chosen on this occasion, were, Diophanes, the ex-Prætor, who adhered strictly to the line of policy pursued by Aristænus, and Lycortas, father of the historian Polybius, who had adopted the sentiments of Philopœmen, and who now urged before the Senate, in firm but respectful language, the right of the Achæan commonwealth to regulate its own domestic affairs. The Senate, whose object it was to prolong the contest and to weaken the union of the League, returned an evasive answer, which each party interpreted in its own favour. Philopœmen, whose command was prolonged for the purpose, marched with the whole Achæan army into Laconia, and renewed his demand to have the authors of the late seizure of Las given up to him. The Lacedæmonians

* Polyb. *Excerpt.* leg. xx. Livy, xxxvi. passim.
† Plutarch, *in vitâ*. ‡ Ibid. § Polyb. *Excerpt.* xxi
|| Livy, xxxviii. 31, &c. ¶ M. Fulvius.

Biography. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 193.

had no longer any hope of being enabled to resist the combination against them; and the obnoxious individuals, eighty* in number, marched out on the assurance of the Prætor that they should not be condemned without a hearing. Some of them were immediately stoned, in a tumult which arose between them and the exiles, in front of the army; and the rest were executed the next morning with little ceremony. The Lacedæmonians were ordered to throw down their walls; to banish all mercenary soldiers beyond the limits of Laconia; to oblige all freedmen to quit the country by a set time, on pain of being seized and sold for slaves; to abolish for ever all the laws and institutions of Lycurgus; and to adopt the democratic constitution and the statutes of Achæa. Nothing, observes Livy, of these conditions was so willingly obeyed as the destruction of the fortifications; nothing so hardly borne as the abrogation of the discipline of Lycurgus.† A great number of mercenary soldiers and freedmen, found wandering about the country, were apprehended and sold; and, by a decree of the Achæan council, assembled at Tegea, the celebrated piazzas of Megalopolis, formerly ruined by the Spartans, were rebuilt with the profits of the sale. And thus, after a lapse of seven hundred years, the extraordinary fabric of Lycurgus was finally crushed by the hand of Philopœmen.‡

Abrogation of the Laws Lycurgus.

B. C. 188. — OL. 148. 1.

B. C. 183. — OL. 144. 2.

After forty years§ of active life, Philopœmen was again chosen General of the united states, in the seventieth year of his age, having lately recovered from a severe and lingering illness. He had scarcely assumed the command, when he was informed that his ancient enemy, Dinocrates, now chief magistrate of Messene, had withdrawn his country from the League, and had marched to seize Corona,‖ a small town in the Messenian territory. Philopœmen immediately set out to relieve the place; but was surprised in an uneven defile by the activity of the enemy.¶ It is reported that he might easily have effected his escape under cover of his Thracians and Cretan archers; but he disdained to provide for his personal safety, whilst the cavalry, the flower of the Achæan nobility, were exposed to be cut in pieces. He therefore put himself at their head, and attempted to retreat by a narrow pass, in which his horse fell and rolled over him. The violence of the shock rendered him insensible; and when he recovered, he found himself in the hands of Dinocrates, who could scarcely credit the evidence of his senses, overjoyed in the possession of so illustrious a prisoner. A courier was instantly despatched to Messene with the news—"The Achæan cavalry are routed, and Philopœmen is taken;"—but so incredible did the story appear, that the messenger was not only disbelieved, but was treated as a madman. The intelligence, however, was soon confirmed, and Messene was literally emptied of its inhabitants, persons of every age and sex crowding through its gates to behold "the last of the Greeks" a captive. The magistrates, apprehending some violence, in the recent agitation of men's minds, and in the compassion naturally excited by so sad a spectacle, led him hastily to the multitude at a safe distance, conducted him to a place of security, Dinocrates crying out that he must be examined, touching the cause of his commencing hostilities, before the council. On his arrival at the town-hall, the magistrates, overawed by his presence and long-established reputation, were unable to put to him a single question; and as the night was approaching, they were greatly at a loss where to confine their formidable prisoner, for whom no one chose to be responsible. At length it was agreed to put him into a strong stone chamber under the public treasury, closing the door with an enormous mass of rock, and trusting the custody of so great a man rather to the strength of the jail than to the fidelity of the guard.*

Capture of Philopœmen.

Philopœmen. From A. M. 3751. — B. C. 253. to A. M. 3821. — B. C. 183.

The deliberations were continued during the night. Fear and the influence of Dinocrates prevailed over every other consideration; and early in the morning an executioner entered the dungeon with a cup of hemlock-juice in his hand. The General, without any change of countenance, took the cup from the officer, and inquired whether Lycortas had escaped in the action of the preceding day, and whether the cavalry had effected their retreat? Both questions being answered in the affirmative, he replied, "then all is well," raised the deadly draught to his lips, and composing himself, as if to sleep, shortly expired.

His death.

The authors of this atrocious crime were not permitted long to enjoy their guilty triumph. The nobility of all Achæa felt at once ashamed of having left their leader in the field, and indignant at the cruel treatment with which he had met: they assembled from every quarter at Megalopolis, and encouraged each other in a determination to avenge the affront. Lycortas, then only twenty years of age,† was chosen General; and so admirably had he profited by the lessons of Philopœmen, that the army seemed still to be conducted by the spirit and experience of their veteran commander. Messene soon yielded to his skill and impetuosity. Dinocrates and his principal adherents avoided his vengeance by committing suicide; but the magistrates, who had voted for examining Philopœmen by torture, were reserved to be executed upon his tomb.‡ The funeral was celebrated by the whole body of the Achæan assembly;§ and so anxious were they to omit no honour which can be conferred upon the memory of man, that they scrupled not to pay him some marks of respect which are proper only to Divinity.‖ His statues were erected in all the cities of the League, and were pointed out for many years afterwards as the "Images of the last of the Greeks."

Thirty-seven years after his death, he was publicly denounced as an enemy to the Roman name, and it was proposed that his statues should be thrown down. But his cause was so ably and boldly defended by Polybius, the historian, son of the gallant and accomplished Lycortas, that Mummius forbade any violence to be offered to the memory of a man, who had never opposed to the ambition of Rome any policy but truth and disinterestedness, nor any arts of war but honour and courage.¶

B. C. 145. — OL. 146. 2.

* Livy, xxxviii. 33. Plutarch, *in loco*. Others make the number 350.

† Livy, xxxviii. 34.

‡ A partial attempt was afterwards made to restore it, but with little effect.

§ Polyb. *Excerpt.* xxi. ‖ Pliny, iv. 5. ¶ Livy, xxxix. 49.

* Livy, xxxix. 50.

† This is Plutarch's assertion; but as Lycortas had previously been sent as ambassador to Rome, and had pleaded the cause of the Achæans before the senate, it seems probable that he was much older.

‡ Plutarch, *in loco*. § Livy, *eod. universo Achaico concilio.*

‖ Id. eod. ¶ Polyb. xi. 7.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XVII.

CONTINUATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE JEWS.

THE ASAMONEAN PRINCES.

	YEARS.	B. C.
JUDAS MACCABEUS	3	163
IACHIM OR ALCIMUS, HIGH-PRIEST	—	163
JONATHAN	17	160
——— APPOINTED HIGH-PRIEST	—	153
SIMON	7	143
JOHN HYRCANUS	30	136
ARISTOBULUS I. AND ANTIGONUS	1	106
ALEXANDER JANNÆUS	27	105
Q. ALEXANDRA	9	78
HYRCANUS II.	3 M.	69
ARISTOBULUS II.	6 M.	69
HYRCANUS II. AGAIN	23	63
ANTIGONUS	3	40

Hales's Chronology, vol. ii.

FROM A. M. 3838. B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. B. C. 37.

FROM THE 146TH TO THE 275TH YEAR OF THE ERA OF THE SELEUCIDÆ, OR OF CONTRACTS.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

THE reign of the Asamonean princes is a period of Jewish history peculiarly interesting, extending over a space of one hundred and twenty-nine years, which terminates in the thirty-seventh year before Christ. In the establishment of their power under Judas, Jonathan, and Simon, we see the reward of valour exerted in defence of religion and law, and the happy effects of family concord; whilst from the dissensions which prevailed amongst their descendants, and paved the way for the aggrandizements of the Herods, princes may learn the useful lesson that family feuds are more to be dreaded than even the rebellion of subjects; the one may for a time deprive the prince of power, the other wrests the sceptre from the family for ever.

General observations on this period.

The period which it is now our business to describe, abounding as it does with examples of public virtue, with incentives to patriotism, and with lessons of political prudence, is more strongly pressed upon our notice, on account of its close connection with the era of Christianity; for it was during the existence of the Asamonean power, that the influence of Rome extended itself to the internal affairs of Palestine. And he that believes the truth of prophecy, must be struck with admiration of the all-controlling power of Jehovah over the free agency of men, when he sees the Jewish nation courting the protection of the Roman Senate, and through the assistance afforded to the conquest of Egypt by Julius Cæsar, even aiding the establishment of that imperial power, by which eventually their temple and city were reduced to ashes, and the prophecies of Christ himself most accurately fulfilled.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

The demoralization of a nation is not the work of a single age; and therefore if we would trace the causes which produced the universal corruption of manners, the unbounded licentiousness, and the gross ignorance of the nature of the Mosaic covenant, which prevailed amongst the Jews at the time of our Lord's appearance, we must not confine our observations to the reign of the Herods, but we must look for the rise of these evils, if not in the early part, at least in the latter years of the Asamonean princes.

Origin of the Asamonean power.

The Asamonean family* being descended from Mattathias, the son of John, the son of Simeon, the son of Asamoneus, a priest of the course of Joarib, united in their own persons the civil and ecclesiastical authority.

Conduct of Mattathias.

The fame of Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabeus, is almost eclipsed by the successful valour of his son; but we must not forget that Mattathias laid the foundation of the authority of his descendants in that

* Josephus *Anti.* l. xii. p. 534.—Hudson.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

resistance to the persecutions of Antiochus, which in his own person he so fearlessly displayed. A time of persecution is always one of anarchy; the laws of nature and of religion can never be publicly violated without destroying the force of all human laws, and weakening those ties of duty which bind men to abstain from the commission of injury. The retirement, therefore, of Mattathias into the mountains of Judæa, afforded to his followers the double blessing of an escape from the fury of Antiochus, and an enjoyment of a pure administration of the law. To this allusion is made, (1. *Macc.* ii. 29.) "Many that sought after justice and judgment went down into the wilderness to dwell there, both they and their children and their wives and their cattle, because afflictions increased sore upon them." And we may easily conceive how powerfully the desire of preservation from private injustice would operate, in aid of a firm attachment to the law of Moses, to unite men under so wise and brave a chief as Mattathias.

In persons so circumstanced it would not be surprising to find something of superstitious enthusiasm. A party of Jews, to the number of one thousand, having retired to the wilderness, were pursued by the army of Antiochus, and being overtaken on the Sabbath day, were so far from resisting their enemies, that they did not even take those measures of defence against attack, which the strength of their position afforded; but patiently submitted to destruction, rather than to the guilt, as they conceived, of violating the sacred rest of the Sabbath. Some of the party escaping, brought intelligence of this dreadful event to Mattathias and his friends; who considering what evil consequences would ensue from this practice, determined to establish a law allowing resistance to be made on the Sabbath* against the attack of an enemy; a mitigation of the severity of the Mosaic law, sanctioned not less by motives of prudence, than by the dictates of nature. Mattathias soon found himself strong enough to attempt publicly the restoration of religion. The altars erected for heathen sacrifices he every where pulled down; the apostates he put to death, but many took refuge among the neighbouring nations; he strictly enjoined the due administration of circumcision, being now able to rid the country of the officers commissioned to prevent the exercise of the rites of the Mosaic law. The extent of his success is thus described (1 *Macc.* ii. 48.) "So they recovered the law out of the hand of the Gentiles, and out of the hand of kings, neither suffered they the sinner to triumph."

Mattathias dies.

The good old man did not long witness the happy results of his piety and patriotism. In the first year after the commencement of the war he died; having lived to witness the defeat of Antiochus's wicked designs for the destruction of the true religion, and leaving to his sons an example of courage and self-devotion, which served to animate them during the perils they were afterwards called to encounter. In 1 *Macc.* ii. Mattathias is represented addressing them on his death-bed, in words worthy the pen of inspiration. We shall therefore insert the address at full length.—"Now when the time drew near that Mattathias should die, he said unto his sons, 'Now hath pride and rebuke gotten strength, and the time of destruction, and the wrath of indignation. Now, therefore, my sons, be ye zealous for the law, and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers. Call to your remembrance what acts our fathers did in their times; so shall ye receive great honour and an everlasting name. Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph, in the time of his distress, kept the commandment, and was made lord of Egypt. Phinees, our father, in being zealous and fervent, obtained the covenant of an everlasting Priesthood. Jesus, for fulfilling the word, was made a judge in Israel. Caleb, for bearing witness for the congregation, received the heritage of the land. David, for being merciful, possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elias, for being zealous and fervent for the law, was taken up into heaven. Annanias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing, were saved out of the flame. Daniel, for his innocency, was delivered from the mouth of the lions. And thus consider ye, throughout all ages, that none that put their trust in Him shall be overcome. Fear not, then, the words of a sinful man; for his glory shall be dung and worms. To-day he shall be lifted up, and to-morrow he shall not be found, because he is returned into his dust, and his thought is come to nothing. Wherefore, ye, my sons, be valiant, and shew yourselves men in behalf of the law; for by it ye shall obtain glory. And, behold, I know that your brother Simon is a man of counsel, give ear unto him alway: he shall be a father unto you. As for Judas Maccabeus, he hath been mighty and strong, even from his youth up: let him be your captain, and fight the battle of the people. Take also unto you all those that observe the Law, and avenge ye the wrong of your people. Recompense fully the heathen, and take heed to the commandments of the Law.' So he blessed them, and was gathered to his fathers."* The curious reader will find it worth while to compare with this passage the corresponding oration in Josephus,† (*Ant.* l. xii. c. 6.) in which the historian, probably considering that the references made by Mattathias to the various passages of sacred history would be less interesting to his heathen readers, has given to the oration of Mattathias a form corresponding to that commonly used by the Greek and Roman historians: the sentiments are also less peculiarly Jewish, and might not be unsuitable to the dying exhortations of a heathen patriot.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

His death-bed address.

* 1 *Macc.* ii. 40.

* 1 *Macc.* ii.

† Similar address given in Josephus, l. xii. p. 536.—Hudson.

HISTORY

JUDAS MACCABEUS.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

On the death of his father, Judas, surnamed Maccabeus, succeeded to the chief command among his religious countrymen. In the list of the five sons of Mattathias, he is placed the third; but Josephus expressly mentions him as the eldest son.* It is probable that though Mattathias had the chief direction of affairs, so long as he lived, yet that during the confusion which prevailed, he was not acknowledged formally as the leader of the nation; but his son Judas being publicly declared the captain of the nation, to him is therefore ascribed the honour of being the first of the Asamonean race of princes.

Judas succeeds his father. B. C. 166.

In the person of Judas Maccabeus, we discern one of those extraordinary characters whom Providence raises up in times of emergency for the accomplishment of some important object. Possessed of great personal courage, and of a mind capable of resisting every impression of danger, he united with this natural virtue, the skill and prudence of an experienced master in the art of war: his army was regularly disciplined, (1 *Macc.* iii. 56.) and divided into that large number of superior and subordinate commands, which gives every advantage of unity of action, and ensures to each part of the army mutual support.

His character.

His warfare.

If we examine the nature of the campaigns he carried on, we shall find them not consisting of desultory warfare against the enemy, but of deliberate schemes of resistance, put into effect with every consideration of the advantage which a small body of men may possess over an invading army in the choice of place and the time of attack. During the first two years of his command, he defeated the Generals of Antiochus, Apollonius, Seron, and Lysias, in four several engagements; and finding that his successes had served to deter the King from any immediate renewal of the contest, he led his victorious army to Jerusalem for the purpose of clearing and dedicating the Sanctuary; a work which could not be accomplished without some difficulty, the Temple being commanded by the fortress on mount Acra, which was still garrisoned by the heathen. By his command a new altar was built to supply the place of that which had been profaned; the Temple was furnished anew with vessels; the candlestick, the altar of incense, the table for the shewbread were again set in their places; the bread was set in order, and the veils were hung up which divided the Holy of Holies from the Holy Place. On the twenty-fifth day of the month Casleu, the very day on which three years before Antiochus had polluted the altar with heathen sacrifices, and three years and a half subsequent to the desolation of the city and temple by Apollonius, did Judas and his countrymen keep the feast of dedication with songs of joy and gladness: the feast was kept for eight days, and it was ordained to be observed by the congregation for ever. This festival happens in the former part of our month December. Our Saviour is related by St. John (chap. x. 22.) to have honoured it with his presence; thus testifying his compliance even with those ordinances which were of mere human authority. By Josephus this feast is called the feast of lights. (Candlemas) a custom prevailing amongst the Jews of illuminating the doors of their houses with candles during every night of the feast. By the dedication of the Temple under Judas Maccabeus was fulfilled most accurately the prophecy given by Daniel respecting the period of its desolation; which he foretold should continue for three years and a half, or in the language of the prophecy, a time, times and half a time, it being exactly as has been related, three years and a half from the desolation of the temple by Apollonius to the rededication of it by Judas. The hill Moriah, upon which the Temple was built, being somewhat lower than the neighbouring hill Acra, which had been fortified by Apollonius, and was still possessed by the partisans of Antiochus, the people were much annoyed in their way to the Temple by the attacks of the garrison. The first care of Judas, therefore, was to surround the mountain of the Lord's house with walls and towers, and to place in it a detachment of his army for the protection of those who came thither to worship. In after times, under the Asamonean reign, the valley between Moriah and Acra was filled up, and the height of the latter hill lowered, so that the buildings of the Temple overhung those on mount Acra.*

Defeats the Generals of Antiochus sent against him.

Dedicates anew the Temple

Feast of dedication.

Prophecy of Daniel, xii. 7. fulfilled. B. C. 165.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

The Temple fortified.

The Idumeans, being now in hostility against the Jews, Judas took the precaution of fortifying Bethsura, a town situated between Jerusalem and Hebron, making it thereby the southern barrier of the country. The exact position of this place is not known; its name implies that it stood on an eminence, and it is probable that it commanded one of the defiles in the south, or hill country, (as St. Luke terms it) of Judæa. The prosperity of Judas excited the envy and hatred of the neighbouring nations, and they formed a league for the utter extirpation of the Jewish nation. Many Jews who were sojourning amongst them they cruelly put to death; but the design of the league was defeated by the sudden death of Antiochus. The tyrant was on his road to Babylon when news was brought him of the entire defeat of his Generals, of the rededication of the Temple, and the abolition of the altars of his Gods.† Enraged at this frustration of his impious designs, he hastened his journey to Judæa, vowing vengeance upon the whole nation of the Jews, and threatening to make Jerusalem their grave; but whilst on his way thither, the stroke of death overtook him, and he died, as other persecutors have done, in the most dreadful agonies of body and soul, conscious that the hand of God was upon him, to revenge the impiety and cruelty of his attempts to destroy his chosen people.

Bethsura fortified. B. C. 164.

League against the Jews defeated by the death of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Intelligence being brought to Judas of the confederacy formed against his countrymen by the neighbouring people, he commenced a campaign against them which was crowned with wonderful success. At Acrabattene, a city of Idumea, he slew twenty thousand men. The children of Bean, a tribe of the Edomites,‡ he defeated in battle, besieged and took

Campaign of Judas against the neighbouring nations.

* *De bell. Jud.* l. i. p. 959.

* *De bell. Jud.* v. p. 1222. † 1 *Macc.* 6. 2 *Macc.* 6.
‡ 1 *Macc.* 5. 2 *Macc.* 10.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

their fortresses, and put the garrisons to death; and when some of the captives escaped by bribing the soldiers, he did not allow such violation of military discipline to pass unnoticed, but publicly convicted the guilty, and inflicted on them the penalty of death. Judas having also made an incursion into the land of the Ammonites beyond Jordan, Timotheus, the Syrian governor, collected all his forces* against him, to avenge the insult thus offered to his province; but he was entirely defeated, and afterwards slain at the taking of Gazara, whither he had fled for refuge. The nations which surrounded Judæa were struck with amazement at the victories of Judas; and the inhabitants of Tyre, Sidon, Ptolemais, and Gilead immediately began an active war against him. It required every exertion to enable him to withstand the enemies by whom he was encircled. He divided the Jewish army into three parts:† with the first, he himself went to the relief of his countrymen in the land of Gilead; the second was intrusted to Simon, for the defence of those resident in Galilee; the third division was left at home for the protection of Jerusalem and Judæa. Such determined valour met with its reward. Judas quickly overran the country of Gilead, took several towns, and returned to Jerusalem laden with spoils. Simon was scarcely less successful in the defeat of the enemy at Galilee; but finding the number of Jews there so small as to be incapable of defending themselves in the possession of the country, he deemed it the wisest policy to withdraw them from it, and by settling them in the land of Judæa, to restore to the population the strength it had lost during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. The party which remained at home, acting in disobedience to the orders which they had received, occasioned some disasters, which threw a damp upon the general joy. Joseph and Azarias, who commanded this division, eagerly desiring to share the fame of the other generals, led forth their forces on an expedition against Jamnia, a seaport town on the Mediterranean; but Gorgias, the governor of that district, fell upon them, and defeated them with a loss of two thousand men. This misfortune, however, did not prevent the fame of Judas and his brethren from extending itself to the nations beyond the confines of Judæa.

His vigorous prosecution of the war

Simon withdraws the Jews from Galilee to dwell in Judæa.

Disastrous enterprise of Joseph against Jamnia.

Judas was now called upon once more to resist the attack of his principal enemy. Lysias, the guardian and kinsman of Antiochus Eupator, the son and successor of Epiphanes, indignant at the insult his countrymen had received in the successes of Maccabeus, collected an army of eighty thousand men, and eighty elephants, with which he advanced to the invasion of Judæa.‡ The entire conquest of the country, and the plunder of the Temple, were the objects of the expedition. And here the wisdom and foresight of Judas in fortifying Bethsura was conspicuously displayed. After Lysias had sat down before this important fortress, which checked his advance into the interior of Judæa, a well planned attack made by Judas not only relieved the garrison from the siege, but ended in the dispersion of the invading army. Whereupon Lysias, weary of so unprosperous a war, made a peace with Judas, which was ratified by Antiochus. It is stated that on this occasion the Jewish nation was benefited by the friendly offices of Q. Memmius and T. Manlius, who were at that time ambassadors from the Romans to the court of Antiochus Eupator. By this peace the decree of Antiochus Epiphanes against the practice of the religion of the Jews was rescinded, and free liberty was granted them to live under the dominion of their own laws. Under so weak a government as that of Antiochus Eupator, a treaty made by the King would have little power to check the border warfare, which the surrounding nations perpetually carried on against the Jews. As soon as Lysias had retired to Antioch, Judas was again called out to avenge the murder of the Jews at Joppa and Jamnia,* and to assist those in Gilead against Timotheus. The expedition terminated in the entire overthrow of the army of Timotheus at Raphon,† on the river Jabbok; and in the farther practice of the policy before adopted of withdrawing those Jews, who lived among the heathen, and settling them within the confines of Judæa. The army returned from this exploit about the time of Pentecost. After the observance of the festival, Judas again made war against Gorgias and the Idumeans: the victory was achieved with difficulty and not without loss. Upon stripping the bodies of the dead, for the purpose of burial, Judas discovered that many of his soldiers wore about them such ornaments, dedicated to the heathen idols,‡ as had been taken amongst the spoils of war. The death of so many brave men was not without reason accepted as a punishment inflicted on them for this sin of idolatry. A collection was therefore made throughout the camp to the amount of two thousand drachmæ, which was sent to Jerusalem to provide sin offerings; and prayers were made publicly in the camp, that their sin might not be visited on them in the destruction of the nation. Judas did not, however, stop from pushing his success to the utmost; he besieged Hebron, the capital of Idumea, and extending his march into the country of the Philistines, plundered their cities, and brought back the spoils in triumph to Jerusalem. This was now considered a favourable opportunity to attempt the reduction of the fort of Acra, which was still held by the Syrians, who continually were sallying out, and disturbing the peace of the city and the service of the Temple. The siege was commenced with the greatest vigour by the Jews, who employed every method of assault against the fort. Some apostate Jews, who formed part of the garrison, well aware that no mercy would be extended to them, should they be forced to yield, contrived to effect their escape, and coming with all speed to Antioch, informed the King of the danger with which the fortress was threatened. Upon the receipt of this intelligence, which foreboded the entire loss of the city of Jerusalem, a vast army, consisting of a hundred and twenty thousand men, with thirty-two elephants, and three hundred chariots, was instantly put in motion for the relief of the fort.§ The King, accompanied by his guardian Lysias, marched with them in person. The operations commenced with the siege of Bethsura. The fear of losing this important post, proved a most powerful means of diverting Judas from pressing the siege of Acra: he flew to the relief of Bethsura, and falling upon the enemy by night, slew four thousand, and effected his retreat in order. At break of day both parties prepared for

Attack of Lysias upon Judæa.

Defence of Bethsura.

Peace made with Antiochus. Friendly interference of the Roman ambassadors.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Judas carries on a border war.

Traces of idolatrous superstition amongst Judas's soldiers.

He attempts to reduce the fort of Acra.

War resumed by the King.

B. C. 163.

* 2 *Macc.* x. 24 † 1 *Macc.* v. ‡ 2 *Macc.* ii.

* 2 *Macc.* xii. † 1 *Macc.* v. ‡ 2 *Macc.* xii. § 2 *Macc.* xiii.

History from A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

action. Judas and his followers fought with the most determined bravery, but seeing that his army was too small effectually to resist the overpowering forces of the enemy, he withdrew from the battle, and retreated in safety to Jerusalem. In this battle Eleazar,* the brother of Judas, fell a victim to his spirit of self-devotion. Perceiving that one of the elephants was of greater size than the rest, and covered with royal trappings, and concluding that the King himself was probably upon it, and might perish in the fall of the beast, he cut his way through the thickest of the fight, and creeping under the belly of the elephant, thrust in his spear, and slew him; the beast fell upon him, and crushed him to death. The siege of Bethsura was then renewed by the Syrian army. The garrison defended themselves with valour; but their provisions failing, they were compelled to surrender the fort, which they did upon honourable terms.† According to Josephus, and the calculation of Dr. Hales,‡ the year was a Sabbatical year, which circumstance will account for the scarcity of provision, which led to the surrender of Bethsura; and, but for the interference of Providence, would have again brought the Temple under the power of Antiochus. For the Syrian army marching to Jerusalem from the capture of Bethsura, besieged the Sanctuary, and when those within were almost reduced to the necessity of yielding, on account of the like failure of provision, they were relieved owing to the intelligence received by Lysias that Philip, whom Antiochus Epiphanes had appointed guardian of his son, had seized Antioch, and taken upon him the government of the empire. Lysias, therefore, found it necessary to make peace with the Jews. The conditions were advantageous, and Antiochus swore to observe them; but on being admitted into the Sanctuary, and observing the strength of the fortifications, he ordered them to be demolished, and, having thus violated the treaty which he had made, he departed from Jerusalem.

Courage of Eleazar.

Bethsura lost.

B. C. 163.

Jerusalem besieged, and capitulates.

The articles of capitulation violated.

We have now to record one of those well merited acts of retribution, which iniquity even in this world so frequently suffers. Throughout the whole time of the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes down to this year, Menelaus, the impious apostate, had borne the title of High Priest. No account is given of his conduct or his place of residence during the war of the Maccabees: but on the last advance of Lysias against Jerusalem, he seems to have left his hiding place,§ and once more to have acted a part on the stage of public affairs. We are told, that on this occasion, "he joined himself with the Syrians, and with the greatest dissimulation encouraged Antiochus, not for the safeguard of the country, but because he thought to have been made governor. But the King of Kings moved Antiochus's mind against this wicked wretch; and Lysias informed the King that this man was the cause of all the mischief, so that the King commanded to bring him unto Berrhœa, and to put him to death, as the manner is in that place. Now there was in that place a tower of fifty cubits high, full of ashes, and it had a round instrument, which on every side hanged down in the ashes. And whosoever was condemned of sacrilege, or had committed any other grievous crime, there did all men thrust him unto death. Such a death it happened that wicked man to die, not having so much as burial in the earth: and that most justly: for inasmuch as he had committed many sins about the altar, whose fire and ashes were holy, he received his death in ashes." Thus died Menelaus, a memorable example of God's vengeance, and a remarkable instance of a wicked man meeting with his deserts from the hands of those to whom he looked for honour and distinction as the recompense of devotion to their interests.

Conduct and end of Menelaus.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

By the treaty concluded with Antiochus at the capitulation of the Temple, Judas was appointed governor of Judæa, under the King. From this year the date of the Asamonean dynasty ought in propriety to be reckoned: for, until the acknowledgment of the authority of Judas by the above-mentioned treaty,* we cannot consider him in any other light than as the leader of a religious insurrection; an insurrection in which it became every lover of God and the true religion to bear his part. And though it is customary to assign the commencement of the government of Judas to the first year (B. C. 166) in which the Jews fought for religion under his standard, it would be more correct to follow, in this instance, the authority of Josephus, who assigns to this dynasty a duration of only a hundred and twenty-six years, which must be reckoned from B. C. 163. We have, therefore, no longer to consider Judas as a leader, whose only right to dominion is gained by the sword, but as the regularly constituted governor over the land of Judæa.

Real commencement of the reign of Judas.

On the death of Menelaus, Alcimus, or Jacimus, was appointed High Priest to the exclusion of the rightful successor Onias, the son of that Onias who was slain at Antioch by the instigation of his wicked brother Menelaus.† Onias hereupon retired in disgust to Egypt,‡ not without hope of diminishing the authority of the Temple at Jerusalem. For this purpose he obtained permission from Ptolemy Philometor to build a Temple at Heliopolis, and thus two rivals existed against Jerusalem, the Temple at Gerizim and the Temple of Onias. The Rabbinical writers reckon the number of Jews resident in Egypt under the Temple of Onias, at twice the number of those who came up from Egypt with Moses. From them it appears that the same sacrifices, rites, and ceremonies prevailed here as in the Temple at Jerusalem, and continued to be observed until its destruction by Vespasian, a short time prior to the ruin of that Temple itself.

Alcimus made High Priest.

Onias thus excluded, retires to Egypt and builds a Temple.

To return to our history. Alcimus, on account of his profligacy and attachment to the heathenish rites, was not long permitted by the people to exercise his office: but when Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopater, dispossessing Antiochus Eupator, had succeeded to the kingdom, Alcimus, desirous of recovering his authority, accused Judas and his friends of hostility to the King's party; by which the King was induced to reinstate Alcimus, and sent Bacchides, the governor of Mesopotamia, with a force for that purpose. Alcimus in vain endeavoured by deceitful proposals§ to entrap Judas and his followers. As many, however, as sixty Assidæans fell into the snare; for foolishly concluding that a priest of the house of Aaron would do them no wrong, they first were

Alcimus accuses Judas of not being received by the Jews. B. C. 162.

* 1 *Macc.* vi. † Jos. *Ant.* xii. p. 546. ‡ vol. ii. p. 606. § 2 *Macc.* xiii. 3.

* Jos. *Ant.* xiv. p. 659. † Jos. *Ant.* xii. p. 547. ‡ Conf., Josephus *de bell.* 7, 10, and *Ant.* xii. p. 547. § 1 *Macc.* vii.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

willing to enter into negociation for peace, but Bacchides having got them in his power, put them to death. Bacchides then left the country to the care of Alcimus, having provided him with a force sufficient for his support. But the conduct of the High Priest did not allow Judas to yield to him a quiet submission. Alcimus being, therefore, again expelled, made his complaint to Demetrius, whereupon the King sent Nicanor with a great army to destroy Judas. This force was twice signally defeated by the valour of Judas and his followers, and in the second action Nicanor was slain. The victory was gained on the thirtieth day of the month Adar, and a yearly festival was kept in remembrance of the deliverance.

B. C. 160.

Interference of the Romans in behalf of Judas.

This year is remarkable for the formation of the first treaty of alliance between the Romans and the Jews. Judas Maccabeus seeing how little dependence could be placed on the Kings of Syria for the preservation of religion, and having heard of the power and influence of the Romans, and of the conquests they had made in Africa, Greece, and Asia, determined, if possible, to form an alliance with them.* He therefore sent two of his friends to Rome for this purpose, to conclude a treaty with the Senate, and to seek their interference with Demetrius in favour of the Jews. The Romans, ever ready to grant favours which reduced the power of foreign princes and increased their own, decreed that the Jews should be received into the number of their friends and allies.† And they wrote a letter to Demetrius, requiring him no longer to harass or disturb that nation, now taken under their protection: but before the delivery of the letter, on the return of the ambassadors, Judas was dead. He died as he had lived, in arms, fighting in defence of religion and liberty; for Demetrius, on the defeat of Nicanor, had sent Bacchides with Alcimus a second time into Judæa, at the head of the flower of his army. Judas had no more than three thousand men to oppose this great force;‡ and all of these, except eight hundred, fled panic-struck at the strength and number of the enemy. With this handful of men the brave and intrepid leader ventured to engage the whole army of Demetrius. The impetuosity of his attack put the right wing of the enemy to flight, and he pursued them to a great distance; but the left wing was still entire: it was impossible to resist the fresh attack of such superior numbers; Judas was slain, and having lost their leader, the army fled. A truce was then concluded. Jonathan and Simon, his brothers, took up his body and buried him in the sepulchre of his fathers at Modin; all the faithful in Judah and Jerusalem making great lamentation over him, and saying, "How is the valiant fallen that delivered Israel!" We have throughout the foregoing transactions seen Judas Maccabeus acting the part of a brave and a generous leader, living as it were in the field, and keeping up a series of warfare, almost without an interval of peace, for the space of six years.

Death of Judas.

In the catalogues of High Priests in the temple at Jerusalem, we commonly find the name of Judas inserted; though neither in the books of Maccabees, nor in the history of Josephus, do we find any account of his discharging the duties of that station. The mistake has arisen from an error committed by Josephus himself,* who relating the death of Alcimus, which did not take place until one year after the death of Judas, adds, that the people then gave the chief Priesthood to Judas.† The historian subsequently, in his regular catalogue of the High Priests, corrects the error into which he had, perhaps inadvertently, fallen; and distinctly states, that Alcimus dying after having filled that office three years, no successor was appointed, and that the office was vacant for the space of seven years, when Jonathan, the brother of Maccabeus, and his successor in the civil authority, was created High Priest. That so important an office should have been allowed to remain vacant so long is certainly a remarkable occurrence: it can only be accounted for under the supposition, that Judas and his brother Jonathan purposely abstained from any the least appearance of illegal usurpation of power: and that they took upon themselves no office but such as necessity compelled them to exercise in defence of their religion and their lives. The Governorship of the country seems to have been received as a boon by Judas from Antiochus;‡ and the account which is given of the readiness with which Jonathan accepted the Priesthood from the hands of Alexander Balas, clearly proves the opinion then entertained of power possessed by the sovereign lord of the country to appoint a successor to that office. We may farther observe, that the disinterested conduct of these two brothers, in not assuming to themselves more power than the immediate necessity of their situation required, must have contributed in a very great degree to the preservation of their influence amongst their countrymen.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Judas never High Priest.

* 1 *Macc.* viii. † Justin, lib. xxxvi. c. 3. ‡ 1 *Macc.* ix.

* *Antiq.* xii. p. 550. † Ibid. xx. 900. ‡ 1 *Macc.* x.

JONATHAN.

The apostate party revives.

The death of Judas proved a source of infinite calamity to his followers. The apostate party, no longer awed into submission by his power, took advantage of this event to reinstate themselves in the possession of the country. A famine also happening at this unfavourable juncture, aided their designs, by the revolts and disorders which want produced amongst the lower orders. Alcimus and his party now reigned without opposition; every office of authority was possessed by them; and not content with exercising the power which they had thus acquired over the administration of justice, they proceeded openly to persecute even to death as many of the followers of Judas as they could get into their hands. Search

Alcimus in power.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

was every where made for the Maccabeans, who were brought before Bacchides, cruelly tortured and put to death.* There was great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time that a prophet was not seen among them, i. e. since the death of Malachi. Bitter must have been the severity of Bacchides, since the miseries inflicted by him upon the faithful Jews, surpassed those which they endured under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. Such circumstances naturally called forth a successor to Judas, in his brother Jonathan. The people, choosing him for their captain, and committing themselves to his guidance, Jonathan used every exertion to collect forces to oppose Bacchides; but finding his person endangered by the diligent endeavours made by Bacchides to seize him, he retired with his brother Simon to the wilderness of Thekon, and there encamped in a strong position upon the river Jordan.† Their goods, and such property as was likely to be lost in the contest, they intrusted to the care of their brother John, that he might remove them into the country of the Nabathæans. On his way thither John was attacked by a party of Arabs of the tribe of Jambria, who slew him and carried off the baggage as their booty; but this enterprise soon after converted a day of joy amongst the Jambrians into one of mourning and sorrow; for Jonathan and Simon having received intelligence of a grand bridal procession that was to take place on the marriage of one of the Jambrian chiefs to a daughter of a Canaanitish nobleman, lay in ambush amongst the mountains, and, falling upon the company, slew nearly all of them, and taking with them the spoil, returned to the camp, having powerfully revenged the death of their brother. Tidings of this event being brought to Bacchides, he immediately marched against Jonathan and Simon, and assaulted their camp on the Sabbath day. The Syrian governor met with a resistance he little expected, considering the sanctity attached to the Sabbath of the Jews; for Jonathan exhorting his men to remember the determination made in the time of Mattathias upon this point, they valiantly resisted the attack, and slew a thousand of the enemy; but finding their numbers unequal to the contest, they threw themselves into the river Jordan, and swimming over to the other side, escaped. Bacchides returned to Jerusalem, and gave orders for fortifying all the strong places in Judæa, and especially the fort of Acra, at Jerusalem, which he provided with all kinds of stores; and taking the children of the chief men of the country, kept them there as hostages for the fidelity of their parents.

Dreadful persecution, Jonathan chosen leader.

Bacchides the governor repulsed by Jonathan.

Alcimus was still in full possession of the authority of the High Priesthood; but it pleased God to deliver Israel from any farther trouble at the hands of this man. It happened that whilst he was giving orders for the removal of a low wall, called the Chel, which had been built for the purpose of separating the Court of the women from the Court of the Gentiles, he was struck with the palsy and died. On the death of Alcimus, Bacchides returned to Antioch, and the Jews suffered no further molestation from the Syrians for the space of two years. It is probable that this blessing of peace resulted from the interference of the Roman Senate; and that orders had come by this time to Demetrius, no longer to trouble the Jews, now admitted into alliance with Rome. To this circumstance we may also refer the vacancy of the High Priesthood after the death of Alcimus. Demetrius not caring to nominate a successor, whom he could not support in the office, without being liable to incur the displeasure of the Romans, should resistance be made to the appointment by Jonathan and his followers. We may, therefore, now consider Judæa for a time left entirely to his government.

Death of Alcimus.

Bacchides retires from Judæa.

For two years Jonathan and his friends dwelt at peace; but at the end of this time Bacchides being informed by the adverse party, that all their enemies might be seized in a single night, came into Judæa for the purpose of putting such a plan into execution. The plot was happily discovered by Jonathan, who seized fifty of the conspirators and put them to death. His forces not being able to cope with the army of Bacchides, Jonathan retired to Bethbasi, in the wilderness, which he fortified, and in it successfully withstood a siege. Bacchides, enraged at this defeat, slew those advisers who had brought him back into Judæa, and making peace with Jonathan, exchanged prisoners, and swore that he would never more return to molest the land. The war was now at an end. Jonathan settled in peace at Michmash, about nine miles north of Jerusalem, where he administered the laws, and pursued his reformation by destroying those who had apostatized from the true religion.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to 3967. — B. C. 37.

Bacchides plots against Jonathan. B. C 158.

B. C. 156,

B. C. 153.

In this year arose that famous impostor Alexander Balas, and set up his claim to the kingdom of Syria. Under the protection of the Roman Senate, he raised forces, and sailing to Ptolemais, in Palestine, seized the city and proclaimed himself King of Syria. Demetrius was therefore called upon to adopt every measure of defence in his power. The disputes between these two competitors proved of infinite advantage to Jonathan,* both parties vying with each other in offers to secure his co-operation. Demetrius appointed him the King's General in Judæa, and sent him letters commanding that all the hostages seized by Bacchides, should be delivered up to him. Compliance with these orders so strengthened the force of Jonathan and the number of his adherents, that all the garrisons in the country, excepting those at Bethsura and at the fort of Acra, left their stations and fled. The apostate Jews, fearing the punishment that must await them if they were taken, still kept the two forts last mentioned. Jonathan now removed to Jerusalem, repaired and fortified the city, and rebuilt the wall round the mountain of the Temple, which Antiochus Eupator had pulled down in violation of the treaty. On the other hand Alexander, hearing what Demetrius had done, made also a proposal to Jonathan, granting to him the High Priesthood and the title of King's friend; he sent him also a purple robe and a crown of gold, in testimony of this grant. In the seventh month of this year, at the feast of tabernacles, Jonathan put on his robes as High Priest,† after that office had been vacant seven years from the death of Alcimus. Demetrius now strove to outbid Alexander, and offered to Jonathan the following immunities and rewards: a release from tributes, customs on salt, and crown taxes; the

Benefits awarded to Jonathan from the designs of Alexander Balas.

Made High Priest. B. C. 153.

* 1 *Macc.* ix. 27. Jos. *Ant.* xiii. p. 555.
† 1 *Macc.* ix.

* Jos. *Ant.* xiii. p. 559. † 1 *Macc.* x.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

addition of the three governments of Ophrema, Lydda, and Ramathem in Samaria, and the government of Galilee, to that of Judæa; the freedom of the Holy City; exemption from tenths and tributes; the restoration of all captives that had been carried out of the land of Judæa, from all parts of the kingdom of Syria, with remission of their tribute, and even of their cattle; immunity and toleration for all the Jews within the realm to celebrate their festivals, sabbaths, new moons, and solemn days, without molestation or hinderance: and in return he required an enrolment of thirty thousand Jews, to be paid by the Crown, and to serve in the garrisons and places of trust, with liberty to live according to their own laws. He offered also the seaport of Ptolemais, in Palestine, with its territory, as a free gift to the Temple of Jerusalem, for its necessary expenses; and a remission of the five thousand shekels of silver, which had been annually paid out of the revenues of the Temple, and which belonged to the officiating priests; to make the Temple an asylum for debtors to the King; and to pay the expenses of repairing and fortifying Jerusalem and the Temple Mount out of the King's treasury. The grant is contained in the first book of Maccabees,* and it is curious inasmuch as it demonstrates the extent of the oppressions practised by the Syrian government, and furnishes a sufficient justification for Jonathan's rejection of such proposals from the insincere Demetrius, and his preference of an alliance with Alexander.

Terms offered by Demetrius to gain Jonathan.

B. C. 150.

In the contest between Demetrius and Alexander, the latter, supported by the Romans, was eventually successful; and having now become master of the Syrian empire, he formed an alliance in marriage with Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy, King of Egypt. The marriage was celebrated in the city of Ptolemais. Jonathan was invited to the wedding, and was received by Alexander with every mark of distinction, being clothed in purple, and admitted to the chief place among the King's friends; and when many had come thither to make accusations against Jonathan, Alexander caused it to be proclaimed in the city that none should speak evil of him: thus honoured, Jonathan returned to Jerusalem.†

Jonathan honoured by Ptolemy.

B. C. 148.

Demetrius, the son of that Demetrius whom Alexander Balas had dispossessed, now asserted his right to the crown of Syria. Apollonius, the governor of Cœle-Syria under Alexander, taking part with Demetrius, first attempted to reduce Jonathan, who remained firm to the interests of Alexander, and encamping at Jamnia challenged Jonathan to the contest. Jonathan marched from Jerusalem with ten thousand men, and took Joppa in the sight of Apollonius's army; and then engaging with the enemy put them to flight, and pursued them to Azotus, which city he burnt, together with the temple of Diana. In requital of this service, Alexander sent to Jonathan a buckle of gold, such as was worn only by the Royal family, and gave him also the city of Ekron with its territory.

Alexander acknowledges the services of Jonathan.

B. C. 145.

Jonathan being now in quiet possession of Judæa, determined to make every attempt to reduce the garrison in the fort of Acra, and accordingly commenced a regular siege. Demetrius Nicator had just succeeded to the throne of Syria. The garrison conveyed intelligence of the attack of Jonathan to the King, who forthwith came to Ptolemais, and summoned Jonathan to appear there before him.* This transaction well displayed the firmness and the policy of Jonathan. He still gave farther orders to press the siege, but went to Ptolemais, taking with him many valuable presents, for he was well aware of the force such arguments possess in a debauched and licentious court. Demetrius, in return, refused to listen to the accusation, confirmed him in the High Priest's office,† and admitted him to the number of his friends, and ratified all the offers which his father had formerly made to secure this friendship. The fort still holding out, Demetrius was urged to withdraw the garrison. At this time the city of Antioch was in a state of tumult, and Demetrius promised compliance with Jonathan's request provided he would send him assistance against the mutineers. Three thousand men were despatched to his aid, and by their help the Antiochians were defeated in their conspiracy against the King. The Jews plundered the city, and returned rich with spoil to their own country. But Demetrius was no sooner relieved from impending danger, than he forgot all the promises which, in the time of his distress, he had made to Jonathan: he refused to exempt the Jews from tribute, and threatened them with war, unless the tribute were rigorously paid. Such ingratitude alienated from him the affections of the whole Jewish nation, and made them ready to assist his enemies upon the first opportunity that might offer. Accordingly, when Antiochus, the son of Alexander Balas, by the assistance of Tryphon, the governor of Antioch under his father, had vanquished Demetrius in battle, and had been crowned King of Syria, upon his sending an embassy to Jonathan soliciting his assistance against Demetrius, and promising the fulfilment of all the engagements which Demetrius had broken, Jonathan readily consented to the proposal, influenced, no doubt, by the gross treatment he had received from Demetrius. A commission was sent to Jonathan, empowering him to raise forces for the assistance of Antiochus. To divert him from this purpose, Demetrius invaded Galilee, but was defeated by Jonathan, who succeeded at the same time in reducing Joppa, Gaza, and Bethsura; but the citadel of Jerusalem still held out for Demetrius, and maintained a long siege.

Jonathan attempts the reduction of the fort of Acra.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

His prudence and skill in politics.

Ingratitude of Demetrius.

B. C. 144.

On his return to Judæa, Jonathan sent ambassadors to Rome, to renew the treaty made by Judas. They were received with honour by the Senate, and returned having completed the object of their mission;‡ at the same time also a league was formed with the Lacedæmonians, because, as it was said, the Jews and Lacedæmonians were brethren, both of the stock of Abraham. A great council was now held at Jerusalem, to consult about the repairing and fortifying Jerusalem and other strongholds in Judæa. It was then agreed to heighten the fortifications of Jerusalem, and at the same time to run a line of circumvallation round the fort to cut off their supplies of provisions; by this latter measure the fort, which had been so grievous a cause of evil to the city, was eventually reduced. Jonathan employed himself in the oversight of the works at Jerusalem, whilst his brother Simon

Treaty with the Romans renewed.

Jerusalem and the neighbouring country fortified.

* Ch. x. v. 29. † 1 *Macc.* x.

* 1 *Macc.* xi. † *Jos. Ant.* xiii. p. 568. ‡ *Ant.* xiii. p. 573. 1 *Macc.* xii.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

superintended the remaining fortifications in the country, so that the whole territory was now fully fortified and prepared to resist the invasion of the most powerful enemy.

The assistance Tryphon had given to Antiochus was only intended to pave the way for his seizing the kingdom to himself, but so long as Jonathan remained to oppose the plot, he despaired of success. With the view of getting Jonathan into his power, Tryphon marched his army against Judæa; but being met at Bethsan by Jonathan, with forty thousand men, he deemed it most prudent to put on the mask of friendship, pretending that he had come only to consult about their common interest, and to put Ptolemais into his hands.* Deceived by this specious conduct, Jonathan fell into the snare laid for his destruction. He was persuaded to dismiss his army, and accompanied by no more than one thousand men, to proceed with Tryphon to Ptolemais, expecting that the city would be delivered to him: but as soon as he had entered it the gates were shut, his men were put to death, and himself taken prisoner. Tryphon advanced from Ptolemais to invade Judæa, carrying Jonathan his prisoner with him. In the meantime, Simon, having been elected by the people to succeed his brother in the chief command, met Tryphon with a great army. The traitor was afraid of engaging with Simon, and pretended that he had seized Jonathan for a debt of a hundred talents which he owed; but that if the debt were paid, and his two sons given up as hostages for his peaceable behaviour, then Jonathan should be released. Simon too hastily complied; for Tryphon failed to perform his promise, and still persisted in attempting the invasion of Judæa, being encouraged by messages from those who were besieged in the fort of Acra: but Simon so constantly baffled every attempt, that at last Tryphon retired to Galaaditis, and at the city of Bascama put Jonathan to death.

Plots of Tryphon against Jonathan.

He seizes him by treachery.

Simon hearing that his brother's body was interred at Bascama, where he was put to death, sent for his bones from that city, and buried them in the sepulchre of his father at Modin, where he afterwards erected a magnificent monument of white marble, of great height, which was visible at sea, and became a mark to direct the course of the mariner. Josephus tells us it was remaining in his time; and Eusebius speaks of it as existing two hundred years after the time of Josephus. Such was the lamentable termination of one of the bravest of the Asamonean Princes. The profound policy which Jonathan displayed throughout his intercourse with foreign princes, might have led us to imagine, that he would have been the last man to have fallen so easily into a snare: in this instance his caution seems to have forsaken him; the desire of possessing the valuable port of Ptolemais probably blinded him to a sense of danger, and prevented him from suspecting the deceit of Tryphon. We cannot but lament that so brave a man, so skilful a general, and so gallant a defender of his country, should have perished by so ignominious a death; but the brave in arms are not always wise in council.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967 — B. C. 37.

Puts him to death.

Observations on this transaction.

* 1 *Macc.* xiii.

SIMON.

B. C. 143.

On the death of Jonathan, Simon succeeded to his authority both in the priesthood and in the government. The first measure of Simon's government was the completion of the fortifications which were erecting throughout Judæa, his attention being especially directed to Bethsura, which he garrisoned and supplied plentifully with provisions. This extensive plan of defence, which was begun in the last year of Jonathan's government, could not have been put into execution without a vast expenditure of labour and money. We learned before that the enclosing the hill Acra with a wall was the result of a national deliberation; and we cannot doubt but that the expense of these great works was defrayed by taxes, levied for this purpose on the whole country. This fortifying of the strong places of Judæa, and the circumvallation at the fort of Acra, are testimonies that the Jews now regarded the descendants of Mattathias as their lawful sovereigns; and that they trusted that under the Roman protection they should establish their independence, and be freed from the tyranny of the Syrian government. This supposition is fully confirmed by the subsequent events; for Simon, on his accession to the throne of Judæa, obtained from Demetrius not only a confirmation of his authority, but also a release from all tributes and taxes, on condition of assisting him against Tryphon. And from this grant the Jews dated the deliverance of Judæa fron a foreign power; and no longer used the era of the Seleucidæ, in their instruments and contracts, but dated them by the years of Simon and his successors.*

Judæa fortified.

Simon an independent Prince.

The government, thus regularly established, allowed the cultivation of foreign commerce. Simon, therefore, made Joppa the seaport of Judæa; from which place an intercourse began to be carried on between the different towns and islands on the Mediterranean, and was continued for many ages. He then reduced some fortresses that still held out, and besieged and took Gaza;† but he treated the heathen garrison mercifully, permitting them to depart the country; the place he planted with Jews, and fortifying it, built there a house for his own residence. The heathen garrison in the fort of Acra now began to feel the effects of the measures taken for its reduction; their provisions were exhausted, and being without possibility of relief, they at last surrendered the place, and were permitted by Simon to depart the land.‡

Encourages foreign commerce.

Acra surrenders to Simon.

For the last twenty-six years this garrison had been the source of infinite trouble to Jerusalem. Simon,

* 1 *Macc* xiii. v. 42. † Ibid. xiv. 5. ‡ Ibid. xiii.

History — From A. M. 3836. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

therefore, determined not only to destroy the fort, but to reduce the hill, on which it stood, to a level with the mountain of the Temple, a work which was accomplished after three years' incessant labour. He also fortified anew the mountain of the Temple, and built his palace within the circuit of the wall, probably on the spot where the castle Antonia was aftewards erected. Simon also took care to train up his son John, surnamed Hyrcanus, in the arts of government, and to cultivate the natural talents which he appeared to possess, appointing him General of all his forces, and sending him to reside at Gazara, near Joppa.

The hill Acra levelled. B. C. 141.

In this year public recognition of Simon's government seems to have been made by the people, in testimony of gratitude to him and his family for their deliverance. Judæa was now at peace, the enemy every where expelled. Such great blessings were worthy some especial record: they therefore engraved on tables of brass the recital of the valiant deeds of Simon and his predecessors, together with an acknowledgment of their submission to his rule, and affixed them in a conspicuous place within the borders of the Sanctuary.* At this time Simon, justly considering that it would materially strengthen his government, were his powers as High Priest and Prince of Judæa recognised by the Romans, sent an embassy for that purpose, with a present to the Senate of a massy shield of gold, weighing one thousand minæ, worth, at the least computation, fifty thousand pounds sterling. His ambassadors were received with every mark of respect, and the object of their mission was fully accomplished. The Senate not only renewed the league, but also sent letters to the neighbouring Princes, commanding them to treat the Jews as their friends and allies.

Public memorial of Simon's acts.

Treaty renewed with Rome. B. C. 140.

The Jews were again compelled to witness the perfidy of the Syrian Kings, in their transactions with Antiochus Sidetes, who had married Cleopatra, the wife of Demetrius, and was now attempting to dispossess the usurper Tryphon. No Princes were more ready to court the assistance of the Jews, in times of need, than the Syrian; none were more perfidious in prosperity, nor more open breakers of oaths and promises which they had made.† When this same Antiochus was desirous to secure the aid of Simon, he fully confirmed all the previous decrees made for the freedom of the Jews; and in proof of his sincerity, he conferred on him the prerogative of coining money as an independent Prince; but no sooner was he seated on the throne of Syria, than he broke every engagement he had made, laid claim to the citadel of Jerusalem, Joppa, and Gazara, and demanded five hundred talents for tribute and damages sustained by the loss of these places. To enforce his claim, he invaded Judæa; but his General was defeated by Judas and John, the sons of Simon, and compelled to retire from the country.

Treacherous conduct of Antiochus Sidetes. B. C. 139.

This peace, however, was far from permanent; being interrupted by the treacherous murder of the venerable Simon. A daughter of Simon having married Ptolemy, the son of Abulas, one of his officers, and governor of the city Jericho,* the ungrateful wretch laid plans for usurping the government; and having concerted measures with Antiochus Sidetes, he invited Simon, who was on a progress through the country with his sons Judas and Mattathias, to partake his hospitality at a castle near Jericho. The plot succeeded, and his father-in-law Simon, and his wife's two brothers, were murdered by him, in violation of every law of nature and every feeling of honour and of duty. John was at this time at Gazara, and happily escaping those who were sent to despatch him, hastened to Jerusalem, and secured possession of the city against those who were sent by Ptolemy to seize it.

Murder of Simon. B. C. 136.

Thus died the venerable Simon, a man who seems to have united in his own person the virtues of courage and of mercy to an extraordinary degree. His conduct to the heathen garrisons, in permitting them to depart the country, is an instance of mild generosity rarely witnessed at the period of his government. Age and prosperity had probably tempered the ferocity which displayed itself in the early wars of the sons of Mattathias. It is impossible to judge between them, whether the palm of courage belongs to one more than to another. They appear to have been equally courageous, firm, and resolute; they never avoided any danger however great, they neither deserted their religion nor their country under the most severe trials. The end of Judas was a soldier's death, he died in battle; but his brothers were less fortunate, according to human judgment; for Jonathan fell a victim to the treachery of an enemy, and Simon to the wicked ambition of one connected with him by the closest ties.

Character of Simon.

* 1 *Macc.* xiv. 48. † Ibid. xv. * 1 *Macc.* xvi.

JOHN HYRCANUS.

B. C. 136. John, the son of Simon, surnamed Hyrcanus, succeeds.

Hyrcanus having, as has been related, taken refuge in Jerusalem from the designs of Ptolemy, his father's murderer, was elected by the people to succeed Simon. He first performed the sacrifices required of him at his initiation into the High Priest's office, and then marching against Ptolemy, besieged him in a fortress near Jericho. Josephus relates* that the siege was carried on less vigorously on account of the feelings of Hyrcanus on behalf of his mother and brothers; for Ptolemy, having them in his possession, brought them upon the walls, and threatened that he would throw them down headlong, if Hyrcanus persisted in the siege. The conduct of his mother is related to have been of the most heroic kind. She cried aloud from the walls to her son "not to desist from his purpose, but to pursue his revenge, unmindful of her sufferings. To endure pain," she added, "would be pleasure to her, if it terminated in the punishment of him who had destroyed those who were dearest to her." Hyrcanus could not, however, resist the impression of pity, which the sight of his mother's torments occasioned. The siege

Heroic conduct of the wife of Simon.

* *Ant.* xiii. p. 581.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

was relaxed, and being continued languidly until the following year, which was the year of the Sabbath, it was at last raised. Ptolemy then put the mother and brothers of Hyrcanus to death, and fled to Zeno, who was tyrant of Philadelphia. No farther account is given of the fate of this ungrateful man.

War of Antiochus.

Antiochus Sidetes, in the following year, B. C. 135, invaded Judæa, and besieged Hyrcanus in Jerusalem: the year being Sabbatical, occasioned such a scarcity of provisions, as, towards the feast of tabernacles, in the autumn, reduced the besieged to the greatest necessity.* Hyrcanus, at this time, prayed a truce for the purpose of keeping the festival; which was not only granted by Antiochus, but he sent also beasts and such things as were fitting and required to be offered in sacrifice. This gracious conduct gave Hyrcanus hopes that Antiochus would not be unwilling to make peace. This accordingly took place; Hyrcanus agreeing to dismantle Jerusalem, and to pay tribute to the King for Joppa and other towns which the Jews possessed out of Judæa. The King demanded also that the fortress at Acra should be rebuilt; but this Hyrcanus refused, and chose rather to pay the King five hundred talents. Hostages were delivered for the performance of the treaty, and the siege was raised. Both Josephus and Diodorus Siculus† concur in ascribing this peace to the clemency of Antiochus; who resisted the persuasion of those who advised him to use the opportunity of rooting out that odious nation the Jews.

His clemency.

B. C. 131.

Antiochus, four years after this event, made an expedition into Parthia, for the purpose of recovering his brother Demetrius Nicator, who was detained there a prisoner. Hyrcanus accompanied the King in this war, and obtained no inconsiderable share of the honour of the victories gained over the Parthians.‡ Antiochus, wintering there, was slain in a general rising of the inhabitants, and was succeeded by his brother Demetrius. Hyrcanus failed not to use to the utmost the opportunity which the troubles, then prevailing in Syria, offered of delivering himself from obedience to the Syrians, and of re-establishing the independence of Judæa. He seized several of the cities bordering on Judæa, in Syria, Phœnicia, and Arabia; and so entirely did he succeed in his purpose, that neither himself nor his successors were ever after tributary to the Kings of Syria. Hyrcanus then took Sechem, the chief seat of the Samaritans, and destroyed the temple erected by Sanballat on mount Gerizim, after it had stood two hundred years.§ He next carried his arms against the Idumeans, and compelled them either to embrace the Jewish religion or to leave the country: they accepted the former proposal. The Edomites were circumcised and admitted as proselytes; and so complete was their incorporation into the Jewish church, that they soon became one with the nation of the Jews.

Hyrcanus accompanies Antiochus into Parthia.

Hyrcanus takes advantage of the death of Antiochus.

B. C. 130.

B. C. 129.

B. C. 128. Ambassadors sent to Rome.

Hyrcanus sent an embassy to Rome, the object of which was to gain from the Romans an acknowledgment that the treaty which he had been compelled to make with Antiochus Sidetes was null and void, as being in violation of that freedom which the Romans had guaranteed to the Jews.* The Romans readily consented, and sent ambassadors to reinstate Hyrcanus in that freedom from the dominion of the Kings of Syria which he had before enjoyed.† In return for this kindness, an embassy was sent the following year to testify the gratitude of the Jewish nation to the Roman Senate, and to present a cup and shield of gold, worth fifty thousand pieces. Upon this, another decree was passed by the Senate to confirm the former. The crown of Syria was once more contested between Demetrius and Alexander Zebina, who was an impostor, the son of a broker of Alexandria, but who pretended to be the son of Alexander Balas. Demetrius dying at Tyre, his wife Cleopatra reigned over one part of the kingdom, and Zebina over the rest. Zebina made alliance with Hyrcanus, who never failed, during these commotions, to advance, to the utmost of his power, the interest of his family and the prosperity of his country.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

B. C. 126.

Such circumstances indeed could not fail to increase the wealth and power of so rising a Prince as Hyrcanus. We find him accomplishing the subjugation of Samaria, which he utterly destroyed; and after this victory making himself master of all Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria, and several other places in the adjacent countries.‡ He raised the glory of the Asamonean Princes to its greatest height, and passed the remainder of his days respected by his neighbours and free from all foreign wars.§ Hyrcanus had been through life attached to the sect of the Pharisees. Josephus‖ relates at some length the circumstances under which he withdrew his favour from them, and conferred it upon the opposite sect the Sadducees. It is probable that he discovered among them symptoms of disaffection; upon which he left their party and gave encouragement to the Sadducees, by forbidding publicly the practice of those customs which the Pharisees had enjoined to be observed in addition to the Law of Moses.¶ We can hardly conceive that so good a man would have denied the resurrection, as the Sadducees did in aftertimes; and indeed the account of his proceedings against the Pharisees, in annulling their precepts, imports that he foresaw the necessity of checking the evils that would result from the observance of their traditions. The Pharisees possessed influence with the lower orders, while the power of the Sadducees was confined to the wealthy. The conduct of Hyrcanus, whatever it was, served to alienate from him and from his family the affections of the Pharisees. To them may be ascribed the declension, and finally the ruin of their state; which was destroyed by their opposition, first to their own Princes, and afterwards to the Romans.

B. C. 110.

Conduct of Hyrcanus towards the Pharisees.

Hyrcanus died, having reigned, with honour, thirty years. That he was a great man as a Prince we cannot doubt, when we consider how skilfully he guided the helm of state, while he raised his country to power and wealth: that he was a good man is also

B. C. 107.

Character of Hyrcanus.

* Jos. *Ant.* xiii. p. 582. † Diod. Sic. lib. 34.

‡ Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, relates that this Prince acquired his name of Hyrcanus from conquering the Hyrcanians in this expedition.

§ Jos. *Ant.* xiii. p. 584.

* *Ant.* xiii. p. 584. and xiv. p. 623.

† Dr. Hales is of opinion that the decree recited by Josephus, *Ant.* xiv. p. 623. ed. Hud. by mistake, is said to have been granted to Hyrcanus II. and that it applies to the embassy here related.—Hales's *Chronology*, vol. ii. 623.

‡ Jos. *Ant.* xiii. p. 586. § *De bell. Jud.* lib. i. p. 962.

‖ *Ant.* ib. ¶ *Ant.* ib.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

clear from the tradition which Josephus* has recorded of his being possessed of the spirit of prophecy; and had there been any thing in his character worthy of blame, his opposition, during the last years of his life, to the encroachments of the Pharisees, would have occasioned some more grievous tale to be registered against him, by a sect of such influence, than that he rejected them because a Sadducee persuaded him that an insult, offered him by one single Pharisee, was the premeditated act of the whole party.

Before we proceed to recount the acts of the successors of Hyrcanus, during the decline of the Asamonean power, it may not be unprofitable to some of our readers if we direct their attention to the remarkable consequences which we have, during the preceding history, observed to result from that extraordinary enactment of the Law of Moses, the observance of the Sabbatical year. On more than one occasion, both when Bethsura was taken by the Syrians, in the time of Judas, and when Antiochus Sidetes took Jerusalem, in the reign of Hyrcanus, we have seen that those apparently unfortunate results of war might be, in a great measure, attributed to that scarcity of provisions which naturally existed during a Sabbatical year; a scarcity, indeed, not amounting to famine, but yet sufficient to prevent the collection of stores against a protracted siege. During the wars carried on by Judas, Jonathan, and Simon, the Sabbatical year must have continually proved an impediment to warlike operations, sufficient, certainly, in the eyes of worldly men, to have justified a suspension of its observance. The difficulties which thence ensued, seem to have been cheerfully borne. The Maccabean Princes were too zealous for the Law, to permit so important a feature in it to be lightly regarded; and in the end we find that, under the superintending providence of that God who gave this Law, and promised blessings to the Jews if they kept it, the kingdom of Judæa rose, during this period, to a higher point of splendour and power than it had attained since the division of Solomon's kingdom, under the two kings Rehoboam and Jeroboam. This singular institution was peculiar to the theocracy established by the Mosaic Law; we may consider it as a perpetual touchstone, whereby the Divine Providence tried the fidelity of the Jews. The command was one to which the divine legislator attached great importance. The pen of inspiration informs us, that the breach of it was among the causes which occasioned the captivity of Judah; for it is said that, as long as the land lay desolate, namely, for seventy years, it thereby enjoyed those Sabbaths of which it had been defrauded.*

B. C. 164.

Observations on the Sabbatical year.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

* *Ant.* xiii. p. 586. *De bell. Jud.* ib.

* 2 *Chron.* c. xxxvi. 21.

ARISTOBULUS.

B. C. 106.

The reign of this unfortunate Prince is marked with horror. Hyrcanus was no sooner dead than his family appear to have indulged towards each other the most bitter animosities. The character of Aristobulus is presented to us in most opposite lights. His acts were those of cruelty; and yet we find Josephus* quoting a passage from the historian Timagenes, in which this Prince is described as a man of equity, and a benefactor to his country. His reign was short and miserable; and his early death seems to have been brought about, in a great measure, by the pain and anxiety which he suffered. The events of the year in which he reigned, are probably attributable to the intrigues of party, and to the same turbulent ambition of the Pharisees, which embittered the latter days of Hyrcanus. As soon as Aristobulus was seated on the throne, he put the royal diadem on his head, and assumed the title of King, being the first that bore this title since the time of the Babylonish captivity. His mother was amongst the foremost of those who disputed his sovereignty, and claimed a right to the supreme power by his father's will. Aristobulus put her in prison and starved her to death; an act of cruelty not to be justified, even by the most ambitious and rebellious designs of a mother. Perhaps with a view of shewing his own unambitious disposition, he admitted his brother Antigonus to partnership in the kingdom; whilst, for the security of his person, he put his three remaining brothers into prison. Aristobulus was successful in a war which he made upon the Itureans; and imitating the example of his father, he compelled them to be circumcised, or to quit their country. Returning from this expedition, and suffering from sickness, he found no peace where he had most reason to expect it, in his own house. The cruel death to which his mother had been condemned, acted as a scourge upon himself and his family; a sure proof that worldly honour can seldom hope to be secured by the commission of unnatural cruelty. His Queen Salome, and the courtiers of her party, were continually exciting him to jealousy of his favourite brother, whom, upon false suspicion, he put to death. This event brought so strongly to his mind, now oppressed with sickness, the remembrance of his mother's untimely end, that his disorder rapidly increased upon him, and he died in bitter agony, lamenting his cruelty to his mother, and his folly in believing that his brother was false to his interests.

Aristobulus assumes the title of King.

Conquers the Itureans.

* *Antiq.* xiii. p. 590.

ALEXANDER JANNÆUS.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

THIS Prince was the third son of Hyrcanus. One of the first acts of his reign was the putting his next brother to death, for entertaining treasonous designs against him. He attempted to take Ptolemais, and besieged it; but Ptolemy Lathyrus, who reigned in Cyprus, came to the relief of the city, and not only caused the siege to be raised, but subsequently invaded Judæa, and would have reduced Alexander to the greatest extremity had not Cleopatra sent an army from Egypt to his assistance. Alexander was successful in taking Gadara, after a siege of ten months; but being foiled in his attempts upon Amathus, a city beyond Judæa, he returned to Jerusalem in disgrace. The misfortunes which thus befel him were grateful to the Pharisees, who, since their quarrel with his father, had become bitter enemies to the royal family, and to none more than to Alexander, from whom they strove, by all means in their power, to alienate the affections of the people.

B. C. 105.

Notwithstanding considerable success which afterwards attended him in his wars, the flame of dissension at last broke out in the eleventh year of his reign, at the feast of tabernacles. Whilst in the act of officiating as High Priest at the altar, he was insulted by the populace, and pelted with citrons, to which they added the most opprobrious language, implying that he was descended from a slave, and unworthy of being either High Priest or King.* Alexander, enraged at this treatment, ordered his guards to fall upon the populace, and slew six thousand persons. To prevent a recurrence of the like insult, he railed in the Court of the priests, to exclude the approach of the people; and for the safety of his person, he employed a guard of six thousand mercenaries. The Pharisees were doubtless the instigators of all these disturbances. Much blame attaches itself to the conduct of Alexander; but the most efficient cause of all the misery which afflicted the Jewish nation, in the civil war then begun, was their desertion of the pure Law of Moses, and the adoption of that corrupt system of religion, of which the Pharisees were the authors. The people, now addicted to Pharisaic superstitions, were condemned to suffer, from the intrigues of that party, the evil consequences of intestine divisions, and all the miseries of civil war: so wonderful is that dispensation of Providence which, under the Jewish Law, and not less under the Christian covenant, converts a national sin into the means of a national punishment. Alexander endeavoured to divert the attention of the people from affairs at home by engaging in war, and succeeded in making the inhabitants of the lands of Moab and of Gilead tributaries to him. This temporary success served for awhile to abate the fury of the storm; but three years after, being unfortunate in an expedition against the country of Gaulonitis, and losing nearly all his army on his return to Jerusalem, the Jews took advantage of his desolate situation, and openly rebelled against him. A civil war then ensued, which continued for six years; during which, though he repeatedly defeated the rebels, he was utterly unable to subdue their refractory spirit. "Wearied at length with punishing and destroying his people, he sought an accommodation, and offered to grant them any reasonable conditions they chose. With one voice, they desired him to cut his throat, for they could be at peace with him on no other terms; and that, considering the great mischiefs he had done them, it were well that they could be reconciled to him even in his grave.* They sent for succours to Demetrius Eucerus, King of Damascus, who brought a powerful army to their assistance, and overthrew Alexander, with the loss of all his Greek mercenaries, to a man, and he would have been utterly ruined, had not six thousand of the Jews themselves, compassionating his distress, revolted from the Syrians and joined him. Being a man of most undaunted spirit, and possessing great resources in himself, he continued the war with his own people after the departure of the Syrians; and at length he defeated them with great slaughter, and shut up the remainder in Bethome, which he besieged and took the year after. On this occasion he was guilty of a most barbarous act of cruelty, which got him the appellation of Thracidas, 'the Thracian.' He brought eight hundred of the prisoners to Jerusalem, and there crucified them all in one day, and put their wives and children to death before their faces, as they hung dying on the crosses; whilst he, his wives, and concubines were feasting in view of the horrid scene, to glut their eyes with the spectacle! After this, Alexander had no more disturbance; the rebels who survived, flying the country, after he had destroyed about fifty thousand of them in the course of the war. He then spent three years in recovering fortresses which had revolted during the civil war, and extended his conquests beyond Jordan. He returned to Jerusalem victorious, and gave himself up to luxury and drunkenness, which brought on a quartan ague, under which he languished for three years, and at length died at the siege of Ragaba, beyond Jordan, in the country of Gerasenes. In his last moments, he advised Alexandra his Queen, to conceal his death until the capture of the fortress, and then on their triumphant return to Jerusalem, he recommended her to convene the heads of the Pharisees, and offer to be guided by their counsels in the administration of the kingdom; and to lay his dead body before them,† and resign it wholly to their discretion, whether to treat it with ignominy, in revenge for all the evils they had suffered from him, or otherwise; adding, that if she followed this advice, she would not only procure him an honourable funeral, but security for herself and her children. And the event justified the prediction: for his funeral obsequies were more splendid than those of any of his predecessors; and Alexandra, according to his will, was quietly established in the government."—*Hales's Chronology*, vol. ii. p. 626.

Civil dissensions under his government.

Evil influence of the Pharisees.

Alexander conquers Moab and Gilead.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

B. C. 89.

B. C. 86.

His cruelty.

B. C. 82.

Gives himself up to luxury.

B. C. 78.

* *Ant.* xiii. p. 596.

* *Ant.* xiii. p. 597. † *Ant.* xiii. p. 600.

QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

History From A. M. 3839. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

B. C. 78. Alexandra his wife succeeds.

Alexandra being settled on the throne, appointed Hyrcanus, her eldest son, to the office of High Priest, and gave up every thing to the entire direction of the Pharisees: as Josephus observes, Alexandra had the kingdom, and the Pharisees the power. The decree of Hyrcanus against them was immediately revoked; the exiles of their party were recalled; and revenge was executed upon those, by whose advice Alexander had put to death the eight hundred rebels. Hyrcanus, the High Priest, being a man of easy temper, did not attempt any opposition to these proceedings: but at last Aristobulus, the younger brother, incensed at the persecutions still carried on by the Pharisees against all his father's former adherents, put himself at the head of the party opposed to the Pharisees, and went with them openly to remonstrate with the Queen against these proceedings. The Queen, touched with the statement of their sufferings, so far agreed to their demands, as to put into the hands of Aristobulus and his friends all the fortresses,* (except Hyrcania, Alexandrium, and Machærus) and in these places they found refuge from the tyranny of the Pharisees.

Hyrcanus made High Priest. B. C. 72.

Aristobulus was sent in the following year to relieve Damascus from the incursions of Ptolemy Mannœus. He took possession of the city; but employed the power thus invested in him to no other advantage than that of securing to himself the affections of the army. Tigranes, King of Armenia, was at this time employed in the siege of Ptolemais, which occasioned no small anxiety to the Queen, lest he should invade Judæa; but the progress of the Roman arms in Pontus and Cappadocia, warning him to provide for the defence of Armenia, Jerusalem and Judæa were thereby relieved from the impending danger. A short time previous to the invasion of Armenia by the Romans, Alexandra died, having attained the age of seventy-three years.

In the account which Josephus* gives of her, we read the perfect character of an ambitious woman. "She was," says he, "destitute of the natural weakness of her sex. In her own love of rule she at once displayed the power her mind possessed in the management of affairs, and at the same time gave proof of the follies of mankind in the errors which they commit in order to obtain dominion: for, utterly regardless of future consequences, if she could but obtain some present good, and counting every object inferior to the absolute possession of power, in the accomplishment of her desires, she paid no regard to the principles either of honour or of justice. And to such extremity did she reduce her own family, whilst she sought more than it became woman to possess, that she caused them to lose that power to which she had aspired in spite of the greatest perils, committing herself to the guidance of those most hostile to her family, and leaving her kingdom deprived of persons able to govern its affairs. The policy she pursued when alive, after her death, filled her palace with calamity and trouble; and yet, during her reign, she preserved the country in peace."

B. C. 69. Character of Alexandra.

* *Ant.* xiii. p. 601.

* *Ant.* xiii. p. 603.

HYRCANUS THE SECOND.

B. C. 69. Short reign of Hyrcanus.

The reign of this Prince did not exceed three months in duration. His younger brother Aristobulus took every advantage of the sickness which preceded his mother's death to get possession of the fortresses. The army was attached to him, and the people, now weary of the lordly tyranny of the Pharisees, were ready enough to encourage a change of government. The Pharisees represented to Alexandra whilst on her deathbed, the designs of Aristobulus, but she declined interfering in the dispute. On the death of the Queen a battle took place between the forces, which the Pharisees had raised in favour of Hyrcanus, and the army of Aristobulus; after which Hyrcanus willingly resigned the High Priesthood and the kingdom, and was contented to lead a quiet life under his brother's protection. Thus, as Josephus* relates, Aristobulus went to the palace, and Hyrcanus to the house of Aristobulus; and so ended the tyranny which, for the space of nine years, had been exercised by the Pharisees over the whole nation.

* *Ant* xiv. p. 607.

ARISTOBULUS THE SECOND.

By the expulsion of Hyrcanus, his brother Aristobulus the Second ascended the throne. The weakness of Hyrcanus seemed little likely to disturb his reign; but there appeared an enemy to contend with more subtle than his brother; and the combination of circumstances abroad unhappily aided the designs which his adversary formed against him. The vices of the later Asamonean Princes, their family dissensions, and submission to the teachers of a corrupt religion, had dimmed the lustre of that glory which shone upon them during the reigns of the first five of their race. Vice, whether in the palace or in the abodes of private life, is equally destructive; it undermines alike the wealth of the private man and the stability of the throne; and we find that in the instance of the Asamonean family, their own wickedness and folly paved the way

History
From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

for the establishment of the authority of the Herods over their master's house.

Origin of Antipater.

The disturbances which happened in Judæa at this time, and the revolution that succeeded, arose from the aspiring temper of Antipater, the father of Herod the Great. This Antipater was an Idumean by birth, but in religion a Jew, the son of Antipas, a nobleman of Idumea, who, under the reign of Alexander Jannæus, was appointed governor of that country, and enjoyed the esteem and friendship of Jannæus and his Queen Alexandra.* The young Antipater, the father of Herod, being brought up in the court, contracted the strongest friendship with Hyrcanus, and naturally looked to his succession to the crown as the means of promoting his own aggrandizement. The deposition of Hyrcanus frustrated all his hopes; from Aristobulus he could scarcely expect safety, much less favour; he

Intrigues of Antipater.

therefore exerted himself to the utmost to repair the fortunes of Hyrcanus, and with them his own. Hyrcanus was a man of too easy a temper, to be excited to exertion by the feelings of ambition. Antipater, therefore, found no other means of winning him to his purpose than by insinuating that danger was to be apprehended to his life from Aristobulus. In the meantime he treated with Aretas, King of Arabia Petræa, and engaged him to furnish an army to assist Hyrcanus; many of the Jews were also ready, through his intrigues, to join in the attempt. With much solicitation, Antipater at length prevailed on Hyrcanus to fly from Jerusalem, and to take refuge

Aretas besieges Jerusalem. B. C. 65.

with Aretas; who immediately marched an army of fifty thousand men into Judæa, and being there joined by the Jews of Hyrcanus's party, gave battle to Aristobulus, defeated him, and compelled him to retire into the Temple mount at Jerusalem, where he besieged him. It happened that at this time Pompey was carrying on the war against Tigranes and Mithridates in Armenia. A division of the Roman army, under the command of Scaurus, had been detached by Pompey and sent into Syria, and Scaurus was now on his march to Judæa, when the two brothers sent to make offers to procure his assistance. Scaurus deemed it most prudent to accept those of Aristobulus, and therefore sent orders to Aretas to retire, under penalty of having war made upon him by the Romans if he refused. Aristobulus now in turn attacked Aretas and Hyrcanus, and defeated them with great slaughter.

B. C. 64. B. C. 63.

As soon as Pompey had finished his war in Armenia he came to Damascus, and reduced Cœle-Syria to a Roman province. On his return to Cœle-Syria in the following year, he was met by ambassadors, both from the Jewish nation and from the two brothers Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, beseeching him to decide the quarrel between them.† In the ensuing spring he came to Damascus; and then directed his attention to the statements these ambassadors made to him respecting

Aristobulus and Hyrcanus appeal to Pompey.

Judæa, and permitted the two brothers to plead their cause before him. The representatives of the Jewish people, alike hostile to the interests of Hyrcanus and of Aristobulus, declared their unwillingness to submit any longer to a kingly government, having always been accustomed to be subject to Priests and not to Kings. They acknowledged that the two Princes were of the sacerdotal family, but that they changed the form of government for the purpose of reducing the people to slavery. No circumstance could prove more strongly the real weakness of the power of the royal family than this declaration of the Jewish nation to Pompey, nor could shew more plainly that Judæa was prepared to become an easy acquisition to the Roman power. Hyrcanus pleaded the injustice of his younger brother, in depriving him of his authority; to which Aristobulus replied, by urging the imbecility of Hyrcanus, and his evident unfitness to hold the reins of government. The artful Roman did not immediately pronounce his judgment upon the merits of the cause; but perceiving that the weakness of Hyrcanus presented the fewest obstacles to the extension of the Roman conquests, he secretly determined in his favour; but apparently left the matter undecided, until he should have leisure to come in person and settle the business at Jerusalem. The crafty intentions of Pompey did not escape the observation of Aristobulus. On his return from Damascus, he began preparations of defence, a circumstance which incensed the Roman general against him, and more fully determined him to depose him. It was no difficult task to overcome Aretas, and deprive Aristobulus of all hope of resistance to the Roman power from that quarter. Pompey took Petræa, the capital city of Arabia Petræa, and made Aretas a prisoner; but released him on his submitting to the terms which he imposed. He then came into Judæa, and found Aristobulus in the strong fortress at Alexandrium. The behaviour of Pompey was that of a man conscious of his own power, and of the weakness of his enemy. He commanded Aristobulus to come and treat with him. Several conferences took place; at the last of which, the Roman General ordered him to deliver up his fortresses, and to sign orders for the surrender of them before he quitted the camp. Aristobulus now perceived that there was no hope of obtaining any thing by negociation, he therefore fled to Jerusalem, and there prepared to make a stand against Pompey; but as soon as the Roman army advanced thither his courage failed, and he tried to make peace, by promising entire submission, and by paying a certain sum of money. Pompey accepted the proposal, and sent Gabinius to receive the money; who returned, having found the gates shut, with an answer that the people would not comply with the conditions. Pompey, incensed at this treatment, marched his whole army against Jerusalem. The friends of Hyrcanus soon admitted him into the city; but Aristobulus and his party, having possession of the mountain of the Temple, there sustained a siege for three months; nor would the fortress have been taken in the end, had not Pompey perceived that, though on the Sabbath days the Jews resisted any assault made upon them, they did not then make any attempts to hinder the works which were carrying on. He therefore gave orders not to make any assault on the Sabbath; but to take advantage of that time, by employing it in carrying forward the works, advancing the battering engines, and filling up the ditches.* At length the Romans succeeded in making a breach in the wall, and assaulted the place. The number of those who perished was reckoned at not less than twelve thousand: none were more cruel in the carnage than the Jews of

Of the Asmonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Weakness of the regal power.

Crafty policy of Pompey.

Aretas conquered.

Pompey besieges Jerusalem.

* *Ant.* xiv. p. 608. † *Ant.* xiv. p. 611. * *Ant.* xiv. p. 614

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Hyrcanus's party. Amidst this dreadful destruction, the priests still persevered in performing their duty in the Temple; many fell by the sword at the very altars, and mingled their own blood with the blood of the sacrifices. The day on which the fortress was taken was that on which a solemn fast was observed, for the capture of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar. The constancy and self-devotion of the priests failed not to meet with the admiration of Pompey. A parallel to it is scarcely to be met with in the records of history. As soon as the place surrendered, Pompey, with several of his generals, took a survey of the Temple; and not contented with viewing the outer courts, entered into the most Holy place; which was a profanation and an insult to their religion bitterly felt and most grievously resented by the Jews. The treasures contained in the Temple he left untouched, and gave orders for the continuance of the service as before; an abstinence which little atoned for the impiety of which he had been guilty. It has been remarked of Pompey that up to this period of his life he experienced the greatest success in all his undertakings, but after this act of profanation he never prospered, his victory at Jerusalem being the last victory he achieved. On the taking of Jerusalem, Pompey restored the High Priesthood to Hyrcanus, and made him Prince of the country, but forbade his wearing the diadem. He then dismantled Jerusalem, and made Judæa tributary to the Romans; and separating from its government all the Syrian and Phœnician cities taken by the predecessors of Hyrcanus, made Scaurus President of Syria. He then returned to Rome, carrying with him Aristobulus, his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus, and two of his daughters, to grace his triumph.

Profanes the Temple. B. C. 63.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Hyrcanus made High Priest.

HYRCANUS THE SECOND RESTORED.

When we consider the continual interference of the Roman authority in the internal affairs of Judæa, which took place after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, and the influence which Antipater possessed over the mind of Hyrcanus, it appears evident that the restoration of Hyrcanus was purely nominal, and that the limited power possessed by the Prince of Judæa, in reality pertained to Antipater, and not to the nominal King. Whilst Pompey was on his way to Rome, Alexander, the eldest son of Aristobulus, effected his escape. In the year B. C. 57, he collected in Judæa an army of ten thousand men, and seizing the fortresses of Hyrcania, Alexandrium, and Machærus, ravaged the country. Gabinius, the President of Syria, despatched Mark Antony to oppose this attempt of Alexander. Antony, uniting his forces with those of Antipater and Hyrcanus, soon defeated Alexander, and compelled him to retire to the fortress at Alexandrium. By the mediation of his mother, Gabinius concluded a peace with him, on condition of his surrendering Alexandrium and the other fortresses, which were afterwards demolished by her advice, lest they should aid further revolts.

Escape of Alexander.

Attempts to recover Judæa.

The policy of Gabinius.

In order to weaken the power of the Jewish nation by increasing a number of independent cities near Judæa, Gabinius gave orders for the rebuilding Samaria, Azotus, Zamnia, Scythopolis, and several other cities which had been destroyed by the Asamonean Princes. The government of these cities was probably constituted in the aristocratic form; for soon after the taking of Alexandrium, Gabinius came to Jerusalem and altered the form of government from the monarchical to the aristocratical,* leaving to Hyrcanus no other authority than that of the High Priesthood. Until this time justice had been administered throughout Judæa by the two Sanhedrims, or courts of justice: the lesser existed in every city, and consisted of twenty-three persons; the other, called the greater Sanhedrim, consisted of seventy persons, and sat at Jerusalem, and to it an appeal lay from the courts beneath. This constitution naturally made Jerusalem the chief place of authority. Gabinius most effectually overthrew this superiority by establishing five supreme independent Sanhedrims, at Jerusalem, Jericho, Gadara, Amathus, and Sepphoris. By this means all power was taken from Hyrcanus and given to the nobles; whilst, at the same time, the nation was deprived of a common centre of union. The existence of the little authority which remained to Hyrcanus and Antipater solely depending on the permission of the Romans, it is not surprising to find Antipater endeavouring, by every means in his power, to ingratiate himself with them.

B. C. 222. Establishes five independent Sanhedrims.

Administration of Antipater.

The Jews in Egypt were a most powerful body. In the invasion of Egypt by Gabinius and Mark Antony, a great part of the success which attended them was owing to the influence of Antipater, who wrote to the Jews and persuaded them to assist the invading army; by which means Pelusium was taken, and a way opened for the admission of the Romans. Two years previously, Aristobulus, escaping from Rome, had made one more attempt, by raising an army in Judæa, to recover his authority; but being besieged in Machærus, he was taken prisoner by Gabinius, and his enterprise entirely failed. This year his son Alexander repeated the attempt, in the absence of Gabinius in Egypt, and raised a force of thirty thousand men, with which he ravaged the country; but on the return of the Roman general, he was defeated near mount Tabor, and his whole army dispersed. Crassus succeeded Gabinius in the government of Syria. His avarice could not withstand the temptation to plunder the temple at Jerusalem of its treasures,* which amounted to ten thousand talents; but this sacrilege was only the prelude to his ruin, for in the following year he perished in the Parthian war, being defeated with great slaughter, and himself and his son killed near Charræ in Mesopotamia.

B. C. 56. Antipater persuades the Jews to assist the Romans.

B. C. 55.

B. C. 54. Crassus plunders the temple.

The civil wars between Pompey and Cæsar hastened the destruction of the Asamonean family. Cæsar released Aristobulus out of prison, and sent him with two legions to promote his interests in Judæa; but the friends of Pompey contrived to get rid of so troublesome an opponent, by poisoning him on his way thither. A fate not less miserable befel his son Alexander, who had raised forces in Judæa, expecting his

B. C. 49.

* *Ant.* xiv. p. 617.

* *Ant.* xiv. p. 618.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

father to arrive, but Pompey sent orders to Scipio, President of Syria, to seize him and put him to death; he was accordingly taken and brought to Antioch, and after a formal trial, put to death. It would be foreign to our purpose to relate the various fortunes which attended Julius Cæsar in his road to power. We cannot, however, avoid noticing that Cæsar was considerably indebted for his release from the difficulties which surrounded him in Egypt, immediately after Pompey's death, to the courage and prudence of Antipater the Idumean; for, when Mithridates had been sent by Cæsar to levy forces in Syria and Cilicia, and to come to his succour in Egypt, Antipater and Hyrcanus not only provided a considerable force in aid of Cæsar, but also accompanied Mithridates in person. In the siege of Pelusium, Antipater was foremost in the assault of the city; and most materially contributed, by his personal valour, to the capture of the place. And but for the presence of Antipater and Hyrcanus, the expedition of Mithridates would have been entirely frustrated by the Jews of the province of Oneion, who had seized the passes, and refused him admittance; but Antipater persuaded them not only to permit the passage of the troops, but also to join Cæsar's party. Nor did his services end here; for in an engagement which took place with the army of Ptolemy, Mithridates commanding in conjunction with Antipater, the division of Mithridates was entirely defeated; but Antipater, having routed the part opposed to him, came to his assistance, and at last succeeded in defeating the enemy with great slaughter. It is worthy of remark, that Cæsar, the founder of the dynasty destined by Providence to complete the overthrow of the Jewish economy, was considerably aided and forwarded on his road to power by this very nation; and the conqueror shewed himself grateful to Antipater for that service; for on his arrival in Syria, he refused to listen to the claims Antigonus, the surviving son of Aristobulus, made upon him, (in consideration, no doubt, of the death of his father and brother in Cæsar's service) for his restoration to the kingdom, and restored the supreme authority to Hyrcanus, abolishing the aristocratical constitution of Gabinius, and appointing Antipater procurator of Judæa, under Hyrcanus. Antipater was a man of great wisdom and foresight, and had acquired such influence in Judæa and Arabia, Syria and Palestine, as made him necessary to the Roman governors in those parts: and to none did he render more service than to Cæsar, who, without his assistance, could never have raised that army, to which he owed his deliverance in Egypt. Antipater had now four sons grown up, of great reputation for valour and wisdom: the eldest was Phasael, whom he made governor of Jerusalem; the second Herod, whom he appointed governor of Galilee; the third son was Joseph, and the fourth Pheroras: he had also a daughter, Salome, a woman of an intriguing spirit, who lived to create serious disturbances in the family. The height to which Antipater had raised himself and his family, failed not to render his prosperity odious to the Jews of the aristocratic party. Herod having exerted himself with great courage against the robbers who infested his district, and put their leader to death by his own authority, and without any formal trial, several of the leading Jews laid hold of this circumstance to summon him to answer before the Sanhedrim for his conduct.* Herod came attended by his guards, and clothed in purple, and bearing with him a menacing letter from Sextus Cæsar, the President of Syria, commanding the Sanhedrim to acquit him. Awed by this behaviour, the whole assembly remained silent, when Sameas, a man of great courage and integrity, boldly stepped forward, and arraigned him both for his crime, and also for his presumption in coming thither so attended; and he predicted that this Herod would one day destroy them all, an event which afterwards came to pass, for he put Hyrcanus, and all the members of the Sanhedrim, to death, Pollio and Sameas only excepted. At this time Hyrcanus seeing the assembly, at the instigation of Sameas, inclined to condemn Herod, adjourned the meeting; thus giving opportunity for him to make his escape to Damascus during the night. It was with difficulty that Herod was dissuaded by his father and brother from marching an army to Jerusalem, to avenge the insult he had received from the Sanhedrim. On the return of Julius Cæsar from the African war, Hyrcanus sent an embassy to him, requesting his permission to repair and fortify Jerusalem; who not only granted his request, but by a decree confirmed Hyrcanus in his authority, as High Priest and Ethnarch; remitted the tribute to be paid by the Romans during the Sabbatical year; and granted such farther privileges to the Jews, throughout the empire, that they could hardly be said to feel the weight of the Roman yoke. Josephus† has preserved the various decrees made by Cæsar in favour of the Jews, as an argument to confirm his account of the esteem in which the Persian and Macedonian Princes held his nation. "For," says he, "if some doubt the truth of what is asserted on this point, because the evidence is not to be found but in the records of our own, and some barbarous nations, they will surely think it worthy of credit, when they read what decrees the Romans made in our favour; decrees not to be denied, but registered in the public offices, and engraved on the pillars of the capitol."

By the assassination of Cæsar, which event took place soon after, the Roman empire was thrown into the greatest confusion. Cassius, one of the conspirators, seized Syria,‡ and being compelled to levy heavy contributions on the country for the support of his army, the territory of Hyrcanus was taxed at seven hundred talents. Antipater made every exertion to raise the sum appointed, and divided the labour of making the assessment between his two sons, Phasael and Herod, and a nobleman, attached to the interests of Hyrcanus, named Malichus. The district allotted to Malichus failing of affording the proper supply, Cassius ordered the inhabitants to be sold, and would have put Malichus to death, had not Antipater redeemed his life, by the payment of a hundred talents out of the treasury of Hyrcanus. Malichus repaid this kindness by the basest ingratitude. Jealous of the authority of Antipater, and disdaining any longer to promote the welfare of Hyrcanus, whilst he held only the second place under Antipater the Idumean, he plotted the entire destruction of the friend to whom he owed the preservation of his life. The treachery of Malichus was soon suspected by Antipater and his sons; but on being charged with it, he so solemnly

Cæsar assisted in Egypt by Antipater.

B. C. 48.

Cæsar requites Antipater for his assistance.

B. C. 47.

Antipater's family.

Herod accused by the Sanhedrim.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

B. C. 44.

The Jews protected by Cæsar.

Death of Cæsar.

Syria seized by Cassius.

Treachery of Malichus.

* Jos. *Ant.* xiv. p. 626. † *Ant.* xiv. p. 628.
‡ *Ant.* xiv. p. 637.

History From A. M. 3833. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

protested his innocence, that Antipater became reconciled to him. On this occasion the ungrateful villain once more owed his life to Antipater; who would not allow one of his two sons to act upon the persuasion he entertained of Malichus's treachery, and thus saved him from death. Malichus, however, soon after poisoned him at a banquet given by Hyrcanus, and took possession of the government of Jerusalem. Still the crafty traitor strove to persuade Phasael and Herod of his innocence; but to no purpose, for they procured him to be assassinated at Tyre, by the Roman garrison, under orders to that effect from Cassius.

Death of Antipater. B. C. 42.

By the defeat of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, the sons of Herod were deprived of their strongest support, the protection of Cassius. The faction of Malichus gained Hyrcanus as well as Felix, the Roman Governor, to their side, by representing to them how much was to be feared from the overgrown power of the sons of Antipater. Phasael, however, by the vigour of his proceedings, soon recovered the ascendency by attacking Jerusalem, and expelling the Roman Governor. The sons of Antipater failed not to upbraid Hyrcanus with his base desertion of the family of Antipater, to whose wise administration he was indebted for every thing which he possessed; but all differences between them were speedily removed by Herod's espousing Mariamne, the beautiful granddaughter of Hyrcanus.* The suppressed faction, though moderated, was by no means extinguished; for they called to them Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, and under pretence of restoring him to his father's throne, raised fresh disturbances in the country: his claim was supported by Marion, King of Tyre, Fabius, Governor of Damascus, and Ptolemy, Prince of Chalcis, who married the daughter of Aristobulus. The next year Antony, coming to Antioch, was met by a deputation sent from the Jewish nation to accuse Phasael and Herod of usurping the government of Hyrcanus. Antony allowed them a hearing in the presence of Hyrcanus,* and then inquiring of him whom he thought fittest to manage the government under him, according to his recommendation, made the two brothers Tetrarchs, and committed the administration of affairs entirely to them. He also imprisoned several of the deputies, and would have put them to death, had not Herod saved them by his intercession. The troubles of Herod were not yet ended. The Parthian General Pacorus having taken Sidon and Ptolemais, was induced, by an offer of a thousand talents and five hundred Jewish women, to assist Antigonus in his claim to the throne. The forces of the two brothers were superior to the Parthians, who finding themselves unable to accomplish their purpose by force, had recourse to treachery, and by it they succeeded. Contrary to Herod's advice, Phasael and Hyrcanus were induced to go in an embassy to the Parthian Governor, as the readiest means of obtaining peace: as soon as the Governor had them in his power, he put them both in chains. Herod escaped from Jerusalem, and fled to Massada, a strong fortress on the lake Asphaltitis. The Parthians then plundered the country, placed Antigonus on the throne,† and giving up to him Hyrcanus and Phasael, left the country. Phasael, knowing his death to be determined on, destroyed himself. Antigonus spared the life of Hyrcanus; but barbarously cut off his ears, to incapacitate him from exercising the Priest's office, and then sent him in exile to Seleucia in Babylonia.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Hyrcanus dethroned.

B. C. 41.

* *Ant.* xiv. p. 639.

* *Ant.* xiv. p. 624. † *Ibid.* p. 643.

ANTIGONUS.

B. C. 40.

Under this emergency Herod made all haste to Rome, intending to procure the assistance of Antony and the Romans to place Aristobulus the brother of Mariamne on the throne. It does not appear that Herod had any other view at this time than that of governing the country under Aristobulus, as his father had done under Hyrcanus; but Antony chose rather to place Herod on the throne, and procured a decree from the Senate to that effect. Herod immediately returned to Jerusalem, and raising forces relieved the fortress at Massada, which Antigonus had in the meantime besieged. The next year Herod still persevered in carrying on the war against Antigonus, and after encountering him with various success, obtained a signal victory over him. Herod was assisted in this war by the Roman Generals; who, however, wasted the country so much, that in reality they more hindered than promoted his interests. It undoubtedly was the interest of the Romans to weaken the power of the Jewish nation; and by departing from the line of policy which they had always followed of preserving the throne to lawful possessors, and giving it in this instance to Herod, who was a stranger, they caused such dissensions between the King and the people, as destroyed all power of opposition to themselves, and in fact reduced Judæa to the rank of a Roman province. The following year Herod besieged Jerusalem,* and consummated his marriage with Mariamne, in the hope of conciliating the people to his government by this affinity to the Asamonean family. After a siege of more than six months the city was taken: the Romans plundered the city, and massacred the inhabitants, being instigated to this cruelty by the General Sosius. Herod complained that the Romans would make him King of a desert; and was forced to redeem the city by a considerable sum of money. Antigonus surrendered himself to Sosius, and implored his mercy; but he, despising such pusillanimity, rejected him with scorn, and calling him Antigona, sent him in chains to Antony at Antioch; who, not long after, at the solicitation of Herod, put him to death in the manner of a common malefactor. The Romans had never before so treated any crowned head. They acted thus, hoping to diminish the attachment of the Jews to the

Herod made King. B. C. 39.

Assisted by the Romans.

Takes Jerusalem. B. C. 37.

* *Ant.* xiv. p. 648.

* *Ant.* xiv. p. 658.

History From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

Asamonean family, who so long as Antigonus was alive, could not be brought to acknowledge Herod as their King. Such was the termination of the Asamonean dynasty, after it had existed one hundred and twenty-nine years from the commencement of the authority of Judas Maccabeus; or one hundred and twenty-six years, if we date it more correctly, and agreeably to the chronology of Josephus, from the acknowledgment of Judas's power by Antiochus Eupator, B. C. 163.

The fortunes of this house, says Dr. Hales, seem to be referred to in the following obscure sequel of Micah's prophecy:—

End of the Asamonean dynasty.

Chap. v. 5. When the Assyrian shall have come into our land,
Then shall be raised up against him
Seven shepherds and eight Princes of men.
6. And they shall waste with the sword
The land of Asher, the land of Nimrod, in its coasts:
Thus shall He deliver [us] from the Assyrian,
When he shall have come into our land,
And when he shall have trampled on our borders.

Interpretation of the prophecy of Micah.

The Assyrian, here, (according to the ingenious conjecture of Dr. Gregory Sharpe) aptly denotes Antiochus Epiphanes, and the succeeding Kings of Syria, who ruled in Assyria and Babylonia, and as we have seen, greatly oppressed the Jews. The "seven shepherds," to be raised up by the Messiah for the deliverance of his people, represent the seven Maccabees, old Mattathias, his five sons, and his grandson John Hyrcanus; who signalized themselves in the defence of their country, and carried the war into the enemy's land of "Asher and Nimrod;" and the last, in particular, raised the glory of his house to the highest pitch, and derived his name Hyrcanus from his exploits in these countries. These are aptly termed "shepherds," because they were leaders of the people, acting under the great shepherd of Israel, and the prime "leader," Christ, noticed in the foregoing part of the prophecy. Their successors are distinguished from them by the title of "Princes," because, not satisfied with the modest title of "Ethnarchs," and "High Priests," they assumed the crown as "Kings," following the example of Aristobulus, the eldest son of Hyrcanus; who, with his two brothers, Antigonus and Jannæus, Alexandra, her two sons, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus the Second, and the two sons of the latter, Alexander and Antigonus, make up eight.' Queen Alexandra may justly be reckoned in the number; for, as Josephus observes, "she was a woman free from the weakness of her sex, and more practised in the art of government than most men."—*Hales's Chronology*, vol. ii. p. 640. If the foregoing interpretation be admitted, great importance must be attached to this prophecy of Micah; since we shall then view it as that great link in the chain of sacred prophecy, which, by describing the reign of the Asamonean Princes, connects those prophecies of Daniel, which relate to the transactions of Alexander's successors prior to the rise of the Maccabees, with those more celebrated predictions contained in the book of Daniel and in other prophets, which foretel the time, place, and other circumstances of the Messiah's coming.

Of the Asamonean Princes. From A. M. 3838. — B. C. 166. to A. M. 3967. — B. C. 37.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XVIII.

SKETCH OF THE EXTERNAL ADVANCEMENT OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, FROM THE END OF THE SECOND PUNIC WAR TO THE INVASION OF THE CIMBRI.

FROM A. U. C. 553. B. C. 201. TO A. U. C. 652. B. C. 102.

History.

There are certain portions of the history of mankind, in which military operations assume a character of such predominant importance, that the historian is bound to assign to them the principal place in his narrative. At other times there may be long and bloody wars, by which great changes have been produced in the state of the world, which yet deserve no more than the most cursory notice; whilst our main attention is bestowed on the progress of society, the rise of literature, or the origin and struggles of domestic factions. The period to be comprised in this sketch belongs to this latter class: it was full of wars; it was marked by decisive victories and extensive conquests; yet its military history is totally uninteresting, from the great inequality of force between the Romans and their several enemies; and from the scarcity of those signal displays of valour and ability, which have, on other occasions, thrown lustre on the resistance of the humblest power. Besides, except the *Fragments*, of Polybius, we have no political nor military history of these times, the authority of which can be relied on with any satisfaction for the detail of events. No more then will be here attempted, than briefly to trace the succession of the Roman conquests, and to notice the causes which rendered them so unbroken and so universal.

U. C. 553. — B. C. 201. First Macedonian war.

No sooner was the second Punic war ended than the Senate of Rome determined to crush the power of Philip, King of Macedon. He had joined Hannibal in the most critical period of the late war, when the destruction of Rome seemed inevitable; he was the most considerable potentate in the countries neighbouring to Italy on the east; and the fame of his armies, derived from the conquests of Alexander, was not yet extinguished. These were considerations sufficient to point him out as the next object of hostility to the Roman arms; and, although peace had been concluded with him two or three years before, yet the grounds of a new quarrel were soon discovered. He* was accused of having attacked the Athenians and some others of the allies of Rome; and of having sent some Macedonian soldiers to the assistance of Hannibal in Africa. A Roman army was instantly sent over into Greece, and a Roman fleet co-operated with the naval force of Attalus, King of Pergamus, and the Rhodians; these powers, together with the Ætolians, being constantly enemies to Macedon, and the present war being undertaken by the Romans chiefly, as was pretended, on their account. The barbarous* tribes on the north and west of Macedonia were also led, by the temptation of plunder, to join the confederacy; and their irruptions served to distract the councils and the forces of Philip. Yet, under all these disadvantages, he maintained the contest with great vigour for three years; till being defeated in a general action at Cynocephale in Thessaly, and his whole country, exhausted as it already was by the war, being now exposed to invasion, he was reduced to accept peace on such terms as the Romans thought proper to dictate. These, as usual, tended to cripple the power of the vanquished party, and at the same time to increase the reputation of the Romans, by appearing more favourable to their allies than to themselves. Philip was† obliged to give up every Greek city that he possessed beyond the limits of Macedonia, both in Europe and in Asia; a stipulation which deprived him of Thessaly, Achæa, Phthiotis, Perrhæbia, and Magnesia, and particularly of the three important towns of Corinth, Chalcis, and Demetrias, which he used to call the fetters of Greece. All these states were declared free and independent; unless that the Romans (pretending that Antiochus, King of Syria, threatened the safety of Greece) retained, for the present, the strong places of Chalcis and Demetrias in their own hands. Philip was forced also to satisfy the several demands of Attalus, of the Rhodians, and of the other allies of Rome, except of the Ætolians, whom it was now the policy of the Romans to humble; as the depression of Philip had left them the principal power in Greece. In addition to these sacrifices, he was to surrender almost the whole of his navy, and to pay to Rome a thousand talents.

Rome.

Battle of Cynocephale. U. C. 557. — B. C. 197. — OL. 145. 4.

Immediately‡ after the conclusion of this treaty

* Livy, lib. xxx. c. 42. lib. xxxi. c. 5.

* Livy, lib. xxxi. c. 28, 38, 41, &c.
† Polybius, lib. xviii. c. 27, *et seq.* c. 17. and lib. xvii. c. 2.
‡ Ibid. lib. xviii. c. 29, *et seq.*

History.

followed the memorable scene at the Isthmian games, where it was announced to all the multitude assembled on that occasion, that the Romans bestowed entire freedom upon all those states of Greece which had been subject to the Kings of Macedon. The Greeks, unable to read the future, and having as yet had no experience of the ambition of Rome, received this act with the warmest gratitude; and seemed to acknowledge the Romans in the character which they assumed, of protectors and deliverers of Greece.

War with Antiochus the Great. U. C. 562. B. C. 192.

The kingdom of Macedon being now humbled, there was no one in a condition to dispute the power of the Romans in Greece, except Antiochus, King of Syria. This prince had lately* enlarged his dominions by reducing those cities on the coast of Asia Minor, which, in the course of the many wars between the successors of Alexander, had been gained by the Kings of Egypt. He now professed his intention of crossing into Europe, and reuniting to his empire those cities and parts of Thrace which had been conquered from Lysimachus by one of his predecessors; and which had since been wrested from the crown of Syria by the Kings of Egypt and Macedon. But the Romans having now brought their war with Philip to an end, resolved at once to stop the progress of Antiochus; and their ambassadors, who found him at Lysimachia, required him to restore every place that he had taken from Ptolemy, King of Egypt, and to leave those cities independent, which, having lately belonged to Philip, were now destined by the Romans to enjoy their liberty. Antiochus replied, that the Romans had no more concern in the affairs of Asia than he had in those of Italy; and the ambassadors departed without gaining their demands. In this state of things, the Ætolians,† who were now totally alienated from the Romans, in consequence of the neglect with which they had been treated in arranging the terms of the peace with Philip, eagerly solicited the King of Syria to enter Greece, encouraging him to hope, that with their assistance, he might destroy the influence of Rome in that country altogether. He accordingly crossed over with a small force, and was admitted, through the intrigues of the Ætolians, and the disposition of the inhabitants, into several places of importance; but‡ the Achæans, and Eumenes, who had lately succeeded Attalus on the throne of Pergamus, declared against him, and their forces occupied Chalcis in Eubœa, to secure it from his attacks. Philip, King of Macedon, also decided on taking part with the Romans; yet, notwithstanding, Antiochus succeeded in reducing Chalcis, and the whole of Eubœa, and won besides several cities in Thessaly. He returned to Chalcis to pass the winter; and the Consul Manius Acilius Glabrio arriving in Epirus in the ensuing spring, and having marched thence into Macedonia to concert measures with Philip, and afterwards having advanced into Thessaly, Antiochus took post at the famous pass of Thermopylæ to oppose his farther progress. He was easily dislodged, however, by the Romans; and that with such severe loss, that he thought it prudent at once to abandon Greece, and to return to Asia by sea from Chalcis, leaving the Ætolians to bear, as they best could, the whole weight of the Roman vengeance.

* Polyb. lib. xviii. c. 32, 33. and Livy, lib. xxxiii. c. 19, 38.
† Livy, lib. xxxv. c. 12, 33, 43, &c.
‡ Ibid. lib. xxxv. c. 50, 51. lib. xxxvi. c. 14, *et. seq.*

Rome.

They were accordingly attacked by the Consul, Manius Acilius,* and, after seeing some of their towns taken, they implored and obtained an armistice for a certain period, in order to allow them time to send ambassadors to Rome. But the demands of the Senate being more exorbitant than they could yet bring themselves to accept, the war was again renewed, and Manius† was actively employed in besieging Amphissa, when the arrival of his successor, L. Cornelius Scipio, afforded the Ætolians another respite. The new Consul, who was wholly bent on crossing over into Asia, to finish the war with Antiochus, was easily persuaded to grant the Ætolians a truce for six months: and their affairs were in so desperate a state, that even this doubtful favour seemed to them most acceptable.

Having thus freed himself from the possible danger of leaving an enemy in his rear, L. Scipio set forward for the Hellespont,‡ accompanied by his brother, the famous Scipio Africanus, who acted under him as his lieutenant. The march of the army was facilitated to the utmost by Philip, King of Macedon; who seems vainly to have hoped that by a faithful and zealous observance of the treaty of peace, he might soften the remorseless ambition of the Romans.§ A naval victory, won by the Roman fleet, ensured the safety of the passage into Asia; and Antiochus, distrusting his own strength, abandoned the sea coast, and concentrated his army near Magnesia and Thyatira. Here he was attacked by the Romans, and totally defeated. Sardis and several other places surrendered immediately after the battle; and Antiochus, completely|| panic struck, sent ambassadors to the Consul and his brother, soliciting peace on their own terms. He was ordered accordingly to resign his pretensions to any dominion whatever in Europe, and to cede every thing that he possessed in Asia westward of Mount Taurus: to pay fifteen thousand talents to the Romans within twelve years, to reimburse them for the expenses of the war: to pay to Eumenes, King of Pergamus, four hundred talents in money, and a certain quantity of corn, which he had engaged by treaty to pay to the late King Attalus: to give up Hannibal and some other individuals who were obnoxious to the Romans: and to give twenty hostages immediately, as a pledge of his sincerity, to be selected at the pleasure of the Consul. These terms were accepted by Antiochus, and hostilities ceased therefore on both sides. Ambassadors were then sent to Rome by Antiochus, to procure a ratification of the peace from the Senate and people; and by Eumenes, the Rhodians, and almost every state within the limits ceded by the vanquished King, to court the favour of the new arbiters of the fate of Asia, and to gain for themselves as large a share as possible of the spoils of the Syrian monarchy. After the several embassies had received an audience of the Senate, the peace with Antiochus was ratified, and ten Commissioners¶ were appointed to settle all disputed points in Asia; with these general instructions, that all the dominions ceded by the King of Syria to the Romans should be given to Eumenes, with the exception

Battle of Magnesia. U. C. 564. B. C. 190.

* Livy, lib. xxxvi. c. 22—35. † Polyb. lib. xxi. c. 1, 2, &c.
‡ Livy, lib. xxxvii. c. 1, 7.
§ Ibid. lib. xxxvii. c. 30, 31, 33, *et seq.*
|| Polyb. lib. xxi. c. 13, &c. ¶ Ibid. lib. xxii. c. 7.

History. of Lycia and part of Caria, which were bestowed on the Rhodians; and those Greek cities which had paid tribute to Antiochus, and which were now declared independent. But before these Commissioners arrived in Asia, the Roman arms had been employed in another successful war. Cn. Manlius* Vulso, who succeeded L. Scipio in the consulship, and in the command of the army in Asia Minor, anxious to distinguish himself by some conquest, had attacked the Galatians, or Asiatic Gauls, on the pretence that they had furnished assistance to Antiochus; and, after several engagements, had obliged the different tribes to sue for peace. Their ambassadors came to him towards the close of the winter to receive his answer; and about the same time Eumenes and the ten Commissioners arrived from Rome. A definitive treaty of peace was then concluded with Antiochus, in which besides the concessions formerly mentioned, he agreed to give up almost the whole of his navy, and all his elephants, and not to make war in Europe, or in the islands of the Ægean.

Defeat of the Galatians.

The Galatians, having been already plundered to the utmost during the war, were only warned to confine themselves within their own limits, and not to molest the kingdom of Eumenes; and Ariarathes, King of Cappadocia, who had also given assistance to Antiochus, was obliged to deprecate the anger of Rome by the payment of six hundred talents; half of which, however, was afterwards remitted to him at the intercession of Eumenes. This last Prince received a great increase of territory, both in Asia and in Europe; and, together with the commonwealth of Rhodes, was in appearance the greatest gainer from the victory of the Romans. However, in the mere act of giving away kingdoms at her discretion, Rome plainly declared the preeminence of her own power: and she soon after shewed, that she could resume her gifts as easily as she had made them, whenever the conduct of her allies began to excite her jealousy.

Conquest of Ætolia.

It has been already mentioned, that L. Scipio, when marching towards Asia, granted a truce for six months to the Ætolians;† but as they could not yet be induced to surrender at discretion to the mercy of the Romans, the war was again renewed, and M. Fulvius Nobilior, the colleague of Cn. Manlius in the Consulship, crossed over into Greece to complete their subjugation. He first laid siege to Ambracia, which was vigorously defended; but the Ætolians, now convinced of their inability to maintain the contest, sued for peace through the intercession of the Rhodians and Athenians; and terms were at length granted them, which besides diminishing their territory, and obliging them to pay a sum of money, reduced them to a state of entire dependence on Rome, by obliging them to follow the Romans in all their wars, and to acknowledge and obey the power and sovereignty of Rome. Their fate excites the less compassion, when we remember that they first invited the Romans into Greece, and that their faithless and ambitious policy had mainly contributed to prevent the union of the Greeks in one powerful state, which might have been able long to maintain its independence against every enemy. Rome.

Intrigues of Philip.

Eleven years had not passed since the conclusion of the last war with Macedon, when it became apparent that another was likely to commence. In the late war with Antiochus, Philip, as has been seen, sided with the Romans; and thus took from the King of Syria the towns of Ænus and Maronea, and some other towns and fortresses on the coast of Thrace; and from the Ætolians several cities which they had occupied in Thessaly and Perrhæbia. All these places, at the conclusion of the war, he proposed to retain in his possession; but on one side, Eumenes laid claim* to the towns of Thrace, insisting that the Romans had given to him that portion of the territories conquered from Antiochus; and on the other, the Thessalians and Perrhæbians demanded the restoration of the cities taken possession of by Philip in their country; urging that the Ætolians had unjustly seized them, and that on their expulsion they ought to revert to their original and rightful owners. The Senate, as usual, appointed Commissioners to hear and to decide on this question; and sentence was given, as might have been expected, against the pretensions of Philip. He had no intention, however, to yield without resistance; but not being yet prepared for war, he sought to gain time by sending his son Demetrius† to Rome to plead his cause. This Prince had formerly been one of the hostages given by his father for his faithful execution of the terms of the last treaty with the Romans; and he had then so won the favour of many of the Roman nobility, that Philip trusted much to the influence he might possess on the present occasion. Nor was he disappointed; for Demetrius was sent back with renewed expressions of the kindness entertained for him by the Senate; and‡ with a promise, that out of regard for him, a fresh commission should be appointed to reconsider the points in dispute between Philip and his opponents. Yet the new commission confirmed the judgment of the former one, and Philip was obliged to withdraw his garrisons from all the contested towns both in Thrace and Thessaly: nor did the favour shewn by the Romans to Demetrius produce any other result than his destruction. A suspicion arose that he aspired to succeed to the throne, through their support, to the exclusion of his elder brother Perseus. This produced an open enmity between the brothers; and after many mutual accusations of each other, Philip, it is said,§ was induced to order the death of Demetrius by poison: but, according to the Roman writers, being afterwards convinced of his innocence, he intended to deprive Perseus of the succession, in abhorrence of his treachery towards his brother. He died, however, before his intentions could be carried into effect, and Perseus ascended the throne without difficulty. This account of the private affairs of the royal family of Macedon, as it relates to matters not likely to be known with certainty by the public, and as it comes to us from writers disposed to believe every calumny against Perseus, merits very little attention. It is only known, that the Romans were disposed, from the very be-

Tragical end of his son Demetrius.

Accession of Perseus; U. C. 575. — B. C. 179. — OL. 144. 2

* Polyb. lib xxii. c. 16, 24, *et seq.* Livy, lib. xxxviii. c. 12, *et seq.*
† Livy, lib. xxxvii. c. 49. lib. xxxviii. c. 3, *et seq.* Polyb. lib. xxii. c. 9, *et seq.*

* Polyb. lib. xxiii. c. 6, 11. Livy, lib. xxxix. c. 23 *et seq.*
† Polyb. lib. xxiii. c. 14. ‡ Ibid. lib. xxiv. c. 2, 6.
§ Livy, lib. xl. c. 24, 55, 56.

History.

ginning of his reign to regard the new King of Macedon with aversion; and that he foreseeing that a war in defence of the independence of his crown would soon be inevitable, took every method of rendering himself popular in Greece, and of strengthening the internal resources of his kingdom.

Second Macedonian war.

The Romans alleged* as the causes of their quarrel with Perseus, that he had made war on some of their allies; that he had endeavoured to draw away others to a connection with himself, incompatible with their duty to Rome; and that he had hired assassins to make an attempt on the life of King Eumenes, when returning from Rome, whither he had gone to instigate the Senate to declare war against Macedon. In answer† to these charges, Perseus replied, that his hostilities with the allies of Rome were purely defensive: and the charge of intended assassination he strongly and flatly denied. With regard to his endeavouring to seduce the allies of Rome from their fidelity, he is made by Livy to refer to a former justification of himself on that point, which is not at present to be found in Livy's history. However, it is evident that the Romans were determined on war, and that the King of Macedon took every step, consistent with the independence of his crown, to avoid it. Although the Romans‡ had accused him of making great military preparations in time of peace, and he was, in fact, in a far better condition to commence immediate hostilities than they were, yet he lost the opportunity thus afforded him from his anxious desire to negociate with the enemy; and when he was actually driven to take up arms, and had gained some advantage over the Consul Licinius, he instantly renewed his § offers of peace, consenting to the same terms which his father had only submitted to after his total defeat at Cynocephale. The most open and unprincipled ambition in modern times, would hardly dare to avow such an answer as that made by the Roman General to a proposal so conciliatory. He replied,‖ that Perseus must submit himself to the discretion of the Senate, and allow it to decide on the state of Macedon, as it should think proper. In other words, the time was now come, when the Romans, in their career of conquest, had reached the kingdom of Philip and Alexander, and nothing could induce them to delay, far less to renounce, their resolution of sacrificing it to their lawless and systematic ambition.

This refusal to negociate after a defeat, was a general maxim of Roman policy, and has often been extolled as a proof of heroic magnanimity. It should rather be considered as a direct outrage on the honour and independence of all other nations, which ought, in justice, to have put the people, who professed it, out of the pale of all friendly relations with mankind. In a moment of madness, the French convention, in 1794, passed a decree, that the garrisons of the four fortresses on the northern frontier, then in the possession of the allies, should be put to the sword if they did not surrender within twenty-four hours after they were summoned. To this decree, a notice of which accompanied the summons of the besieging general, the Austrian governor of Le Quesnoy nobly replied, "No one nation has a right to decree the dishonour of another: I shall maintain my post so as to deserve the esteem of my master, and even that of the French people themselves." In like manner, a refusal to make peace, except on their submission, was to decree the dishonour of every other nation: nor had Rome any right to insist, that whatever were the events of a war, it should only be terminated on such conditions as should make her enemy the inferior party. Had other nations acted on the same principle, every war must necessarily have been a war of extermination; and thus the pride of one people, would have multiplied infinitely the sufferings of the human race, and have reduced mankind to a state of worse than savage ferocity. The avowal of such a maxim, in short, placed Rome in a condition of actual hostility with the whole world; and would have justified all nations in uniting together for the purpose of forcing a solemn and practical renunciation of it; or, in case of a refusal, of extirpating utterly the Roman people, as the common enemies of the peace and honour of mankind.

Rome.

After the refusal of the Consul Licinius to negociate with Perseus, the war was protracted for two years more without any decisive success; the Roman officers who were employed in it displaying little ability or enterprise, and disgracing themselves by flagrant * acts of extortion and oppression towards their allies. At last L. Æmilius Paullus, son of the Consul who was killed at Cannæ, and himself inheriting his father's reputation for wisdom and valour, was chosen Consul; and the province of Macedonia falling to his share, he took every method to bring the war to a successful issue. Great care was † observed in the appointment of the officers who were to serve under him; and when he arrived in Greece and took the command, he greatly reformed the discipline of the army, and brought it into a high state of order and activity. His exertions were soon rewarded by the battle of Pydna, of the details of which we have only the account of Plutarch, but the event is abundantly known. The Macedonian army was totally destroyed, the cities of the kingdom successively surrendered to the conquerors, and Perseus himself shortly after gave himself up to the Consul's mercy. He was taken to Rome with his family to adorn the triumph of Æmilius; and, according to Paterculus, died about four years afterwards at Alba,‡ which was assigned as the place of his confinement. His principal nobility, and every man§ who had ever held any office under him, were ordered to transport themselves into Italy on pain of death; lest they should disturb the new settlement of their country. Macedonia was then divided into four districts; each of which was to be under a republican government. Half the tribute formerly paid to the King was henceforward to be paid to the Romans, who

Battle of Pydna.

End of the kingdom of Macedon.

U. C. 586. — B. C. 168. — OL. 153. 1.

* Livy, lib. xlii. c. 30, 40. † Ibid. lib. xlii. c. 41.
‡ Ibid. lib. xlii. c. 43. § Polyb. lib. xxvii. c. 8.
‖ Ibid. lib. xxvii. c. 28.

* Livy, lib. xliii. c. 4, 5, 6, &c. † Ibid. lib. xliv. c. 21, 34.
‡ Vid. Vell. Patercul. lib. i.—But it would be nearer the truth to say, that Perseus was murdered by the Romans; for after having suffered such cruel treatment in the dungeon to which he was at first consigned, that Æmilius Paullus complained of it in the Senate as a national disgrace, he was removed to a less miserable prison; and there having offended the soldiers who guarded him, they, in revenge, harassed him night and day, and never allowed him to sleep, till he expired under their persecutions.—Vid. *Fragment.* Diodor. Sicul. lib. xxxi. p. 893, edit. Rhodom.—and *Mithridatis Epistolam, apud Fragm.* Sallust.
§ Livy, lib. xlv. c. 32, 29.

History. also appropriated to themselves the produce of all the gold and silver mines of the kingdom. The inhabitants were forbidden to fell timber for ship-building; and all intermarriages and sales of land between the people of the several districts were forbidden. With these marks of real slavery, they were left, for the present, nominally free; and Macedonia was not yet reduced to the form of a Roman province.

Conduct of Rome to her allies. It is curious to observe, how, after every successive conquest, the Romans altered their behaviour to those allies who had aided them to gain it, and whose friendship or enmity was now become indifferent to them. Thus, after their first war with Philip, they slighted the Ætolians; after they had vanquished Antiochus, they readily listened to complaints against Philip; and now the destruction of Macedon enabled them to use the language of sovereigns rather than of allies to their oldest and most faithful friends, Eumenes, the Rhodians, and the Achæans. The* Senate first tampered with Attalus, the brother of Eumenes, hoping that he might be persuaded to accuse his brother, and to petition for a share of his dominions; but when they found him deaf to their temptations, they retracted some promises which they had before made him, in the hope that he would listen to them. Afterwards, when Eumenes himself landed in Italy on† his way to Rome, with the view of removing the suspicions entertained against him, the Senate, aware of his purpose, issued an order that no King should be allowed to come to Rome; and despatched one of the Quæstors to announce it to him at Brundusium, and to command him to leave Italy immediately. The Rhodians had offended by declaring openly, "that they‡ were tired of the war with Perseus; that he, as well as the Romans, was the friend of their commonwealth; that they should wish to see the contending parties reconciled; and that they would themselves declare against those whose obstinacy should be an impediment to peace." This declaration, which was received at Rome most indignantly, had been privately recommended by Q. Marcius, the Roman Consul, to one of the Rhodian ambassadors, who had visited him in his camp in Macedonia, during the preceding year: and Polybius§ reasonably conjectures, that Marcius, confident of a speedy victory over Perseus, gave this advice to the Rhodians, with the treacherous purpose of furnishing the Senate with a future pretence of hostility against them. However, their fault was punished by the loss of Lycia and Caria,‖ which the Senate now declared independent; and the individuals who were accused of favouring Perseus were given up to the Romans,¶ or at the instigation of Roman officers, were put to death by the Rhodian government. Nor should it be** omitted, that a general inquiry was instituted throughout Greece into the conduct of the principal men in the several states during the late war. Those who were accused by their countrymen of the Roman party of having favoured Perseus, were summoned to Rome to plead their cause as criminals; and some were even put to death. But if the mere opinions and inclinations of individuals were thus punished, the states which had actually taken part with Macedon met with a still heavier destiny. Let it be for ever remembered, that by a decree* of the Senate, seventy towns of Epirus were given up to be plundered by the Roman army, after all hostilities were at an end; that falsehood and deceit were used to prevent resistance or escape; and that in one day and one hour seventy towns were sacked and destroyed, and one hundred and fifty thousand human beings sold for slaves. The instrument employed on this occasion was L. Æmilius Paullus, the conqueror of Macedon, and one of those whom we are taught to regard as models of Roman virtue. There is no reason to doubt his sincere affection for his country, his indifference to money, and his respectability as a citizen, husband, son, and father. But it is useful to see what dreadful actions the best men of ancient times were led unhesitatingly to commit, from the utter absence of a just law of nations, and the fatal habit of making their country the supreme object of their duty. Nor is it possible that these evils should be prevented, unless truer notions have insensibly established themselves in the minds of men, even of those who are least grateful to the source from which they have derived them; and if modern Europe be guided by purer principles, the Christian historian cannot forget from what cause this better and happier condition has arisen.

Rome. It remains now that we speak of the conduct of the Romans towards the Achæans. The early history of the Achæan League, and the leaning of its councils towards a friendly connection with Macedon, has been already noticed. In the war between the Romans and Philip, however, the Achæans were persuaded to join with the former; a step which Polybius† describes as absolutely necessary for their safety; whether it were altogether equally honourable, we have hardly the means of deciding. But their new connection, whatever may be thought of its origin, was ever afterwards faithfully observed: insomuch, that the Romans, though sufficiently adroit in finding matter of complaint, when they were disposed to do so, and though offended by the free and independent tone which the Achæan government always maintained towards them, could yet obtain no tolerable pretext for attacking them. There was, however, a traitor amongst the Achæans, named Callicrates,‡ who, jealous of the popularity of the ruling party in the councils of his country, endeavoured to supplant them through the influence of Rome; and to ingratiate himself with the Senate by representing his opponents as despisers of the Roman authority, which he and his friends vainly endeavoured to uphold. After the Macedonian war, his intrigues§ were carried to a greater extent than ever. He accused a great number of the most eminent of his countrymen of having favoured the cause of Perseus; and although the conduct of the Achæan government towards Rome had been perfectly blameless, and nothing was found among the papers of the King of Macedon which confirmed the charge, even against any of its individual citizens, yet, on the demand of the Romans, more than a thousand of the most eminent men in the commonwealth were arrested and sent into Italy,

---

* Polyb. lib. xxx. c. 1, *et seq.* † Ibid. lib. xxx. c. 17.
‡ Ibid. lib. xxix. c. 7. Livy, lib. xliv. c. 14.
§ Polyb. lib. xxviii. c. 15. ‖ Ibid. lib. xxx. c. 5.
¶ Livy, lib. xlv. c. 10. ** Ibid. lib. xlv c. 32.

* Polyb. lib. xxx. c. 15. Livy, lib. xlv. c. 34. Plutarch, *in Vitâ Æmilii Paulli*, c. 29.
† Polyb. lib. xvii. c. 13. ‡ Ibid. lib. xxvi. c. 1, *et seq.*
§ Ibid. lib. xxx. c. 10. Pausanias, *Achaa*, c. 10.

History. under pretence that they should be tried for their conduct at Rome. On their arrival in Italy, they were confined in the different cities of Tuscany, and there remained nearly seventeen years. The Senate repeatedly refused the petition of the Achæan government, that they might either be released, or else be brought to trial. It is added, that whoever among them were at any time detected in endeavouring to escape, were invariably put to death. At last,* after most of them had died in captivity, the influence of Cato the Censor was exerted in behalf of the survivors, at the request of Scipio Æmilianus; who was anxious to serve one of their number, his own familiar friend, the historian Polybius. But the manner in which Cato pleaded their cause deserves to be recorded. He represented the Achæan prisoners as unworthy of the notice of the Senate of Rome: "We sit here all day," said he, "as if we had nothing to do, debating about the fate of a few wretched old Greeks, whether the undertakers of Rome or Achæa are to have the burying of them." We have dwelt the more fully on this treatment of the Achæans, because it sets in the clearest light the character of the Roman government; and enables us to appreciate the state of the world under the Roman dominion, when such men as Polybius were subject to the worst oppression and insolence from a nation which boasted of Cato the Censor, as one of its greatest ornaments.

Importance of Andriscus. U. C. 603. — B. C. 151. — OL. 157. 2.

Hitherto, however, Achæa and the rest of Greece still enjoyed a nominal independence, notwithstanding the real supremacy of the Roman power. But within little more than twenty years from the overthrow of Perseus, even these poor remains of freedom were destroyed. A man† of low condition, named Andriscus, availing himself of his personal resemblance to the royal family of Macedon, assumed the name of Philip, and pretending that he was the son of Perseus, was joyfully received by the Macedonians. After a short contest, he was defeated and led prisoner to Rome by Q. Cæcilius Metellus; and from henceforward Macedon was placed entirely on the footing of a Roman province. The fall of Achæa followed almost at the same time. It appears‡ that a party had lately acquired an ascendency in the Achæan councils, warmly inclined to throw off the control of Rome; but without the wisdom or integrity which had enabled Philopœmen and Lycortas to command respect from the Romans, while they avoided giving them the slightest pretence for attacking their independence. The party now in power, on the contrary, seemed bent upon provoking a war with Rome. They attacked Lacedæmon,§ which, although obliged to become a member of the Achæan confederacy, was on all occasions ready to break off its connection; and when the Lacedæmonians appealed to Rome, and Commissioners were sent as usual to give their judgment, the Achæan government treated them with the utmost indifference, and took the most violent measures for exciting popular feeling throughout Greece against the arbitrary interference of the Romans. The ferment was at its height when the Commissioners, who had arrived at Corinth,‖ pronounced it to be the pleasure of the Senate, that not only Lacedæmon, but Corinth also, and Argos, and several other states which had been united with the Achæans, should now be separated from them, because they had originally formed no part of Achæa. Nothing can be said in excuse of this decision, which was alike insolent and unjust; yet, where resistance is so evidently hopeless, as it was at this time in Greece, it must ever be condemned as a useless aggravation of a people's sufferings. The whole frame of society was loosened by the Achæan leaders; and great immediate evils were occasioned with no reasonable prospect of their leading to permanent good. Slaves* were set at liberty, and enlisted to swell the Achæan army; debtors were protected from their creditors; and heavy requisitions were laid on all individuals, male and female, to contribute to the wants of the commonwealth. But there was no corresponding spirit in the people; and these strong measures which, if adopted voluntarily, often produce effects so wonderful, were considered vexatious and oppressive, when enforced by an unpopular government. Metellus, at this time, commanded in Macedonia; and wishing to win the double glory of being the pacificator of Macedon and Achæa, he was anxious to persuade the Achæans to submit before Mummius the Consul should arrive to take the command against them. His advances were slighted, because they were attributed to fear; and an Achæan army† marched towards Thermopylæ to oppose his march into Greece. But so totally unequal were the Greeks to the maintenance of this contest, that they abandoned their ground on the first approach of Metellus; and, being overtaken on their retreat, were immediately and completely routed. Metellus then advanced towards Corinth, having reduced Thebes and Megara on his march; and his offers of peace being again rejected, he was obliged to surrender the task of finally subjugating Greece to L. Mummius, who about this time arrived from Italy. The new commander finished the war in a single battle, under the walls of Corinth. Diæus, the Achæan General, fled to Megalopolis, and there destroyed himself by poison; the Corinthians, for the most part, abandoned their city, and Mummius entered it with little or no resistance. But every horror that follows the most hardly won capture of a town by storm, was practised with deliberate cruelty. Most of the citizens were slain; the women and children were sold for slaves; the temples and houses were alike ransacked; and Corinth, finally, was burnt to the ground. The Achæan League was then dissolved, and Greece was henceforward treated as a province, was subjected to tribute, and was governed by a Roman Proconsul, or Prætor.

Rome. Capture of Corinth. U. C. 608. — B. C. 146. — OL. 158. 3.

We have thus related the final overthrow of Grecian independence, somewhat more particularly than the difficulty of the conquest or its particular importance might seem to demand. Something, however, is due to the memory of illustrious names; and interested as we are from our childhood in the fortunes of Greece, the story of its fall cannot be read without attention. It now remains that we turn to a scene in itself far more striking, and presenting a still more painful picture of misery and atrocious ambition, the third Punic war, and the destruction of Carthage.

Acæan war.

* Polyb. lib. xxxv. c. 6.
† Livy, *Epitom.* lib. xlix. 1. Florus, lib. ii. c. 14. Jornand. lib. i.
‡ Polyb. lib. xxxviii. c. 1, &c. § Pausanias, *Achaica*, c. 8, *et seq.*
‖ Pausan. *Achaica*, c. 14.

* Polyb. lib. xl. c. 2. lib. xxxviii. c. 3.
† Pausanias, *Achaica*, c. 15, 16.

History. State of Carthage.

Since the time at which Hannibal was obliged to abandon his country, by the animosity of those whose corruptions he had exposed and checked, and by the jealousy of the Romans, Carthage seems to have rested quietly in the state of humiliation to which the event of the second Punic war had reduced her. Forbidden as she was, by the terms of the treaty of peace, to take up arms against the allies of the Roman people, she was obliged to suffer repeated aggressions on the part of Masinissa, King of Numidia; and when, as her only resource, she applied to Rome* for protection, she found a tardy and insufficient redress. She observed, however, faithfully, the conditions of her submission; and Carthaginian ships formed a part of the Roman fleet, in the wars with Antiochus and with Perseus. But when some years had elapsed after the destruction of the Macedonian monarchy, the Romans, having no other enemy to attract their attention, felt their hatred of Carthage revive; and it was openly professed by some members of the senate, that the very existence of that commonwealth† ought no longer to be permitted. The resistance which the Carthaginians had been at last driven to make to the continued encroachments and hostilities of Masinissa, furnished the Romans with a pretext for declaring war; and the two Consuls, with two consular armies and a large fleet, were despatched to Sicily, in order to cross over from that island into Africa as soon as possible. The Carthaginians had tried every means of pacifying the Romans, without throwing themselves entirely upon their mercy; but when they found that an army was actually on its way to attack them, and that Utica,‡ the most important of all their dependencies in Africa, had already offered an entire submission to the Romans, the danger seemed too great for any further hesitation; and their ambassadors at Rome announced to the Senate, that Carthage yielded herself up entirely to its disposal. In return, they were promised the enjoyment of their laws and liberty, and the uninterrupted possession of their lands and moveable property, on condition that they should send over to Lilybæum, within thirty days, three hundred children, of the first families in Carthage, as hostages, and that they should obediently receive the commands which the Consuls should deliver to them on their arrival in Africa. A vague suspicion of the fate that awaited them possessed the Carthaginians on the return of their ambassadors; still they resolved to persevere in their submissions. The hostages were sent to Lilybæum, and then were despatched to Rome; and a deputation waited on the Consuls soon after their landing at Utica, to know the final pleasure of the Senate, and to express the readiness of Carthage to obey it. The Consuls commanded that all arms, offensive and defensive, and all engines of war, should be surrendered to them; and even this was complied with.‖ A number of members of the supreme council, of priests, and of other individuals of the greatest distinction in Carthage, followed the long train of waggons in which the arms were carried to the Roman camp. They hoped to move compassion, by the sight of all that was most noble and most venerable in their country reduced to the condition of suppliants. But one of the Consuls, L. Marcius Censorinus, having arisen, and composed his countenance, says Appian, to an expression* of sternness, briefly told them, "That they must abandon Carthage, and remove to any place more inland, that should be about nine or ten miles distant from the sea; for Carthage," said he, "we are resolved to raze to the ground." This declaration was received by the Carthaginians who heard it, with the most lively emotions of rage and despair; they vented curses against the Romans, as if wishing to provoke them to forget the sacred character which they bore. To this burst of passion the deepest grief succeeded; they bewailed the fate of their country with such agony of sorrow, that it is said even the Romans were moved to tears; and they attempted even yet to obtain from the Consuls a mitigation of their sentence. But when Censorinus repeated that the orders of the Senate must be performed, and *that* immediately, and when the lictors began to drive the deputation from the Consuls' presence, they begged to be heard again for a few moments; and then said, that they only entreated the Romans to advance with their fleet instantly to the city, to prevent the people from provoking their utter destruction by some act of despair. Censorinus accordingly moved forwards with twenty ships, and remained off the mouth of the harbour, while the Carthaginians brought back the report of their doom to Carthage.

Rome.

Third Punic war. U. C. 605. — B. C. 149.

The tidings were received with one common feeling of indignation by the supreme council and by the people. Generals were chosen immediately; and when the Consuls refused to grant a truce for thirty days, in order that ambassadors might be sent to Rome, war was at once resolved on; and the whole population, men and women alike, began to labour night and day in the fabrication of arms, to supply the place of those which they had surrendered. The Consuls, after waiting some days, to see if the ferment would subside, at length marched towards Carthage, and the operations of the siege commenced. But such was the strength of the fortifications, and such the spirit of their defenders, that, notwithstanding their want of arms, they repulsed every attempt of the enemy; and the Roman army, baffled by the Carthaginians, and suffering from sickness, saw the year draw to a close without having obtained any other success than such as the extreme wickedness of the cause deserved.† Nor were the Consuls of the following year more fortunate; and the spirits of the Carthaginians, encouraged by their long resistance, began to anticipate a final deliverance. Masinissa, the old ally of Rome, was lately dead; and his sons, among whom his dominions were divided, whilst promising succours to the Roman army, evidently shewed no real disposition to assist it.

But in the third year of the war, P. Scipio Æmilianus, the son of Æmilius Paullus, but adopted into the family of Scipio by the son of the famous Africanus, was elected Consul, and appointed to the command in Africa by an especial vote of the people. He had greatly distinguished himself under the former Consuls, when serving as a military Tribune; and there was besides a superstitious persuasion among the people

* Appian, *Punica*, c. 68, 69.
† Livy, lib. xxxvi. c. 42. lib xlii. c. 56.
‡ Appian, *Punica*, c. 69, *et seq.* § Polyb. lib. xxxvi. c. 1, *et seq.*
‖ Appian, *Punica*, c. 80, *et seq.*

* Appian, *Punica*, c. 80. † Ibid. c. 105, *et seq.*

History. Siege, in his favour, that the Scipios were destined to be the conquerors of Carthage. On his succeeding to the command, his first care was to restore the discipline of the army, which had suffered greatly from the misconduct of the last Consul; and by his ability in this respect, as well as by his skill in the conduct of the war, he soon destroyed all the hopes of the Carthaginians. The situation of Carthage, from this time, began to resemble the picture left us of the miseries of Jerusalem in its last siege by Titus. Numbers died of famine through the strictness of the blockade; numbers deserted to the enemy; while Asdrubal, who commanded the principal military force in the town,* was himself rioting in luxury, and exercising the greatest tyranny over his countrymen; his conduct, as a General, at the same time, being totally destitute of courage and wisdom, and marked only by savage cruelty towards the prisoners who fell into his power. Yet† the city continued to hold out during the year of Scipio's Consulship; and the winter was employed by him, successfully, in reducing the strongholds which still remained in the power of the Carthaginians in the neighbouring country. In the following spring, his command being still continued, he resumed the siege with vigour; and, by a combination of assaults, succeeded in forcing his way into one of the quarters of the city, when famine had enfeebled the bodies and the spirits of its defenders. But the Byrsa, or Citadel, still remained untaken; and six days were consumed in a horrible struggle from street to street, and from house to house; in the course of which, fire and the sword, and the ruin of falling buildings, combined to carry on the work of destruction to the uttermost.

Capture, At last the remnant of the inhabitants sued for mercy, and it was granted them; such mercy as was practised in ancient times, when hopeless slavery, without distinction of sex or age, was the lot of all whom the sword had spared. Fifty thousand individuals were thus made prisoners, to enrich their conquerors by the price to be paid for them in the slave market at Rome; and the victorious army was then allowed to plunder the city for several days. Shortly after, a commission‡ of ten senators was sent from Rome, as usual, to determine the future condition of the conquered country. By their orders, whatever part of the buildings of Carthage had survived the siege, was now levelled with the ground; and curses were imprecated on any man who should hereafter attempt to build on the spot. The territory was subjected to a tribute, and governed henceforth as a Roman province; with the exception of certain portions which were given to the people of Utica and Hippo, as a reward for their timely desertion of the Carthaginian cause. Thus was the great rival of Rome totally destroyed, only a few months before the final conquest of Greece, in the year of Rome 608, and about a hundred and forty-six years before the Christian era.

And destruction of Carthage. U. C. 608. — B. C. 146.

Progress of the Roman arms. It will now, perhaps, be most advisable to trace the progress of the Roman arms in Spain and Gaul; then to notice the accessions to their empire gained in Africa by the conquest of Jugurtha; and to conclude with a general view of the extent of their dominion at the period which forms the limit of the present sketch.

The end of the second Punic war had left the Romans no other enemies in Spain to contend with than the natives themselves; but these were of so stubborn and warlike a temper, that it was not easy to effect their subjugation. It may be asked, what claim of right could be advanced by the Romans in attempting this conquest; and no answer can be given, except that a civilized nation, in its intercourse with an uncivilized one, easily finds grounds of quarrel, while it exacts from men, ignorant of all law, an observance of those rules, which men, in a more advanced state of society, have agreed to call the law of nations. Those Spanish tribes that had been subject to Carthage were treated by the Romans, on the defeat of the Carthaginians, as a conquered people, were subjected to a tribute, and governed with the usual arbitrary authority of the Roman provincial magistrates. If they attempted to shake off the yoke, it was not unnatural that some warriors of those tribes, which were yet independent, should join the armies of their countrymen: and this afforded the Romans a pretext, sometimes, for demanding hostages from the people whose citizens had been found in arms against them; or, sometimes, for requiring the surrender of their arms; conditions which, since in their eyes they implied degradation, were generally refused, and thus gave occasion to war. If, on the contrary, they were acceded to, the Romans would proceed to exercise some acts of sovereignty which would provoke the tribe to take up arms; or the mere detention of their hostages was a continual irritation to their minds, which at last would break out in open hostility. Or, if this pretence failed, there was another which could scarcely ever be wanting. If the vanquished soldiers of any tribe engaged in war with Rome received from their countrymen the ordinary succours of humanity, if they were entertained or sheltered, this was called assisting the enemies of the Republic, and was supposed to justify a Roman General in demanding satisfaction from those who had been guilty of it. This was the original cause of the quarrel between Rome and Numantia.* Thirdly, if there were any tribes whose situation, or whose caution, had preserved them from any sort of connection with the enemies of the Romans, some dispute amongst themselves was likely, sooner or later, to arise; and the vanquished party was always sure to find in the Romans, willing and effectual supporters. The Roman† Generals instantly interfered as arbiters; and if their decision was not submitted to, they presently proceeded to enforce it by arms. A system like this steadily pursued amongst a warlike and independent people, naturally furnished the Romans with an occasion of attacking, in their turn, the inhabitants of every part of the Peninsula. Of all these, the most obstinate and successful in their resistance were the Lusitanians and Numantians. The first, under‡ the command of Viriathus, a chief of remarkable enterprise and ability, maintained the contest for several years, and defeated several of the Roman officers; till their leader was assassinated by three of his followers, at the instigation of Servilius Cæpio, the Roman general, then commanding against him. Numantia has acquired still greater fame, by the disgraces which its inhabitants

Rome, In Spain.

Lusitanian war ends. U. C. 644. — B. C. 140.

Numantian war.

* Polyb. lib. xxxix. c. 2. † Appian, *Punica*, c 126, *et seq.* ‡ Appian, *Punica*, c. 135, *et seq.*

* Florus, lib. ii. c. 18. † Appian, *Hispanica*, c. 51. ‡ Appian, *Hispanica*, c. 61, *et seq.* Florus, lib. ii. c. 17. Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii.

History. inflicted on the Roman arms, and the desperation of their final defence. They obliged a Roman Consul,* C. Hostilius Mancinus, to purchase the safety of his army by an unfavourable treaty; and when the Senate, in contempt of the public faith, refused to ratify the terms, and ordered Mancinus to be given up to the enemy to expiate his act with his own life, the Numantians refused to accept him: and the Roman writers record, without a blush, this contrast between the honour of the barbarians and their own perfidy. At last Scipio Æmilianus, the conqueror of Carthage, was elected Consul, on purpose to carry on the war with Numantia. With an army of sixty thousand men, he blockaded the city, the male population of which had never exceeded† eight thousand; and fearing to encounter the despair of the inhabitants, he hemmed them in with lines of circumvallation, and waited patiently till famine should do his work for him without danger to himself. The Numantines tried to obtain tolerable conditions; but they had been too formidable to find mercy from an enemy like the Romans, who never had any sympathy with courage from which they themselves had suffered. Finding that they had no hope left, the besieged mostly destroyed themselves and their relations, and a few only surrendered alive to the conqueror. He selected‡ fifty of their number to adorn his triumph, the rest he sold for slaves, and then levelled Numantia to the ground; and for such a victory, so hardly won, over an enemy so inferior in numbers and resources, he was extolled with the highest praises at Rome, and received the surname of Numantinus. Still, even after the destruction of Numantia, the Spaniards continued, at various times, to maintain the struggle for liberty; nor were they fully reduced to obedience till a much later period than that with which we are now concerned.

Destruction of Numantia. U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

In Gaul. The Romans were first led to carry their arms into Transalpine Gaul, by an application from the people of the Greek colony of Marseilles, to protect them against the assaults of some of the native tribes in their neighbourhood. An embassy to this effect remains recorded in one of the *Fragments*§ of Polybius, and appears to have taken place as early as the year of Rome, 600; but no important consequences seemed to have followed from it immediately. About twenty-eight years afterwards, however, on a new complaint from the people of Marseilles, a Roman army attacked and conquered the Salyes‖, a tribe of Transalpine Gauls; and after their defeat, the Allobroges and Arverni, their neighbours, were accused of having given them assistance, and of having offered injuries also to the Ædui, another Gaulish tribe, which had before obtained the friendship of Rome. Several victories were gained over these new enemies, and one or two colonies were founded in Gaul; such as¶ Aquæ Sextiæ, or Aix, in Provence, planted by C. Sextius, and Narbo,** or Narbonne, the origin of which is fixed a little later. By these means the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, on both sides of the Rhone, from the Alps to the Pyrenees, and extending inland as far as the Jura* and the mountains of Auvergne, were reduced to the form of a Roman province, about the year of Rome 632. Rome

Sketch of the history of Jugurtha. While the Republic was thus extending its dominion in Spain and Gaul, its empire in Africa received an important addition in the conquest of Numidia. After the destruction of Carthage, the principal part of the territories of that commonwealth were at once subjected to the Roman government; and thus the Romans were brought into close contact with the Kings of Numidia; whose dominions lay to the west and south-west of Carthage, and stretched along the coast of the Mediterranean till they were bounded by the confines of Mauritania. The name of Numidians, borrowed from the Greek term Nomades, signifies a people who live by pasturage; and has accidently become the peculiar appellation of the native tribes in the west of Africa; although, under the government of Syphax, Masinissa, and Micipsa, they seem to have been, in many respects, advanced far above a mere pastoral life. Micipsa,† the son of Masinissa, divided his kingdom between his sons Hiempsal and Adherbal, and his nephew Jugurtha; but on his death, Jugurtha, who was much older than his cousins, and who had acquired military experience and high distinction, by serving in the Roman army at the siege of Numantia, at once proceeded to assassinate Hiempsal, and then openly invaded the dominions of the surviving Prince Adherbal. He easily overcame him, stripped him of his territories, and obliged him to fly to Rome for refuge and redress. But dreading lest the Romans should avail themselves of so fair a pretext to seize upon the kingdom of Numidia for themselves, he strove to deprecate their enmity by employing bribery, to a large extent, among the members of the Senate; and thus nothing was done in favour of Adherbal, except the sending a commission of ten Senators to Africa, to divide the kingdom between him and Jugurtha. It is said,‡ however, that this commission was also corrupted by Jugurtha, and thus was induced to assign to him by far the most valuable share of Micipsa's inheritance. Of this he took advantage, and in a short time he again attacked Adherbal, defeated him, shut him up in the strong town of Cista, and there besieged him for some months; till the Italian soldiers, who formed the most effective part of the garrison, persuaded Adherbal to surrender himself to his rival, and, stipulating only for his life, to rely for every thing else on the interposition of Rome. But no sooner had he given himself up, than Jugurtha ordered him to be put to death in torments.

Sallust, the warm partisan of Cæsar, and anxious, therefore, to vilify to the utmost the character of the Senate, asserts§ that even this flagrant crime would have been passed over with impunity, owing to the influence which Jugurtha had obtained by his bribes among the nobility, had not one of the Tribunes roused the feelings of the people, and denounced the scandalous motives to which, as he said, the Senators were sacrificing the honour of their country. However this be,

* Appian, *Hispanica*, c. 80, 83. Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii. Florus, lib. ii. c. 18.
† Appian, *Hispan.* c. 97. Florus makes them only four thousand, lib. ii. c. 18.
‡ Appian, *Hispan.* c. 98. § Polyb. lib. xxxiii. c. 4.
‖ Florus, lib. iii. c. 2. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lx. lxi. Appian, *Gallica*, c. 12.
¶ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxi.—Cassiodori *Chronicon.*
** Vell. Patercul. lib. i.

* Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. iii. c. 4.
† Sallust, *Bell. Jugurthin.* c. 9, *et seq.* ‡ Ibid. c. 16.
§ *Bell. Jugurthin*, c. 27.

History.

Jugurthine war.

war was declared against Jugurtha; and L. Bestia Calphurnius, one of the Consuls, was sent over to Africa to commence hostilities against him. Still, we are told,* Jugurtha continued to employ his usual arts: and the Consul, after suffering the campaign to be protracted in fruitless negociations, at last granted his enemy peace, on condition of his laying down his arms, and submitting himself and his kingdom to the Romans. But only a small part of Jugurtha's resources were in fact surrendered; and the Consul returning to Rome to preside at the elections for the ensuing year, the war was as far from conclusion as ever. The succeeding season was equally unproductive of any decisive event; but towards the close of it, when the Consul Sp. Albinus had, as usual, returned to Rome, the army which he left under the command of his brother sustained a severe defeat from the enemy, and was reduced to such difficulties as to purchase its retreat by a promise of evacuating Numidia within ten days; and, it is added, by concluding a treaty of peace. But Jugurtha, who had served at Numantia, must have remembered how lightly the Senate could violate the stipulations made by its officers; and he could not, reasonably, calculate on gaining any other advantage from his agreement, than the getting rid of the Roman army for the present. The treaty, as he might have expected, was immediately disavowed at Rome; and the new Consul, Q. Cæcilius Metellus, was likely to prove a far more formidable adversary than those whom he had hitherto encountered. Metellus was bent on prosecuting the war in earnest. He reformed the discipline of the army, which is always described as faulty, when the usual career of Roman victory was delayed or interrupted; but he did not scruple, at the same time, to tamper† with the several officers whom Jugurtha sent to him to propose terms of peace, and to tempt them to betray, or even to assassinate their master. He evaded giving any decisive answer to the offers made to him, but continued to advance into the heart of Jugurtha's country; and had deprived him of a large portion of his resources, before the Numidian perceived that his enemy was merely amusing him, and that he had nothing but the sword to trust to. In the course of the campaign, Metellus gained some advantages, but he received also several severe checks from the activity of Jugurtha; who turned to the best account his own perfect knowledge of the country, and the peculiar excellence of his subjects in desultory warfare. Experience, however, taught Metellus to guard more completely against this kind of annoyance; and his intrigues were so successful with the principal officers of his enemy, that Jugurtha found those whom he had most trusted engaged in a conspiracy against his life; and although he escaped the immediate danger by putting them to death, his prospects for the future were overcast with fear, and he regarded every one about him with suspicion. Meantime the famous Caius Marius,‡ who had served with distinction under Metellus as his second in command, impatient of holding an inferior station, and coveting to himself the glory of conquering Jugurtha, had obtained leave to go to Rome, and offer himself as a candidate for the Consulship. He was a man of low birth, and totally illiterate; but active and able, with power sufficient to make him feared by the nobility, and with an inveterate hatred against them, because their scorn of his mean condition galled his pride, and impeded his way to greatness. By depreciating* Metellus, and promising soon to end the war if the command were in his own hands, he won the favour of the multitude; for invectives against high birth and station, joined to an unabashed self-assurance, are powerful pleaders with the low and the ignorant; and he was elected for the first time, to that office which he afterwards filled more frequently than any other Roman; and in which he was the author of as signal military services, and as great domestic injuries, as any one individual has ever been known to bring upon his country.

Rise of Caius Marius.

Rome.

His first Consulship.

Marius, soon after his election, received from the people, in spite of a contrary resolution of the Senate, the command of the army in Numidia, and the conduct of the war with Jugurtha. On his arrival in Africa, he found that some of the most important towns in Numidia had been taken by Metellus, and that Jugurtha had implored and obtained the assistance of Bocchus, King of Mauritania, so that he had an additional enemy to encounter. But Bocchus, having no direct interest in the quarrel, did not refuse to listen to the overtures of the Roman General; and promised himself, if the fortune of war should prove adverse, to secure his own interests, by surrendering Jugurtha to his enemies. However, for the present, the two Kings were in close alliance with each other; and Marius, in hopes of bringing them to action, employed himself in besieging some of the most valuable towns and fortresses in the Numidian dominions. It is worthy of notice, that at Capsa,† a strong place in one of the remotest parts of the country, after it had been surrendered, the whole male population was massacred, the women and children were sold for slaves, and the city was plundered and burnt; for no other reason than because the place was inconvenient for the Romans to garrison, and the people were not thought trustworthy. If we remember, how strong a sensation has been excited in our own times, by the massacre of the Turkish prisoners at Jaffa, and then observe how Sallust excuses ‡ the conduct of Marius at Capsa, we shall somewhat understand how dreadful were the atrocities of Roman warfare, and how degraded the condition of Roman morality.

He is appointed to command against Jugurtha.

The loss of these towns drove Jugurtha and Bocchus, as Marius had hoped, to try their fortune in the field; and he defeated them in two battles with severe loss. This disposed the King of Mauritania to open a communication with the Romans; the management of which, was intrusted by Marius § to L. Cornelius Sylla, his Quæstor; and after much debate, Bocchus consented to win the favour of Rome, by betraying Jugurtha. Accordingly, having allured both Sylla and Jugurtha with the hope that he was going to deliver their enemy into their hands, he proposed that they should have a meeting with each other, to discuss the possibility of concluding a peace; and when the appointed time came, he ordered Jugurtha

Betrayal of Jugurtha.

* *Bell. Jugurth.* c. 29. † Ibid. c. 46. ‡ Ibid, c. 63, 64, &c.

* Sallust, c. 64. † Ibid. c. 91.

‡ *Id facinus, contra jus belli, non avaritiâ neque scelere Consulis admissum: sed quia locus Jugurthæ opportunus, nobis aditu difficilis: genus hominum mobile, infidum, neque beneficio neque metu coercitum.* c. 91.

§ Sallust, c. 102, *et seq.*

History.

Death of Jugurtha. U. C. 648 — A. C. 106.

to be seized, and delivered him bound to Sylla. He was by him taken to the head-quarters of Marius, and from thence conducted to Rome, led in triumph * with his two sons before the chariot of the conqueror, and then put to death in prison. His own crimes had well deserved his punishment; but they in no way lessen the iniquity of the Romans in inflicting it, by no other right than that of conquest.

Extent of Roman dominion.

By the event of this war, Numidia was added to the list of Roman provinces. It was not till a somewhat later period that the Republic acquired Cyrene and its dependencies, by the bequest of their King, Ptolemy Appion; and Egypt and Mauritania remained unconquered till the times of the Cæsars. In the year of Rome 652, the date at which the present narrative closes, the dominions, formerly subject to Carthage and the kingdom of Numidia, were all that the Romans possessed in Africa; and these extended, to speak generally, along the coast of the Mediterranean from the greater Syrtis † to the river Ampsaga, or the town of Sardis, corresponding nearly with the limit between the modern governments of Tunis and Algiers. Their limit, towards the interior, it is impossible precisely to ascertain; and indeed, in fixing the extent of the Roman empire at any one period, minute accuracy, if attainable at all, would not repay the labour of arriving at it: because, our materials for the history of Rome are by no means full and uninterrupted; and many countries were at one time given away to some ally, and then again united to the empire, and thus are sometimes included amongst the provinces, and sometimes spoken of as independent. Again, in some parts, as for example, in the countries between Macedonia and the Danube, continual warfare was carried on for ages between the Romans and the natives; and whilst a victory would nominally extend the bounds of the empire, by leading to the submission of various tribes, any change of circumstances would presently contract them, by exciting the new subjects to revolt. Besides the imperfect state of ancient, and we may add, of modern geography, makes it difficult, if not impossible, with regard to many quarters of the Roman empire, to fix the limits of provinces or of countries loosely inhabited by barbarian tribes; and even where there is any great natural division spoken of as the boundary, such as the Rhine and the Danube, at a later period, or the chain of Mount Taurus, after the war with Antiochus, there might be natural fastnessess, and wild districts, even within the general frontier, which defied the Roman authority, and furnished the provincial officers with occasions of victories and triumphs. These considerations may excuse the imperfections, or even the inaccuracies, of that sketch of the extent of the empire, which we now propose to offer.

What has been already said in the course of the narrative, will sufficiently show the nature and extent of the Roman power in Africa, Spain, and Gaul. The Balearian ‡ islands were conquered by Q. Metellus about the year 630, complaint having been made that the inhabitants infested the sea with piracies. Sardinia and Sicily had been gained from Carthage, as has been mentioned in a former part of this history, before the second Punic war; and Corsica had been conquered at the same time with Sardinia, but it seems to have been considered of little importance; and there is no mention of any attempt having been made on it, by either party, during the war with Hannibal. Melita, or Malta, of which we speak only on account of its modern celebrity, was first taken, according to Livy,* in the very first year of the second Punic war; and at the end of that war, was finally ceded by the Carthaginians, together with their other islands in the Mediterranean. The whole of Italy, in the modern sense of the term, was already subject to the Romans; although the Ligurians and Istrians were still probably in a state of imperfect obedience. To the eastward, the countries between the Danube and Greece offer, as we have said, the most indistinctly marked portion of the empire. A part of the eastern coast of the Adriatic had been conquered, even before the second Punic war; or rather underwent the first introduction to conquest, in becoming † allied to the Romans. In the second Macedonian war, Gentius, a King ‡‡ of a large part of Illyria, having allied himself with Perseus, paid the penalty of losing all his dominions. Dalmatia, to the north-west of Illyria, skirting the eastern coast of the Adriatic, had been first attacked and partially subdued by C. Marcius Figulus § and P. Scipio Nasica, in the years of Rome 597 and 598; but triumphs continued to be earned, by victories in Dalmatia, even down to the time of Augustus: and the same may be said of Thrace, and the other countries to the north of Macedonia, which remained so long in a wild and unsettled state, that we read of revolts in Thrace || even in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar. If we turn to the southward, Macedonia, ¶ Thessaly, and Epirus, are said to have been reduced at one time to the form of a province, at the end of the third Macedonian war, in the year of Rome 608. The southern states of Greece were also subjected to the government of a Roman Prætor, by the decree of the ten commissioners, who, as usual, were sent to determine ** the future condition of the country, after the destruction of Corinth. By their decision, the popular assemblies were every where abolished, and the local administration was made strictly oligarchical; but afterwards, the old assemblies were restored, when the power of Rome was so securely established, that such empty shows of liberty might be granted without danger.

Rome.

By the termination of the war with Antiochus, Rome, as we have seen, gained to herself, nominally, no dominion in Asia. But as she claimed †† the right of resuming at pleasure, such gifts of territory as she awarded to her allies, she may thus be considered the actual sovereign of Lycia and Caria, which she bestowed on the Rhodians, and of Phrygia, Lydia, and several other provinces, which were given to the King of Pergamus. The first actual province, ‡‡ however, which the Romans formed in Asia, consisted of the dominions of their oldest allies; of those very Kings of Pergamus, who had given them such useful aid in all their wars with the Greek Princes and

* Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxvii.
† Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. v. c. 2, 3. Strabo, lib. xvii. p. 972. edit. Xyland.
‡ Strabo, lib. iii. p. 177. edit. Xyland. Florus, lib. iii. c. 8.

* Livy, lib. xxi. c. 51. † Polyb. lib. ii. c. 11. lib. iii. c. 16.
‡ Appian, *Illyrica*, c. 9.
§ Ibid. *Illyrica*, c. 11. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. xlvii.
|| Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. ii. c. 64. lib. iv. c. 46, *et seq.*
¶ Rufus Festus. Jornandes. ** Pausanias, *Achaica*, c. 86.
†† Appian, *Numidica*, sect. 3. edit. Schweighæuser.
‡‡ Jornandes, lib. i. Florus, lib. ii. c. 20.

History. commonwealths, from the first contest with Philip, King of Macedon, to the final overthrow of the Achæan confederacy.* Attalus, the son of Eumenes, dying in the year of Rome 620, left his dominions by will to the Roman people. But Aristonicus, a natural brother, as some say, of the late King, endeavoured to obtain the kingdom for himself, and at first met with some success; but was afterwards defeated and taken, and according to the usual practice of the Romans, was led in triumph, and afterwards put † to death. It is mentioned by Florus,‡ that Manius Acquilius, by whom this war was brought to an end, did not hesitate to poison the wells, in order to reduce some of the revolted cities to submission; nor does it appear that for so dreadful a crime, his conduct was ever called in question by his government. In this manner, by the overthrow of Aristonicus, the kingdom of Pergamus was reduced into the form of a province, which was called peculiarly the province of Asia. Along the southern shore of the Euxine, the kingdoms of Bythinia, Cappadocia, and Pontus, still subsisted under their native sovereigns; and from the last of the three, was soon to arise an enemy, only second to Hannibal in the abilities and obstinacy with which he so long combated the Romans, the famous Mithridates. To the south of the province of Asia, the countries of Lycia, Pamphylia, and Cilicia, were not yet formally annexed to the empire; although Lycia and Pamphylia, having been among the districts ceded by Antiochus, enjoyed their liberty only as a gift from Rome. Further to the eastward, the Romans, as yet, had made no advances: Crete and Cyprus were untouched; and Rhodes, taught § by the treatment it received after the war with Perseus, had been since careful to purchase its municipal independence by the utmost deference to the will of the Senate and its officers.

Causes of the Roman conquests.

Great as was the empire which the Romans had by this time acquired, none of their conquests, since the end of the second Punic war, were such as can at all surprise us. The ascendency of a well constituted army, and a good system of military policy, over the utmost perfection of rude courage or individual ability, is so well known, that the gradual reduction of Spain, of Gaul, of Thrace, and of Illyricum, as well as the subjugation of Numidia, may be considered as matters of course. Carthage, at the time of its final struggle, was hardly more than a single city; and the long disuse of arms had taken away all the opportunities, by which good officers, and an efficient military system are created; to which, we may add, that the Carthaginians helped their own ruin, by the surrender of their arms and engines of war, at the very moment when they were most needed. Antiochus was a Prince of little ability or courage, and the event of the first general battle, frightened him into submission; nor can the issue of that battle in itself appear wonderful, when we remember how little skill and discipline have ever been found in the organization of Asiatic armies; and that the Kings of Syria were, by this time, fully infected with the ignorance and weakness of Asia. It is only in Greece and in Macedon that we might have expected a longer and a more doubtful contest. The country which first sent forth regular armies to war, and the infantry of which had long maintained so complete a superiority over the soldiers of all other nations, ought not, we may think, to have bowed beneath the yoke of Rome, without signalizing its fall by some heroic effort, and yielding to its enemy a dearly purchased victory. The posterity of Xenophon, of Epaminondas, and of Alexander, might surely have inflicted on Rome a second Cannæ, before they suffered defeats more humiliating than that of Zama. Rome.

But, in fact, the circumstances of the Macedonian and Achæan wars abundantly explain the easiness with which the Romans obtained their successes. In their first contest with Philip, they hemmed him in on every side with enemies, and the resources of Macedon were exhausted by the plundering parties of the Ætolians and Dardanians on one side, and, on the other, by the united fleets of Rome, Pergamus, and Rhodes, which infested the coasts; and by the main consular army, the ranks of which were swelled by the contingents of half the states of Greece. The battle of Cynocephalæ was the only regular action in the whole war; and its result laid open to the victorious army the whole of Thessaly, and the entrance into Macedon itself. As for the event of that battle, there is no reason to dispute the judgment of Polybius, who pronounces the Macedonian tactics to have been unable to compete with the Roman; and Hannibal's authority ought to have determined all other commanders to oppose the Roman legion with troops armed and organized in the same manner. Neither Philip nor Perseus were able Generals; and the monarchy of Macedon was so rudely constituted, that all depended on the personal character of the sovereign; nor could the King have seen, without jealousy, and probably without danger, the actual control of his armies in the hands of a subject, whose ability might supply his own deficiencies. Had Hannibal been the General of the Macedonians, his genius would probably have so modified the Grecian tactics, as, without forfeiting their own peculiar advantages, to have given them some of the improvements of the system of their enemies, and thus he might have changed the fortune of particular battles; but, where the force of the two contending powers was so unequal, he could scarcely have hoped to alter the event of the war.

With regard to the Greek republics, in addition to the inferiority of their tactics, which they shared in common with the Macedonians, they laboured under a defect peculiar to themselves, and arising naturally from their inconsiderable extent and power, and the insignificant scale on which they had been used to see military operations conducted. Though much individual courage existed amongst the Generals and soldiers, yet war had assumed a character of less horror, from the balanced strength of the several commonwealths, the habit of avoiding extreme measures on either side, and the comparatively little slaughter with which their battles were accompanied. The Romans, on the contrary, made it a part of their policy to give war its most terrible aspect. Their battles were decisive and bloody; the very wounds which were inflicted by their favorite weapon, a heavy sword, equally calculated for stabbing or for cutting, were an appearance of peculiar ghastliness; and in the storming * of

* Strabo, lib. xiii. p. 721. and lib. xiv. p. 744. edit. Xyl. Livy, *Epit.* lib. lix.

† Paterculus, lib. ii. Strabo, lib. xiv. p. 744. Orosius, apud Sigonium, *Comment. in Fest. et Triumph. Romanorum.*

‡ Florus, lib. ii. c. 20. § Rufus Festus. Jornandes.

* Polyb. lib. x. c. 15.

History. towns, they added to the usual horror of such scenes, by deliberately lopping the limbs of the dogs and other animals which fell in their way, on purpose to exaggerate the impression of the destruction occasioned by their arms. A large army of twenty or thirty thousand men, conducting a campaign on this system, and regarded, besides, with that terror which civilized nations usually feel towards those whom they consider barbarians, filled the minds of the Greeks with fearful imaginations of its superior strength and ferocity; exactly in the same manner, and from the same causes, as the little states of Italy, in the fifteenth century, trembled before the impetuous courage of the French; when they found that the field of battle was made the scene of actual and terrible slaughter, and not, as in their own insignificant encounters, a mere stage for the display of their arms and their manœuvres.

Rome.

Start of the various roaming tribes in the north of Europe

Thus victorious over every enemy, and removed, as it might have seemed, far above any apprehension of danger, the Roman Republic was suddenly obliged to struggle for its very existence; and amidst all its warlike population could find one man alone to whose guidance it could venture to trust its armies in this alarming emergency. The reader will perceive that we are alluding to the invasion of Italy by a vast swarm of barbarians from the north of Europe, known by the various names of Cimbri, Teutones, Ambrones, and Tigurini. And here we cannot but remark a striking peculiarity in the state of the most civilized of the ancient nations, which widely distinguishes them from the empires and kingdoms of modern Europe. The Greeks and Romans saw almost before their eyes the limits of that world with which alone they were concerned, and beyond which they knew nothing. The Alps and the mountains of Thrace were like the enchanted barriers of romantic story, beset with so many various perils, that the inhabitants of the region which they enclosed attempted not to surmount them. A few vague reports, brought by some enterprising trader, and collected amidst the difficulties of imperfectly understood dialects, from the fabling ignorance of barbarians, were the only information which could be gained concerning those vast countries, which are now the seat of so many mighty empires, from the Danube to the Frozen Ocean, from China to the British Isles. Yet this unknown region was not like the sands of Africa, the unpeopled and impracticable wastes of which afford the countries, on which they border, their best security against the attacks of an enemy; on the contrary, the north of Europe teemed with inhabitants, and might be likened to a volcano the inward workings of which cannot be seen, nor the causes of its eruptions traced; but which, from time to time, pours forth upon the cities at its base a sudden and unforeseen destruction. In this manner the earliest Greek historian* records the irruptions of Cimmerian and Scythian tribes into the more civilized parts of Asia, the dominions of Lydia and Media; and the earliest memorials of Italy bear testimony to similar invasions of the Celts or Gauls, who sometimes overran, and sometimes permanently occupied, the countries to the south of the Alps. In process of time, as the Roman power extended itself, Gaul became better known, and it was found that inroads from that quarter were no more to be dreaded; for the Gauls were now become a settled people, and, instead of wandering forth to prey on others, had acquired those comforts which began to induce their more barbarous neighbours to prey upon them. But if Gaul had ceased to inspire alarm, it was not so with the wide tract of country, which from the Rhine and the Alps extended eastward and northward, far beyond the knowledge or even the reasonable conjectures of the Romans. Amidst the forests with which Germany was then overspread, there was nurtured a race of men, bold, strong, hardy, and totally uncivilized, delighting in war, and despising the confinement of a settled habitation; numerous, from the unchecked instinct of population, where nothing more was coveted than a bare subsistence; yet still occasionally multiplying to such a point that even this could not readily be found; and then pouring forth upon wealthier countries, to gain by their swords, in a manner to them most welcome, indulgences which not even the labour that they hated could have procured for them at home. We are now to record the first assault made by this people on the dominions of Rome; from which period, the Romans, as their power increased, for a long succession of years were in their turn the assailants, and advanced the limits of their empire and their knowledge from the Alps to the Danube. Beyond that river they could never penetrate; and soon after they had ceased to go forward with their conquests, the Germans renewed their old incursions upon them, till the empire was totally dismembered, and Italy itself, together with its provinces, submitted to the sceptre and the laws of a northern conqueror.

It was just at the close of the war with Jugurtha, that the alarm of the Cimbri and Teutones was at its height in Rome. They had been first heard of about eight or nine years before, when they attacked the province* of Illyricum, and there defeated Cn. Papirius Carbo, one of the Consuls, with a consular army. After this victory they turned their course into another direction, and are said to have attacked several nations† of Gaul, and even to have penetrated into Spain; but being repelled from that country, they presented themselves on the frontiers of the Roman province of Transalpine Gaul; and requested admittance, as settlers, into some part of the Roman dominions, offering to employ their arms in the service of the Republic, as a return for the lands which they should hold. On receiving a refusal, they proceeded to gain their ends by force; and in two successive years, they defeated two other Roman Consuls in Gaul; but with the caprice of barbarians, instead of following up their successes, they were allured in pursuit of some other objects, and left the Romans for two years unmolested. But in the year of Rome 648, they again fell upon them, and defeated two Consular‡ armies united, with such terrible slaughter, that the capital itself was filled with alarm, and all men concurred in raising Marius to the Consulship, as the only commander capable of saving his country. Fortunately, perhaps, for his reputation, the Germans again forbore to cross the Alps, and moved off into Spain; and being a second time driven back by the natives, they recrossed the Pyrenees, and spent another year in wandering over

* Herodotus, *Clio*. c. xv. 103.

* Appian, *Gallica*, c. 13. Livy, *Epitom*. lib. lxiii.
† Cæsar, *Bell. Gallic*. lib. vii. Florus, lib. iii. c. 3.
‡ Sallust, *Bell. Jugurth*, c. 114. Livy, *Epit*. lib. lxvii

History. Gaul; while Marius had been re-elected a third and a fourth time to the Consulship, and had thus the rare advantage of becoming thoroughly acquainted with his army, and inuring them to exertion* and implicit obedience by the strictest discipline, and by employing them in some of those laborious works, which afterwards became so familiar to the Roman legions in all parts of the empire. Thus when, in his fourth Consulship, the Cimbri, reinforced by some other German hordes, attacked the Romans at once in Transalpine Gaul, and towards the north-eastern side of Italy, Marius not only completely destroyed the multitude by which he was assaulted in Gaul, but hastening immediately after his victory to the support of Lutatius Catulus, his colleague, engaged the other division of the enemy in conjunction with him, and gave them a second overthrow as complete as the first, in the neighbourhood of Verona. By these battles their force was entirely broken, and the alarms which had so long disturbed the minds of the Romans were totally dispelled. Rome.

Here then this portion of our narrative closes. From the period at which we are now arrived, ten years only elapsed before the beginning of the war between Rome and the states of Italy, and thirteen before the first expulsion of Marius, and the commencement of the civil war. These transactions, together with some of an earlier date, such as the seditions of the Gracchi, and the revolt of the slaves in Sicily, will form a fit introduction to that history of the domestic affairs of the Republic, upon which we now propose to enter.

* Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 13, *et seq.*

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XIX.

SYRIA, FROM THE REIGN OF ANTIOCHUS THE GREAT TILL THE TERMINATION OF THE DYNASTY OF THE SELEUCIDÆ.

FROM A. M. 3811. B. C. 193. TO A. M. 3940. B. C. 64.

History. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

BETWEEN the complete establishment of the Seleucidæ on the throne of Antioch, and the final overthrow of that family by the Romans, there is a brief period in ancient history during which the affairs of Syria appear to claim a distinct and separate narrative. The influence of the Macedonian name, and a knowledge of the great objects which had animated as well as ennobled the ambition of Alexander, continued for some time to support the reputation, and to direct the policy of his successors; on which account, as well perhaps as on the ground of their common origin and connection, it has been usual to give a combined view of the history of those powerful kingdoms which were founded upon the conquests of the renowned son of Philip. But the lapse of a few generations dissolved the bonds of this political consanguinity. The Grecian Kings of Syria and Egypt lost by degrees all remembrance of their extraction as Macedonian chiefs, and relinquished, amidst the splendour of confirmed sovereignty, those high objects of glory or universal dominion which the respective founders of their dynasties had never ceased to contemplate. The reign of Antiochus the Great may be regarded as marking with sufficient accuracy the limits of that federal attachment, or historical unity, which characterised the earlier proceedings of Alexander's successors. We therefore proceed to narrate, under the names of this monarch and of his immediate descendants, the more important events which paved the way for the final annexation of Syria to the Roman empire.

Policy of the Romans.

The cautious policy pursued by the republicans of Italy in regard to the Grecian states, had already extended the influence of the Senate to the remotest parts of Thrace and of Peloponnesus. The Proconsul Flaminius, who knew well how to throw the veil of moderation, and even of generosity, over the ambitious designs of his countrymen, had returned to the banks of the Tiber, carrying with him the rare praise of having at once conquered and liberated a large portion of Greece. He had not, indeed, disarmed the power of Antiochus, nor removed all danger that might arise from the claims of Syria upon certain towns situated on the western shores of the Hellespont; but he had materially strengthened the enemies of that monarch, and had made preparations for opposing him which could hardly fail of success.

Syria. From A. M. 3811 — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940 — B. C. 64.

We have already mentioned the repeated conferences which were held in Greece between the Roman deputies and the representatives of the great King, and stated the grounds on which the contending parties rested their respective claims. No adjustment having been effected when Flaminius withdrew his troops into Italy, Antiochus, either with the intention of gaining time, or of seriously attempting to secure the neutrality of such powerful mediators, thought it expedient to send two ambassadors to Rome. The discussions which ensued were attended with no material result, besides an increase of irritation on both sides, and a more determined resolution to persevere in those particular measures from which each party laboured to dissuade the other. The Romans loudly condemned the restless policy of Antiochus, who, not satisfied with his immense territories in Asia, never ceased to prefer some antiquated claims upon the independence of the Grecian cities; which, as the friends of liberty in all parts of the world, and more especially as the allies of the free states whom he wished to oppress, they were determined by all the means in their power, whether by arms or negociation, to protect and support. The Syrian envoys, on the other hand, did not affect to conceal their suspicions of the insidious conduct and hypocritical professions of the Roman Senate. They set forth the ancient and hereditary right of their master to all those cities, both in Thrace and Asia Minor, over which he was desirous to extend his dominion; they magnified his services to the Greeks, whose walls he had repaired, and whose wealth and security he had increased; and they concluded by observing, that his honour not less than his interest was concerned in maintaining the authority of the Syrian crown.

Conference at Rome. B. C. 193. — OL. 146. 4.

History. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

These deliberations were terminated by a proposal on the part of the Romans to send to the head-quarters of the King, in the character of ambassadors, the three persons who had treated with him the preceding year in his camp at Lysimachia.*

The King of Syria carries on war in Asia Minor.

Meanwhile Antiochus was at the head of an army in the Lesser Asia, prosecuting hostilities in person against his rebellious subjects in the province of Pisidia. Another division of his forces was occupied in besieging Smyrna and Lampsacus; two towns of great importance to his future views on the opposite coast of Thrace. This vigorous activity, during the whole period that the negociation was pending at Rome, was enough to convince the enemies of Syria, that the King had either no desire or no expectation that peace could be secured. But whatever might be his views on this head, it admits not of any doubt that the Romans had already resolved on war. The conquest of Carthage made such an accession to their power, as well as to their ambitious designs, that they could no longer tolerate a rival influence in any part of Europe; and whatever might be wanting to their pretexts, on more general grounds, was amply supplied by the following considerations.

The Romans urged to warlike counsels by the fear of Hannibal.

No sooner had the Syrian deputies departed from Rome, than messengers arrived at that city from Carthage, to inform the Senate that Hannibal was already concerting measures with Antiochus for carrying back the war into the heart of Italy. The Romans, whose fears were renewed at the very name of their late invader, succeeded in driving him from the head of affairs, in the capital of Africa, and compelled him to seek an asylum among the people of Tyre; whence he soon after proceeded to Antioch, and subsequently to the camp of the King, in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, where a conference was to be resumed with the Roman ambassadors, on the great question of peace or war.† The advice of the Carthaginian commander confirmed the resolution of Antiochus, to trust his cause to the decision of arms; and as this determination could not fail to be made known to the Romans, it may be regarded as affording a reasonable excuse for the warlike attitude which they forthwith prepared to assume.

Plans of Eumenes in cooperation with the Romans.

Another motive which induced them to declare war against Antiochus, may be found in their political connection with Eumenes, the King of Pergamus. Foreseeing that a rupture would in all probability take place between the Romans and his Syrian neighbours, this cautious prince had refused to cooperate with Antiochus in his designs upon Greece, and had thus exposed himself to an unequal conflict with a very powerful enemy. Eumenes, therefore, actuated by the very obvious view of self-defence, as well, perhaps, as by the dictates of a more profound and less justifiable policy, pressed upon the Romans the expediency of war; promising, at the same time, the assistance of his arms and counsels, should the scene of hostilities be eventually transferred into the provinces of Asia Minor. The Roman Commissioners, accordingly, who were sent to negociate with Antiochus, deemed it proper to pass through Pergamus, in order at once to inform themselves in regard to the precise relations which subsisted between the Asiatic sovereigns, and to communicate to Eumenes the strongest assurances of support from the Senate, should they finally resolve upon a war with Syria.

Syria. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193 to A. M. 3940 — B. C. 64.

The peace of the Grecian states, and the interests of Rome were threatened from another quarter also, which, if not so formidable in point of power, was more to be dreaded in respect of the implacable revenge and desperate counsels with which the renewal of war was meditated. The Ætolians, who had been the most active in inviting the interference of the Romans in the affairs of Greece, were the first to discover the mischievous effects of that short-sighted policy; and now finding themselves disappointed in all their hopes, and contemptuously dismissed whenever they sought compensation, or claimed a share of the advantages obtained by their own arms, they every where indulged in the most furious invectives against their late allies, and invited an open confederacy of the more independent states to throw off for ever their odious dominion. With this view, they despatched embassies to Nabis of Sparta, to Philip of Macedon, and to Antiochus, the King of Syria; and as the last of these sovereigns was already disposed for war, the intemperate counsels of Ætolia were not urged in vain.

Warlike disposition of the Ætolians.

Resolution adopted by the Romans B. C. 192. — OL. 147. 1.

Such measures, openly pursued by some of the leading republics of Greece, and not less openly countenanced by others, could not fail to alarm the vigilant policy of Rome. It was immediately resolved to adopt such precautions as might obviate the danger to which the interests of the Roman people appeared to be exposed from the hostile intentions of Antiochus and the Ætolians; and also, in the mean time, to add to the number of their Commissioners already despatched into Asia Minor, that they might the more certainly become acquainted with the real views of the Syrians, and watch the motions of their wavering allies. A small force of men and ships was sent under Flaminius, who seems in this, as in the former expedition, to have been charged with the superintendence of diplomatic as well as of military affairs; and that wary general found, immediately upon his arrival in Achæa, the most unambiguous proofs that a second and more decisive crisis was impending over the Grecian republics, and threatening with important change the whole of the Lesser Asia.

Professions of their ambassadors.

When the invitation to assist in the liberation of Greece reached Antiochus, he appears to have been still resident at Ephesus, and to have permitted at his court the attendance of the Roman envoys, Sulpicius and Villius. These functionaries continued to use the language of peace, and to cover the designs of their country by the usual professions of moderation, and of a conscientious regard for the interests of their Grecian allies. The reply of Minio, the minister of the Syrian potentate, addressed on this occasion to these haughty and insidious republicans, conveyed at once a merited reproof, and also the sentiments which were then generally entertained in regard to the protection vouchsafed by the Romans to the Greek commonwealths. "Your conduct," said he, "where you are in a condition to act without disguise, is a much better evidence of your intentions, than any professions you may think proper to make in Greece or in Asia, where, by assuming a popular character, you have so many parties to reconcile to your interest. Are not the inhabitants of Naples and of Rhegium Greeks, as well as those of Lampsacus and Smyrna? You are extremely desirous to set the Greeks

Remonstrances of the Syrian ministers.

* Livy, lib. xxxiv. c. 57. † Ibid. lib. xxxiii. c. 33.

History. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

at liberty from the dominion of Antiochus and Philip, but have no remorse in subjecting them to your own."*

Advice of Hannibal to Antiochus.

War being no longer doubtful, nothing remained for the King of Syria but to determine whether to attack the Romans in their own country, or to wait their arrival in the territory of their allies. Hannibal, who had never ceased to hold the opinion that the Romans could only be conquered in Italy, recommended with the utmost earnestness and force of reasoning the manifest advantages of an invasion, as the sole means whereby the King could effectually weaken the power and distract the counsels of that warlike people. Soliciting from Antiochus an armament of no more than a hundred galleys, ten thousand foot, and a thousand horse, he offered his services as the commander of the expedition; assuring him that, with this small force, together with the troops and supplies which he could raise at Carthage, he would be able to effect a descent on the Italian coast, and thereby create a powerful diversion in his favour.

Opinion raised of the royal forces.

This wise counsel was overruled by the influence of the Ætolians, and the jealousy of the Syrian courtiers. Such a monarch, said the latter, stood in no need of foreign aid or direction; his own forces and his own talents were sufficient to vanquish the Romans in any part of the world; the liberation and recovery of Greece ought to be the first object of his arms, and there every thing promised success. Antiochus is himself a Greek, and his appearance on their shores will be hailed by his countrymen with transport and affection: the Ætolians are already in arms: Nabis longs for an opportunity to recover the possessions of which he has been despoiled by the Romans; and Philip of Macedon, who smarts under the indignities which he has suffered from that encroaching people, will obey the first signal to retrieve his wrongs, and will join his standard to that of the great King.†

Antiochus invades Greece. B. C. 192. — OL. 147. 1.

The Ætolians, who had already made some hostile movements against the Achæans and inhabitants of Eubœa, were extremely urgent in their entreaties that Antiochus would pass over into Greece. At length he complied with their request; for, leaving the blockade of Smyrna and Lampsacus to the care of his lieutenants, he sailed into the Pelasgic gulph at the head of ten or twelve thousand of his best troops. His reception on the European shore was marked with that ardent enthusiasm which distinguished the ancient Greeks. The Athenians themselves were shaken in their fidelity to Rome. The Bœotians were prepared to extend their services to the invader; and none of the states remained steady in their allegiance to the Roman republic, except the members of the Achæan League, and the small commonwealth of Eubœa. The opposition of the latter body provoked the first act of hostility on the part of Antiochus. He reduced their capital, and subdued their island; in which achievement he gained, at the same time, a partial triumph over the allied arms of the Achæans, as well as those of Eumenes, the King of Pergamus, who had so early taken the field on the side of the Romans. This trifling conquest was the only event which occurred to crown the preparations and boastful promises of the Syrian monarch and his confederates; after which he retired to pass the winter in negociation, and to await the more important transactions of the ensuing summer.

* Livy, lib. xxxv. † Ibid. lib. xxxvi. c. 7.

Syria. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

The vigour of Antiochus's mind proved unequal to the mighty contest in which he was about to engage; and his weakness nowhere shewed itself with more fatal effects than in his contemptible jealousy of Hannibal, who still administered to him the most valuable counsel. In direct opposition to the advice of this consummate statesman and soldier, the Syrian King not only neglected to secure the friendship of the Macedonians, but even by affording unseasonable countenance to a rival prince, who had pretensions to the throne, he provoked the open enmity of Philip, and drove him into a new alliance with the Romans. It was to dissuade Antiochus from the pernicious policy which he was now pursuing, and to remove from his mind the unhappy suspicion which he saw the King entertained in regard to his fidelity, that Hannibal related to him the interesting anecdote of his early life, so familiar to every schoolboy, and which is recorded by Polybius, Livy, and Cornelius Nepos. But remonstrances and protestations were now alike in vain. The infatuated Syrian wasted his time in concluding obscure treaties, and in besieging unimportant towns, till he was roused to a momentary activity, and to a sense of the manifold dangers which gathered around him, by the sight of a Roman encampment, of which the fires already blazed on the hills of Thessaly.

Weak and unsteady conduct of Antiochus.

Vigilance and activity of the Romans. B. C. 191. — OL. 147. 2.

No sooner had Sulpicius and the other ambassadors reported at Rome the unsuccessful issue of their negociations with the great King and his Ætolian allies, than active preparations were ordered by the Senate to meet all the contingencies of the approaching war. Aware of the offensive measures recommended by Hannibal, the Romans stationed forthwith a powerful army of observation at Tarentum; provided for the safety of Sicily and the shores of the republic, by fitting out two numerous fleets; and, above all, gave directions for assembling a large armament, early in the spring, at a convenient port on the Adriatic, that it might be transported into Illyricum, upon the first signal of a hostile operation on the part of the enemy. The allies of Rome seconded, with unwonted zeal, her preparations against Antiochus. Carthage, in order to wipe off all suspicion that Hannibal acted with the concurrence of his native government, offered large supplies of corn. Ptolemy, actuated by personal resentment, and the more justifiable motives of national security, volunteered his aid against the conqueror of Cœle-Syria, and Phœnicia: whilst Philip of Macedon, enraged at the threatened violation of his territory, professed his readiness to join the standard of the Consul with a considerable force of men, money, and provisions.*

Zeal of their allies against Antiochus.

The Romans under Appius Claudius march into Thessaly and raise the siege of Larissa.

The army which subsequently passed over into Greece, under the command of Manius Acilius Glabrio, amounted to twenty thousand foot, two thousand horse, and about fifteen elephants. The siege of Larissa by Antiochus was held to be a declaration of war; and accordingly, at the request of the Macedonians, Appius Claudius, at the head of a powerful detachment, marched into Thessaly, as well for the relief of that city, as to apprize the invader that

* Livy, lib. xxxvi. *ab initio.*

History.

From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

his ravages in the territory of a Roman ally would not be allowed to pass unavenged. This demonstration was more than sufficient to disconcert the hasty and ill-provided inroad of the Syrians. Antiochus immediately retreated to Demetrias, and afterwards to Eubœa; in which latter place, it is said, he gave himself up to the pursuit of an unequal love, and renewed for a time the sensuality and voluptuous indolence which had disgraced the earlier part of his life. Most historians agree in fixing the date of his marriage with the daughter of Cleoptolemus, after his retreat from Thessaly: but there is reason, we think, for placing this amorous transaction among the occurrences which fell out at Chalcis, during his first residence there; as it is hardly possible to imagine that he would allow himself to indulge in the protracted fooleries with which he celebrated his nuptials, immediately after being repulsed by one army, and whilst threatened by another still more powerful. However this may be, we are not permitted to doubt that Antiochus was in the field before Acilius landed his troops in the gulph of Ambracia.

Battle of the straits of Thermopylæ, and defeat of Antiochus.

The commencement of the war was signalized on the part of the Romans by the reduction of Pelinnæum, a Thessalian city, which had been garrisoned by the Syrians, and committed to the charge of Philip, commonly called the Megalopolitan, and whom we have already described as a Pretender to the throne of Macedonia. But the main object contemplated by Acilius was to drive Antiochus out of Europe; and with this view he pursued his retreating phalanx until he succeeded in shutting him up on the narrow shores of the Malian gulph. Here the Syrian determined to make a stand, in order at least to protect the entrance into Greece, and gain time for the assembling of a more numerous army. But the straits of Thermopylæ were no longer esteemed impregnable. The Persians and Gauls had undeceived the Greeks as to the imaginary strength of that celebrated defile; and the Romans, as Antiochus well knew, were not inferior to the troops either of Xerxes or Brennus, in point of enterprise, courage, and perseverance. It was in vain that the Ætolians occupied the narrow passes in the neighbouring mountains. Cato, the celebrated Censor, then in the prime of life, exercised a subordinate command under Acilius; and being on this occasion detached with a body of active soldiers to dislodge the Ætolians from the high ground, he effected his object so completely, as to afford the most essential aid to the principal attack on the enemy's camp and lines, against which the Consul advanced in person. The Syrian army was cut in pieces: the King himself, not without some difficulty, escaped, with a few hundred men, to Elatia, and afterwards to Chalcis; whence he was escorted to Ephesus by a small squadron of scattered ships, which had succeeded in assembling at Eubœa.

Resistance and distress of the Ætolians.

After the defeat of Antiochus, and his flight from Europe, no enemy remained in Greece to dispute the ascendency of the Romans, except the fickle people of Ætolia, who now found themselves at the mercy of a victorious foe, whom they had provoked by a long course of insolent invective, and by the most selfish and traitorous disaffection. The Consul advanced into their country, laid siege to Naupactus, and having reduced them to considerable distress, agreed to a cessation of arms, which was to last only whilst their deputies were proceeding to Rome, to implore forgiveness, and to make their peace with the Senate. Their mission to the banks of the Tiber was, however, attended with little success. No terms were promised, except on the condition of unlimited surrender, and the payment of a thousand talents. The Ætolians, therefore, made haste to resume their arms. Naupactus was strengthened so much as to bid defiance to the renewed attacks of Acilius; who, that he might achieve something memorable before his command should expire, removed his army to the siege of Amphissa.*

Syria.

From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

Affairs were in the posture we have now described, when news arrived that Lucius Scipio was appointed to conduct the war against Antiochus, aided by the counsels of his brother, the renowned Africanus, who had accepted of an appointment under his command. The new Consul carried with him into his province a powerful army, reinforced by the addition of five thousand veterans, who were desirous to renew their laurels under the banners of a captain, whose name was at once extremely popular, and had long been auspicious to Roman glory. The fleet, too, was greatly augmented under Livius, already become a successful commander: and ample supplies of money and military stores were furnished by the King of Egypt, who, at this momentous crisis, appears to have confined his narrow views to the humiliation of Syria, overlooking the more formidable ambition, and still more formidable arms of his new allies. Philip, likewise, exerted all his powers of civility and accommodation to further the views of the Consul Scipio for carrying on an Asiatic war. He granted a free passage through Macedonia; was delighted to report that his roads and bridges were in excellent order, and that his magazines were amply replenished with every thing that might be found necessary to promote the comfort and expedition of the Roman soldiers. The siege of Amphissa was no longer regarded as worthy of delay: the army of Acilius joined the ranks of Scipio; and the latter, cheered by the enemies of Antiochus, and unobstructed by his friends, performed an easy and rapid march to the shores of the Hellespont.†

Lucius Scipio appointed to the command in Greece, accompanied by his brother Publius, the victor of Zama. B. C. 190. — OL. 147. 3.

Situation and measures of Antiochus.

When Antiochus had reached Ephesus, after the defeat at Thermopylæ, his fears were not alleviated when he heard from the faithful lips of Hannibal, that he would soon have to contend with the Romans *for* Asia *in* Asia. Roused to a sense of his danger, the King resolved to make a vigorous effort to recruit his army, and to strengthen his interests by negociation, before his active enemies could cross the Ægean sea. He reinforced his garrisons at Chersonesus, equipped a powerful fleet under Polyxenidas, and despatched ships of observation to guard the coasts, or to give early notice of such hostile movements as it might be necessary to oppose. He relied with undiminished confidence on the boundless resources of his Asiatic provinces; and though Lampsacus and Smyrna still refused to acknowledge him as their master, the greater part of the maritime towns were open to his forces, and well stored with magazines to meet the various contingencies of war. His matrimonial relations with Pontus and Cappadocia, afforded to him the ground of a reasonable hope that the arms of these

* Livy, lib. xxxvii. c. 5. † Ibid. lib. xxxvii. c. 7.

History. From A. M. 3811. — B. C 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

kingdoms would be joined to those of Syria in defeating the schemes of the Romans against the independence of the Lesser Asia. He likewise courted the alliance of Prusias, the warlike prince of Bithynia, and entered into a treaty with the inhabitants of Galatia, the descendants of those formidable Gauls who had filled with terror the most powerful states of Greece, and conquered an independent settlement from one of the most vigorous of Alexander's successors. In this way he made arrangements for encountering in Asia the redoubtable armies of Rome, and for meeting the exigencies of the momentous struggle in which he had involved the interests of his hereditary dominions.

Defeat of his fleet at Corycus. B. C. 190. — æt. æt. 3.

The first events of the war proved rather unfavourable to his hopes, and weakened considerably one of the main supports of his ascendency in Greece. His fleet was defeated by the Romans near Corycus, and pursued into Ephesus, where it was afterwards blockaded. A temporary advantage gained soon after over the Rhodian navy, was dearly purchased by a gross breach of faith committed by his admiral, and by a renewed declaration of hostility on the part of those hardy islanders, who were in this instance the victims of his guile.

The territory of Pergamus invaded by Seleucus.

Whilst the Romans were employed in an unsuccessful expedition against the seaports of Lycia, the plans of Antiochus began to be developed, in the invasion of Pergamus by an army under his son Seleucus. Eumenes, although thus taken by surprise, was not altogether unprepared for resistance. His capital sustained a protracted siege, carried on by the whole united army of the Syrians, until it was relieved by a seasonable reinforcement of troops from Achæa. An assault on Adramyttium by Antiochus in person was, in like manner, defeated; after which the arms of the contending parties appear to have been for some time employed in mutual ravages of each other's fields, and in pillaging defenceless towns.

Sea fight near Pamphylia.

A more severe disappointment than he had yet sustained was soon announced to Antiochus. A large fleet, conveying to him an important supply of men and stores, and commanded by Apollonius and the faithful Hannibal, had just left the shores of Phœnicia, when the Rhodians, informed of its approach, prepared to intercept its progress, and defeat its object. The memorable fight off the coast of Pamphylia ensued, in which the Carthaginian general displayed so much ability as a naval commander, and so nearly retrieved, by a signal victory, the depressed fortunes of Antiochus. But the skill and activity of the Rhodians baffled all the efforts of the Syrian ships; which were at once unwieldy from their size, and encumbered with a heavy loading. Hannibal had the mortification to behold once more the rising fortunes of Rome bearing down his hopes, and thwarting his utmost endeavours. He witnessed the total discomfiture of his friends; saw the Phœnician fleet driven on the rocks, or scattered on the surface of the deep; and after a useless display of courage, and a partial success in the division which he personally commanded, he was compelled to join the general flight, and to seek for safety on the neighbouring shore.

To recover the power which he was thus daily losing at sea, Antiochus resolved to make a vigorous effort with the fleet under Polyxenidas, before the Consular army, led by the two Scipios, could gain a firm footing in Asia. But the Romans, with their vigilant allies the sailors of Rhodes, were fully prepared to meet the Syrian admiral. The hostile squadrons encountered near Teios, a city of Ionia, when victory once more declared for the confederates, who destroyed or captured more than thirty of the enemy's ships. The command of the Ægean was now entirely in the hands of the invaders; the Syrian garrisons were hastily withdrawn from Chersonesus, and the King retreated in no small panic to Sardis, where he expected a contingent of troops from Cappadocia, furnished by his son-in-law, Ariarathes. It is said that the reverses which he had already sustained even affected the reason of Antiochus. His conduct was marked with an unmanly trepidation and fickleness; and upon finding that he could not secure the alliance of Prusias, the sovereign of Bithynia, his rage and fear gave themselves vent in the most unbecoming terms of reproach and despair.

Syria. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64

The Scipios observe the festival of Mars.

The progress of the Consul at the head of the invading army, had been somewhat delayed by the necessity of celebrating the festival of Mars at the appointed season. Africanus, who was himself a priest of that god, took an important share in the religious ceremonies in which the soldiers were employed; being resolved to carry with him into Asia all the aids which the military system of the Romans was wont to derive from their warlike superstition, particularly when entering upon a new soil, and about to expose themselves to the untried powers of foreign divinities.

The Romans visit Troy, as the cradle of their ancestors.

When they had crossed the Hellespont, the Romans, who now delighted to cherish the recollection that they were descendants of Æneas, proceeded with great solemnity to visit the remains of ancient Troy, that famed and venerated seat of Phrygian sovereignty. The inhabitants of Dardanus and Rhœteum met the Roman soldiers on the plain which surrounded the old capital of Priam; whence they ascended, hand in hand, to the temple of Minerva, to perform sacrifice to their tutelary goddess, who still enjoyed divine honours amid the ruined walls, which she had not been able to protect, and spread the sanctity of her mild worship over the neighbouring fields, on which her heroes had fallen under the swords of their enemies. The soldiers of Africanus felt the auspicious influence of this interesting commemoration. They had come to claim with their affections, not less than with their arms, the country of their progenitors; and having conquered Europe and Africa, they were now about to add to their triumphs the third great division of the habitable world.*

Proposals for a treaty by Antiochus.

Availing himself of the delay occasioned by these repeated halts, Antiochus sent an ambassador to the camp of the Romans, in order to propose terms of peace. It was hoped by this monarch, that Scipio Africanus, as his glory could receive no accession from the reduction of a few provinces in Asia, which were always ready to change their master in the presence of a superior force, would not be ardently bent on the prosecution of a distant war. He expected much, too, from the paternal feelings of that renowned commander, whose son had fallen into the hands of the Syrians, and was at that time a prisoner with the King, who is said to have treated him with the utmost kindness. Heraclides, the envoy em-

* Livy, lib. xxxvii. c. 33.

ployed by Antiochus, represented to the Roman chiefs, that his master had already made great concessions, with the view of maintaining amity with their republic; that he had relinquished several strong positions and valuable towns on the Chersonesus; and that he was willing, rather than desolate his country with blood, to renounce also his just right to Smyrna and Lampsacus. The Consul informed the ambassador, that peace was not now to be retained at so mean a price. Antiochus, says he, whose ambition and restless spirit have drawn the Roman eagles across the Hellespont, must consent to resign all the territory which he holds westward of Mount Taurus, and also to defray the whole expense which the Romans have incurred in preparing for war. It was in vain that Heraclides applied more private arguments to the individual interests of Africanus, and promised that his son should be immediately delivered up to him, were the views of Antiochus promoted, in regard to a treaty with Rome. The conqueror of Zama returned for answer, that he was less surprised that the envoy of the Syrian King should be ignorant of the character of the Romans, than that he should not be acquainted with the condition of his own master. After relinquishing his defensive positions on the Hellespont, and having allowed his enemies to pass quietly into Asia, Antiochus, says he, may be compared to a horse, which has not only admitted the rein, but has patiently received a rider. Alluding, then, to his own concerns, Scipio continues: "I shall accept my son from his hands as the highest personal favour; I will hold myself ready to repay him by the highest personal service in my power. But as to public affairs, I can do nothing for his interest, except by giving him this one advice, that he accede to any terms of peace, proposed by the Romans, however hard and unreasonable they may appear to him."*

Rejected by the Romans.

Both sides prepare for battle.

Preparations were now made, on both sides, for battle. Eumenes joined the Romans with a considerable force, eager to share in the merit, and to brave the danger of a conflict, which he perceived was now altogether inevitable. Nor was Antiochus less active than his formidable opponents. With seventy thousand infantry and twelve thousand horse, he made haste to occupy a strong post near Mount Sipylus in Ionia; defending his camp, by means of ramparts and other fortifications, against any sudden attack on the part of the Romans, who had already assembled, in considerable strength, on the frontiers of the Pergamenian territory.

The son of Scipio restored.

Scipio Africanus had been obliged to leave his brother on his march, and to yield to the pressure of a severe indisposition, which confined him at Elæa. Whilst in that city, an embassy reached him from Antiochus, restoring to his arms his captive son. The gratitude of the Roman General was ardent and sincere; and as the only return which he could make to the Syrian King, he entreated him not to commit his affairs to the hazard of a battle, until the father of the youth whom he had just set at liberty had rejoined the camp of the Consul.

Decisive battle of Magnesia. B. C 190.

But Antiochus did not follow this advice, which was unquestionably meant for his advantage. The Romans having advanced within two miles of his lines, provoked him to the combat by every demonstration of martial ardour and of personal contempt. They even prepared to attack his intrenchments, and drive him from his position; when, at length, yielding to necessity, to his own impatience, or to the demands of his army, he descended into the plain to meet the insulting confederates. The fortune of the day was various, and the conflict obstinate and bloody. The phalanx and a select body of cavalry, trained according to the exercises and discipline of the renowned Alexander, constituted the main strength of the Syrians; whilst they were opposed by four legions of Roman soldiers, well armed, and full of courage; by a large body of Pergamenians, commanded by Eumenes, and by several thousand Macedonians, sent into the field by Philip. The celebrated horsemen, called the *Agema*, vindicated, on this occasion, their ancient fame; for, breaking through the Roman cavalry, they carried Antiochus a victor to the very gates of the enemy's camp, and threw a momentary consternation into the various ranks of the Consular army. But the tribune Æmilius, at the head of the reserve, checked, after a severe contest, the victorious Syrians. The aspect of the field immediately changed. Antiochus returned to his infantry, only to witness their total discomfiture; and the utter impossibility of recovering the ground he had lost, induced him to set an example of flight, which he continued, surrounded by a few horsemen, until he reached, about midnight, the walls of Sardis.

Flight of Antiochus into Syria.

But the strongest fortress in Asia Minor could no longer inspire confidence, or ensure safety to the vanquished King. Leaving Sardis, he accordingly hastened his retreat into the plains of Cilicia, whence he pursued, in great dejection, the road which led to Antioch. Destitute of defence, the principal cities in Ionia and Lydia opened their gates to the conquerors, or anticipated their arrival, by sending offers of submission. There was now no hope in arms, as the whole Syrian host had been either slaughtered at Magnesia, or dispersed by the active pursuit of the Romans; and the only resource which remained for Antiochus, was placed in the moderation of his powerful enemy, the jealousy of their allies, and the personal gratitude of the elder Scipio.

Embassy to the Romans at Sardis.

No time was to be lost in this critical and arduous predicament. Antiochus immediately selected for his ambassadors to the Roman generals, the experienced Zeuxis, who had long held an important command in Lydia, and his nephew Antipater, who had probably been the companion of the son of Africanus. The head-quarters of the Consul were already advanced to Sardis, where he appears to have been joined again by his illustrious brother; and it was in this capital of the Lydian province, that the deputies of the great King presented themselves before the victorious soldiers of the western republic, to implore their clemency in behalf of one of Alexander's successors, and to entreat that the throne of Seleucus might be allowed to stand.*

Peace granted, and the terms thereof.

Scipio Africanus replied to the speech of Zeuxis, who, in his address to the conquerors, had used the humblest language, and employed the most submissive arguments, that the crouching spirit of an Asiatic could dictate. The Roman, not less mindful of the wise policy which had every where seconded the

* Livy, lib. xxxvii. c. 36.

* Livy, lib. xxxvii. c. 44, *et seq.*

History. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

vigour of his country's arms, than of his private obligation to Antiochus, made haste to assure the Syrians, that the recent success of the Consul did not at all affect the moderation of his demands. The events of war, said he, depend upon the will of the gods, but the sentiments of the heart, and the generosity of our intentions, belong to ourselves. The King of Syria, instructed by misfortune, must henceforth confine his pretensions to a more limited territory, and resign, not only his claims upon all Grecian states and cities, but also upon that portion of Asia Minor which lies westward of Mount Taurus. To defray the expense of the war, he must pay, by successive instalments, the sum of five thousand talents; and, to secure the performance of the conditions thus imposed, he must surrender into the hands of the Romans twenty hostages, such as they shall require. To remove from him the temptation to enter anew upon a destructive war, or to annoy, by a menace of hostilities, any of the allies of Rome, he must likewise consent to give up his elephants, and all his navy, with the exception of ten ships; and even these are not to be allowed to extend their progress at sea, beyond a certain point on the coast of Cilicia, unless when they shall carry ambassadors, hostages, or tribute.

Stipulation in regard to Hannibal.

The severity of these terms was mixed with a becoming degree of generosity and self-denial, inasmuch as the Romans could have stripped Antiochus of all that they chose to leave him, and as they conferred upon Eumenes, and their other allies, the whole of the valuable provinces which they thus wrested from the Syrian crown. The stipulation in regard to Hannibal was the only one which indicated either fear or revenge; and fortunately for the fame of Africanus, as well as for that of Antiochus, it was not in the power of the latter to fulfil it, by delivering up the renowned Carthaginian into the hands of his enemies. It was reserved for another sovereign, and another Roman general, to employ the vile arts of perfidy and deceit against one of the greatest commanders of antiquity; and Hannibal, a few years afterwards, received from the hands of Prusias, the mean, cruel, and disgraceful treatment, which the treaty of Sardis failed to inflict.

Death of Antiochus. B. C. 187. — OL. 145. 2.

Antiochus did not long survive the battle of Magnesia, which had so entirely denuded him of power as a King, and of reputation as a military chief. The last act of his life continues to cloud his memory. Compelled by the pecuniary claims which pressed upon him to have recourse to violent measures, he formed the resolution of robbing one of those sacred emporiums, in which the caravans of Media and Persis were wont to deposit their goods, and to perform the stated acts of their religion. The assault, conducted by the monarch himself, was made in the night; but meeting with greater resistance than had been expected, the royal troops were repulsed by the fierce barbarians who guarded the temple; a great slaughter ensued, and Antiochus was numbered amongst the slain. A various and eventful reign of thirty-seven years was thus closed in a paltry attempt to pillage a few travelling merchants: and a King, to whose name the epithet "Great" was attached, sacrificed his life in a nocturnal brawl, whilst fighting against the commerce, the arts, and the religion of his subjects.

Accession of Seleucus Philopater.

The throne of Antioch was immediately filled by the eldest son of the late sovereign, Seleucus Philopater. The younger brother, Antiochus, who had been selected by the Romans as one of the twenty hostages which they demanded upon the peace of Sardis, was now in that condition of honourable captivity, learning the language and arts of his conquerors on the banks of the Tiber.

Syria. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

Fifteen years elapsed after the accession of Philopater, during which nothing of material consequence occurred to employ the pen of history. He appears to have paid punctually to the Romans the annual tribute with which they had burdened the crown of his father, and to have enjoyed, in uninterrupted security, the inglorious peace, of which that tribute was the price. But, like his predecessor, he was driven, by his necessities, to perpetrate, or to attempt an act of sacrilege. The treasurer, Heliodorus, being informed that the Temple of Jerusalem concealed a rich treasure, proceeded, at the command of his master, to demand from the High Priest a portion of his wealth for the use of the Syrian government. Onias, who at that time filled the highest office in the sanctuary, represented to the treasurer, that the gold and silver in question, of which the amount had been greatly exaggerated, was a charitable deposit, reserved for their widows and orphans. Heliodorus was not satisfied with this explanation, but proceeded to enter, by force, the holy gates of the Temple. His progress was arrested by supernatural means, which the reader will find described with much minuteness and animation in the second book of the Maccabees.

Sacrilegious attempt to pillage the temple of Jerusalem. B. C. 176. — OL. 151. 1.

Treason of Heliodorus; murder of Seleucus; and accession of AntiochusEpiphanes. B. C. 175. — OL. 152. 2.

The disappointment of the Syrian King in this nefarious attempt, was soon afterwards followed by his death. The miraculous interposition which saved Heliodorus from the guilt of sacrilege did not, it should seem, impress his mind with any salutary fear of the gods, or with the love of justice and fidelity. Upon his return to Antioch, he contrived the murder of his sovereign, whose throne he meant to usurp, in the absence at once of Antiochus the brother, and of Demetrius the son of Seleucus. This young prince was on his way to Rome, to succeed in quality of a hostage, his uncle, Antiochus Epiphanes, who was now to be relieved from that irksome restraint; and the opportunity thus presented to the treasurer of seizing upon the government, impelled him to perpetrate the horrid crime to which we have just alluded, and remove his master by a cup of poison. But the speedy appearance of Antiochus with an army, prevented the complete consummation of the treason, and the full success of the traitor. Heliodorus was expelled, and the brother of Seleucus Philopater, with the concurrence of Eumenes and Attalus, assumed the reins of authority, to the prejudice of his nephew Demetrius, whose juster claims were overlooked.

Trifling behaviour of Antiochus.

To supply the deficiency of his right to the throne, the new King is described as having descended to the lowest arts of popularity. He adopted, in the streets of Antioch, the dress and manners of those who, at Rome, announce themselves as candidates for public offices; he saluted the meanest of the people, joined in their amusements, solicited their suffrages, and scattered amongst them handfuls of money. The highest orders of Syrians despised at once the meanness of his character, and his unseasonable imitation of foreign customs; and, using their wit as the instrument of their revenge, they substituted for Epiphanes, the "illustrious," Epimanes,

History. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64. — OL. 153. 2.

the "fool:" an alternative of epithets, of which neither can be held as truly descriptive of his conduct or character.

No sooner had he recruited his army, and reestablished the finances of his kingdom, than he turned his thoughts to the enlargement of his territory, and in particular to the safety of his Egyptian frontier. His sister Cleopatra directed, at that period, the government of her son, Ptolemy Philometor; in which delicate office, she displayed so much wisdom and prudence, that no pretence could be found for involving the country in war. Upon the death of the regent, however, Antiochus opened his ears to a rumour, which spread from Alexandria, that his nephew had been advised by his ministers to renew the claims of Egypt upon Cœle-Syria and Palestine; and accordingly, without attempting to ascertain by inquiry, or to avert by negociation, the warlike intentions ascribed to the young King, he marched an army across the desert, and forthwith commenced hostilities. His fears or his ambition being gratified with some important advantages in the first campaign, he renewed his invasion in the following year, defeated Philometor in battle, and even took him prisoner.

He declares war against Egypt. B. C. 168.

Siege of Alexandria; and the arrival of Roman Commissioners.

The people of Alexandria, who alone had successfully withstood the irruption of Antiochus, chose for their King the younger brother of Philometor, on whom they conferred the surname of Evergetes. The Syrian monarch soon after laid siege to Alexandria; whilst, to distract the counsels of the new government, he restored the captive prince to the titular sovereignty of his kingdom. But the Egyptians had already despatched an embassy to Rome, describing their wretched condition, and imploring the aid of the Senate. Returning to complete his intention on the besieged town, in which the chief strength of Evergetes was placed, Antiochus was met at Eleusine by the ambassador Popilius Lænas, who, with Decimius and Hostilius, had been sent from Rome to remonstrate against his unprincipled aggressions. The Syrian King, to whom Popilius was personally known, expressed his delight at seeing an old acquaintance in so distant a country; but the Roman declined all compliment, until he should be informed whether Antiochus would instantly relinquish his views upon Egypt, and comply with the request of the Senate. The King glanced over the letter which was put into his hand, and said he would immediately proceed to consider its contents, and give an answer without delay. Nay, exclaimed the envoy, drawing a circle with his staff around the person of Antiochus, you shall answer it before you stir out of the narrow space which I have now circumscribed! The King then consented to follow the instructions of the Senate, and to withdraw his troops: upon which the haughty republican condescended to exchange civilities, and to revive his friendship for the Syrian hostage whom he had formerly known at Rome.

Submissive conduct of Antiochus, and conclusion of the war.

Philometor and Evergetes agree to reign in common.

The Roman Commissioners next employed themselves in negociating a peace between the two brothers, who agreed to occupy a common sceptre, and to share the honours of royalty together. Proceeding next to Cyprus, which had just been reduced by the sea forces of Antiochus, and wrested from the Egyptian dominion, they dismissed the Syrian fleet with orders to return to their own shores, and restored the allegiance of the island to its former masters.

Syria. From A. M. 3811 — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64. — OL. 154. 1.

In following the traces of the most authentic annals, we find Antiochus, soon after his humiliating repulse from Egypt, engaged in war with the Jews; but as we have narrated the principal events connected with that unhallowed enterprise under its proper head, we shall rest satisfied here with referring the reader to our article on JEWISH HISTORY.

The wars of Antiochus against the Jews.

His expedition into Upper Asia and death. B. C. 164.

Leaving his general Lysias in Palestine, the King, in person, undertook an expedition into Upper Asia, for the purpose, it is thought, of collecting tribute, as well as of checking the turbulent spirits of his barbarian subjects. Nothing remarkable is recorded in regard to the events of this campaign, if we except the sacrilegious assault which was made upon the temple of Elymais; the same emporium of eastern merchandise which had tempted the cupidity of Antiochus the Great. The gods were thought to protect, in this instance as in the former, the wealthy votaries who had confided to their keeping the treasures of Media and of the Indus; and the Syrians, baffled and disappointed, found it necessary to secure their safety by a speedy retreat before the bands of the enraged mountaineers, in whose district the temple was situated. Antiochus himself reached Ecbatana, smarting under the wounds he had received at Elymais; and it was in this capital that the news was conveyed to him that his armies in Palestine were utterly discomfited, that Jerusalem was retaken and fortified, and that the affairs of his enemies were every where greatly improved. In his rage he swore that the ruins of the Jewish cities should soon bury all their inhabitants; and setting out in haste, to realize his impious threats, he died at an obscure village, on the road to Babylon; his demise being accelerated partly by his wounds, and partly by a fall which he had suffered from his chariot.

Accession of Antiochus Eupator.

The throne of Syria was immediately filled by the young Antiochus, the fifth of the name, who is also known in history by the cognomen Eupator. Being only nine years of age, the cares of government were intrusted to the veteran Lysias, who had, indeed, been appointed by the late King both regent of the kingdom, during his absence in the east, and also guardian to the prince, whose education he was to direct.

Escape of Demetrius Soter from Rome. B. C. 162. — OL. 154. 3.

But the reign of this boyish sovereign was of very short duration, though acknowledged by the Romans and even supported by their influence. Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopater, who had been sent by his father as a hostage to Rome, and had remained in that city during the long usurpation of his uncle Epiphanes, no sooner heard of the death of the latter, than he made preparations for returning to Antioch. Unable to obtain the consent of the Senate, he contrived, with the help of the celebrated Polybius, and the Egyptian ambassador Menyllus, to procure the means of escaping from Italy; and embarking in a Carthaginian vessel at Ostia, he succeeded in deceiving the vigilance of his enemies, and reached in perfect safety the coast of Phœnicia. His appearance at Antioch was the signal for a revolution. The army secured the persons of Lysias and his royal ward, whom, to please Demetrius, they immediately put to death: and the nation at large, conceiving that the son of Seleucus could not have left Rome without the concurrence of the Senate, hailed his accession to the

History. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

throne with expressions of the greatest respect and attachment.

The beginning of the reign was embroiled with a Jewish war, of which, as usual, the events were various, and the conflicts most obstinate and bloody. But Demetrius, dreading the power of Rome more than that of Palestine, and finding that no reasonable concessions could procure the countenance of the Senate, resolved to court the alliance of the Greek Kings in Asia Minor; whose arms, if united, might still, he hoped, oppose a permanent barrier to the ambition of the haughty republic. His success, however, was not equal either to his expectation or to the strength of the arguments which he employed. In his attempts upon Cappadocia he added guile to reasoning; and, by the instrumentality of an intriguing woman, carried his designs so far as to change the succession to the throne. His designs were, however, ultimately defeated; and he very soon fell a prey to the craft of his enemies; who, in planning his destruction, had recourse to the same kind of stratagem, and to the use of the same weapons which he had employed against Ariarathes, the Cappadocian Prince. A Rhodian youth named Balas was induced to personate the character of a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, who, in fact, had been some years dead, but who was said to have been only concealed. Balas was taught to claim the crown of Syria. His pretensions were listened to by the Romans, who had not yet forgiven the flight of Demetrius: and, accordingly, assisted by that warlike people, as well as by the Jews, he took the field with an army, to dispute the throne of Antioch with the son of Philopater. Victory crowned his attempt. Demetrius was killed in the first battle, and the sceptre of the Seleucidæ passed into the hands of a Rhodian swindler.

Intrigues and death of Demetrius. B. C. 151. — OL. 157. 2.

Stratagem and accession of Alexander Balas. B. C. 150. — OL. 157. 3.

Alexander Balas soon proved himself unworthy to reign. Combining vanity with the most boundless voluptuousness and profligacy, he disgusted his subjects, who began to turn their thoughts to the sons of Demetrius, their late sovereign, who were enjoying an honourable retreat in the city of Cnidus. The eldest, who bore the name of his father, being encouraged by some of the governors and other leading men throughout Syria, hired a body of troops, and passing into Cilicia instantly raised the standard of rebellion againt the usurper. But Balas had a powerful support in the alliance of Egypt, the King of which country had given him his daughter in marriage; and had the spirit of the Rhodian been at all equal to his means, and to the high destiny which he pretended to vindicate, the efforts of the young Demetrius must have been crushed at the very outset. It was not long, however, before Ptolemy discovered that his son-in-law was utterly undeserving of his protection. He found him equally pusillanimous and faithless; upon which, after having himself refused the Syrian crown which the people of Antioch had solicited him to accept, he espoused the cause of the rightful heir, and offered to Demetrius at once the assistance of his arms and a bride in the person of his daughter Cleopatra. Balas at length roused by danger and shame resolved to make one effort to secure his throne. He advanced towards Antioch at the head of some Cilicians, whom he had gained over to his interests, and meeting in a field near the capital with the forces of Ptolemy and Demetrius, he rushed into battle with

Unworthy conduct of Balas: the claims of Demetrius Nicator, and his success. Death of Balas, and accession of Demetrius. B. C. 146. — OL. 158. 3.

thoughtless and ignorant impetuosity. The young King gained at once an easy victory and the surname of Nicator, by which he was thenceforth distinguished; and, to complete his success against this enemy of his house, he was presented, in a few days, with the head of the fugitive Balas, who had in vain sought for safety among the treacherous hordes of the Arabian desert. But the joy attending this good fortune was somewhat clouded by the death of Ptolemy Philometor, who sunk under his wounds about a week after the battle.

Syria. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

The royal house of Seleucus had now lost all the virtues which during several generations supported the Grecian throne of Syria, and was fast sinking into the voluptuous effeminacy of the Persian dynasty which it had displaced. Demetrius on the throne disappointed the hopes of his friends, and afforded to his enemies, by his feeble and versatile conduct, an apology, at once, and the means for plotting his ruin. The son of Alexander Balas was set up in opposition to him by Diodotus, who had served, in the quality of minister, that weak and unfortunate Rhodian. Demetrius found it necessary to take the field against this pretender; but being defeated in a battle which was fought near the walls of Antioch, he had the mortification to learn that his rival was proclaimed King of Syria by the title of Antiochus the Sixth, whilst he himself was compelled to seek for refuge in the fortress of Seleucia Pieria.

The son of Balas is proclaimed King, and defeats Demetrius. B. C. 144 — OL. 159. 1.

Diodotus, who administered the government in the name of the youth whom he had raised to its head, endeavoured to strengthen his interests by gaining the Jews, as well as by creating, on the coast of Cilicia, a powerful body of seamen, who soon thereafter degenerated into the character of piratical banditti. At length he aspired to the throne, which he had thus professed to strengthen for the family of Balas. He betrayed Jonathan the Jewish chief, whose zeal and activity had contributed much to the elevation of the young King, and after depriving that veteran of his life, he proceeded to the murder of the unfortunate boy himself, who occupied for about a year the name and seat of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Usurpation of Diodotus, and death of Antiochus the Sixth.

This usurper assumed the name of Tryphon, and maintained during four years the ascendency to which his crafty ambition had raised him. Demetrius sought in indolence and dissipation a solace for the loss of power; and it was not until the complaints of the Greeks in Upper Asia reached his ear, representing the sufferings and indignity to which they were subjected by the domination of the Parthians, that he shook off his contemptible habits, and resumed the character of a soldier. Leaving to a lieutenant the care of his native states, or rather of the war against Tryphon, whose authority was almost universally acknowledged, he placed himself at the head of the Asiatic Greeks, and prepared to meet in battle the Parthian Mithridates. After various success, the King of Syria was taken prisoner by his formidable opponent, and sent into Hyrcania, where he sustained ten years of captivity, mitigated, indeed, by the most humane attentions, and by the enjoyment of every indulgence that was not incompatible with his safe keeping.

Demetrius makes war on Parthia. He is taken prisoner.

Accession of Antiochus VII and death of Tryphon. B. C. 138. — OL. 160. 3.

The Syrian crown meanwhile passed to the head of his brother Antiochus, called Sidetes, or the hunter. Cleopatra, the wife of Demetrius, upon learning that her husband was a captive among the Parthians,

History. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

where he had espoused one of the daughters of Mithridates, immediately invited to her bed and the throne of his ancestors the young prince already named. Antiochus the Seventh listened to her proposals, and acceded to her conditions; and being joined by a large body of his countrymen, he took arms against Tryphon, whom he defeated in battle, pursued into Phœnicia, and from thence into Apamea, where the tyrant soon breathed his last.

The brother of Demetrius, either to avenge the dishonour of his family, or to secure his eastern frontiers against an active enemy, employed the resources of his kingdom in fitting out a mighty expedition, which he prepared to conduct in person into such of the Syrian provinces as were afflicted by Parthian invasion. His progress was at first marked with brilliant success; but at length, yielding to his own rashness, or to the guile of his foes, he was attacked to great disadvantage, and either killed on the field, or driven to an act of suicide.

Antiochus VII. slain among the Parthians.

Demetrius returns and resumes the throne; is defeated by the intrigues of Egypt, and murdered at Tyre. B. C. 126. — OL. 163. 3.

Demetrius, whose escape from Parthia may be ascribed either to accident or to intention, presented himself at Antioch, upon the death of his brother, to resume his troubled reign which had been interrupted by so many circumstances of treason and misfortune. His marriage with the Parthian Princess Rhodogyne alienated the affections of his wife Cleopatra, and gave great offence to her powerful friends in Syria. Involving himself in a war with Egypt, in order to support the pretensions of the Queen-regent against her husband Physcon, he gave place to a conspiracy at home, which ultimately deprived him both of his crown and his life. The Egyptian King fomented the turbulent humours of the Syrians, supplied them with troops and sent to them a competitor for the throne in the person of a youth, who was taught to claim his descent from Antiochus Epiphanes, though he was in reality the son of an Alexandrian broker. A battle, as usual, determined the contending claims. Demetrius was defeated; and upon taking refuge in Tyre was cruelly massacred, at the suggestion of his profligate wife, who eagerly sacrificed to ambition and revenge all the duties and sentiments of the female heart.

Alexander Zebina usurps the throne; and after a disputed reign of six years is put to death. B. C. 121. — OL. 164. 3.

The Egyptian impostor assumed the honours of royalty under the title of Alexander the Second, and disputed the occupation of the throne with the sons of Demetrius for nearly six years. Seleucus, the eldest of these youths, was greeted as King by a large party in the nation; but not being submissive enough to his mother, he fell a victim to her jealousy and to the aspiring wishes of a younger brother. Antiochus the Eighth, surnamed Grypus, was acknowledged the sovereign of Syria; who, receiving in marriage a daughter of Physcon, was immediately secured in his hereditary right by a powerful army of Egyptian mercenaries. A battle ensued. Alexander was worsted, and put to flight; and in an attempt, now become very common among Syrian rulers, to rob a temple of its treasures, he was either killed on the spot, or despatched by his pursuers at a small distance from Antioch.

Antiochus Grypus ascends the throne, which is disputed by his brother.

The tranquillity of Grypus's reign was soon disturbed by the claims of a brother whom Cleopatra had borne to Antiochus the hunter, during the captivity of Demetrius in Parthia. From the town Cyzicus, in which he was educated, this pretender is known in history by the name of Cyzenicus: and relying on the assistance of the Jews, whilst he was impelled by the intriguing and vindictive genius of his Egyptian wife, he raised an army with which he marched to Antioch, and soon precipitated the son of Demetrius from the throne. The victor assumed the vacant diadem under the title of Antiochus the Ninth, and insulted by his vices or silly pursuits the kingdom of Syria, during several months. Grypus, at the end of a year, advanced from Pamphylia with a formidable body of troops; upon which Cyzenicus retreated into Cœle-Syria, unable to oppose the progress of his brother, and entertaining no hope of an accommodation. The heir of Demetrius, however, instructed by misfortune, and diffident in regard to the chances of war, agreed to a partition of the kingdom; and reserving to himself the Greater or Upper Syria, of which Antioch was the proper capital, he granted to Cyzenicus the sovereignty of the province into which he had fled, with the power of fixing his seat of government at Damascus.

Syria. From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

A partition of the kingdom is agreed to, and a new seat of government is established at Damascus. B. C. 111. — OL. 165. 2.

This amicable arrangement, which promised peace and security to Syria, was interrupted after a short period by the murder of Grypus, perpetrated by an ambitious retainer, who seems to have aspired to his master's place. Cyzenicus embraced this opportunity to reunite the kingdom under one crown; but his nephews, the sons of Grypus, thwarted his intentions, challenged him to the field, and defeated him in a decisive battle. The King of Damascus lost his life, either by the sword of his enemies, or by his own hand, leaving one son to inherit his claims and to avenge his death. This youth, who reigned under the name of Antiochus the Tenth, and was, from the filial spirit with which he entered upon the war, saluted "Eusebes," succeeded in collecting to his standard a considerable force, with which he vanquished, in the first conflict, his cousin Seleucus, the conqueror of his father, and drove him into Cilicia, where he soon after perished. But Grypus had five sons, of whom four still survived to participate in the last honours of their expiring dynasty. Antiochus the Eleventh and Philip the First had recourse to arms to punish the murderers of their brother Seleucus, as well as to vindicate their own rights; but Antiochus Eusebes, having obtained the assistance of the Parthians, set their efforts at defiance, and maintained his seat on the throne of Antioch. Demetrius, the fourth son of Grypus, who had issued from the retirement of Cnidus to support the claims of his house, fell into the hands of the Parthians, and was led by them into captivity beyond the Euphrates, where he sank under the load of his disappointment.

Grypus murdered and Cyzenicus slain. B. C. 95. — OL. 171. 2.

As soon as the fate of this unhappy youth was known at Damascus, his youngest brother, the last in order of the five sons of Grypus, ascended the throne of Cœle-Syria. He was the twelfth who inherited the family name of Antiochus, to which, in his case, the cognomen of Dionysius was added; and his popular character aided by some talent for war enabled him to maintain, during two years, the independence of his provincial government, not only against his kinsman Eusebes, but also against his brother Philip, and the predatory bands of Arabs which issued incessantly from the Nabatheean desert. The hostility of these barbarians was more to be dreaded than the divided arms of the rival cousins.

Antiochus XII. ascends the throne of Damascus, and is killed, two years after, in battle with the Arabs. B. C. 85. — OL. 173. 4.

History.

From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

Dionysius, whose impetuous valour led him to attack their camp on the edge of their own wilderness, fell pierced with numerous wounds, surrounded by the greater part of his followers, and leaving the crown of Damascus to deck for the first time the brows of an Arabian chief.

The dynasty of Seleucus Nicator, the founder of the Greek kingdom of Syria, was now about to become extinct. Disgusted with their weakness, their folly, and their crimes, and exhausted by their interminable disputes and rivalships for power, the people of Antioch directed their eyes to a neighbouring nation, in search of wiser rulers and a more potent protector. They elected for their sovereign Tigranes, the King of Armenia, whose rising fortunes and vigorous administration appeared to promise to them the peace and security of which their whole nation had long been deprived. The sons of Grypus had, it should seem, already disappeared from the scene of conflict. Eusebes saved his life by a seasonable flight into Cilicia; and his wife Selené retired into a fortress of Commagene, to superintend the education of her two infant princes, and to await the chances of fortune.

Tigranes of Armenia invited to assume the government of Syria. B. C. 78. — OL. 175. 3.

Tigranes governed Syria with more vigour than mildness for the space of fourteen years; after which period the country of the Seleucidæ ceased to be a kingdom. The sovereign of Armenia, vanquished by Lucullus, yielded all his territories into the hands of the Romans. The conqueror, it is true, listened to the claims of the elder son of Selené, and even meditated his restoration to the throne; but the plans of Lucullus were thwarted by the more rigid policy of Pompey, and Antiochus Asiaticus, the name of the youth in question, was dismissed from the tent of the Roman General, as unworthy to reign, and even as unentitled to any compensation for the loss of his hereditary dominions. The authority of a Proconsul, who united civil to military powers, directed henceforth the affairs of Syria, until the decline of Roman ascendency, under the successors of Augustus, opened a path for other conquerors to avenge the cause of the Seleucidæ, and to establish a barbaric government on the ruins of the western republic.

Syria.

From A. M. 3811. — B. C. 193. to A. M. 3940. — B. C. 64.

Syria reduced into a Roman province by Pompey. B. C. 64. — OL. 179. 1.

PERSEUS KING OF MACEDON.

FROM A. M. 3826. B. C. 178. TO A. M. 3837. B. C. 167.

Biography — From A. M. 3826. — B. C. 178. to A. M. 3837. — B. C. 167.

We avail ourselves of the name of this monarch, to bring down the annals of his country until the period at which it finally merges into the Roman republic; being sensible that the history of Alexander's successors cannot be esteemed complete, so long as the kingdom of Macedon remains, and the sceptre is swayed by a member of the royal house of Pella. It is no doubt true, that, from the moment the Generals of Rome crossed the Adriatic and carried their victorious arms into Illyricum and Epirus, the events which follow are at least as closely connected with the history of the Romans as with that of the Greeks; and it was under this impression that we stopped short in our narrative of Macedonian affairs, at an early epoch in the reign of the fourth Philip, and referred the reader, for an account of subsequent transactions, to our sketch of Roman history, or to the biography of those great commanders, who ultimately conducted the legions to the eastern boundaries of Europe, and established there the supremacy of the Senate. On reconsidering, however, this part of our plan, we are convinced that it will contribute somewhat to the lucid order and arrangement which we are so desirous to maintain, if we devote a short article to the closing years of Macedon, and set forth its expiring efforts, for a separate and independent existence, under the last of its Kings.

Recapitulation. Battle of Cynocephale, and the effects of the peacewhich followed.

The battle of Cynocephale broke down the strength of Macedon, and gave a decided and permanent ascendency to the Romans in the affairs of Greece. The Rhodians, encouraged by their powerful allies, attacked Philip both by sea and land; whilst the other states, more disposed to cherish the remembrance of occasional despotism on the part of their Macedonian protectors, than to listen to the wise counsels of those, who already foresaw in their Roman auxiliary the designs and temper of their future masters, refused to accede to such a confederacy, as might have at once defeated the ambitious views of Rome, and restricted, within safe limits, the dreaded power of their northern neighbour. The terms of the peace which were granted to the solicitations of the vanquished King, disarmed his hands whilst they lowered his dignity. He was commanded to surrender every city in Greece which was occupied by his troops; and to disclaim all authority over the minor commonwealths and free towns, which lay scattered in different parts of Thrace, and on the shores of the Bosphorus. He was compelled to give up his ships of war, and to pay, for the indemnification of his conquerors, a thousand talents of gold; whilst, in order that these conditions might be observed and strictly fulfilled, he was required to send his younger son, Demetrius, a hostage to Rome. Nay, so far was the spirit of Philip subdued and his fears alarmed, that, when the Romans were about to be embroiled with the King of Syria, he thought it expedient to send an embassy to the capital of these republicans, to assure them of his strict neutrality in regard to Antiochus, as well as of his readiness to assist with supplies and furnish with guides, such divisions of their army as might happen to pass through his dominions.

Perseus King of Macedon. — From A. M. 3826. — B. C. 178. to A. M. 3837. — B. C. 167.

The miserable policy of the Syrian monarch was no doubt one of the principal means of driving Philip into a closer alliance with Rome, than either his personal inclination, or the interests of his kingdom, would otherwise have induced him to form. The pretensions of Antiochus himself to the throne of Macedon, and the open countenance which he afforded to the Prince of Athamania, who was also taught to fix his eyes on the same lofty object, had carried the King to adopt the very questionable measure of assuming arms in cooperation with his formidable conquerors. For we find that, whilst the Scipios were preparing to conduct their troops across the Hellespont, and to attack the Syrians in their hereditary provinces, the Macedonians were actively employed, in conjunction with the Romans, in expelling from certain strongholds in Thessaly the inconstant but warlike Ætolians, who had already forfeited the esteem, or despised the protection of the Senate. Acting in the capacity of an ally of Rome, Philip, it is true, succeeded in recovering a portion of the territory, as well as of the influence, of which he had been deprived by the fortune of war; but his talents, both in respect of diplomacy and the more important resources of the military art, were much too moderate to justify the hope which he seems to have cherished in his own bosom, and to have inspired into the minds of others, in regard to the reestablishment of Macedonian independence on a new and lasting basis.

Subserviency of Philip.

Ambitious views of the Romans, and their hostility to Macedon.

The recent additions made to his power on the borders of Thessaly and Thrace, alarmed the vigilant jealousy of the Romans. A commission was appointed to hear complaints, and award redress; and Quintius Cæcilius, who had been named to direct the movements of that migratory court, proceeded to the Thessalian territory, to meet the King of Macedon, and to confront him with his accusers. In reply to the charges of violence and aggression, which the deputies of the injured districts urged against him, Philip pronounced a speech full of recrimination and contempt; retorting upon his enemies the ambitious motives and unjust procedure, with which they attempted to load his character; and glancing at the selfish policy of the Romans, he concluded by reminding them, that "the sun of all his fortunes had not yet set." It was in vain, however, for the Macedonian sovereign to give vent to his indignation, or to console the impotence of his rage by uttering useless threatenings. The Commissioners gave sentence, that he should immediately withdraw his garrisons from all the cities of which he had lately taken possession; whilst, as to other matters in dispute, they reserved to themselves the power of pronouncing a decision whensoever a proper court should have been appointed,

Biography. From A. M. 3826. — B. C. 178. to A. M. 3837. — B. C. 167.

and due inquiry instituted at the several localities in question. Cæcilius acted on the same principles, when discharging the duty of umpire between Philip and Eumenes. The claims of the latter to certain towns, seized upon and garrisoned by the Macedonians, were tacitly allowed, though no right could be shewn on the one hand, and no violence proved on the other. Philip was again commanded to withdraw his troops. He yielded to an authority which he could no longer resist; and satisfied himself with an appeal to the Senate, in whose presence he intended to sue for his rights, thus unjustly questioned, and to claim compensation for the numerous sacrifices which he had been compelled to make, by the arbitrary proceedings of Cæcilius and his colleagues.

Grand project of Philip.

It could not, meanwhile, escape the penetration of Philip, that he would soon have to contend with the overwhelming power of Rome, for the possession of the narrow territory of ancient Macedonia. It was, therefore, the principal object of his administration, during the peace which followed the disastrous battle of Cynocephale, to strengthen the internal resources of his kingdom by improving agriculture, by extending commerce, and by introducing within his confines the first stock of a hardy peasantry from the neighbouring fields of Thrace. He laboured also to form new alliances with the warlike barbarians who dwelt on either side the Danube. The tribes of Scythians, and those numerous branches of the great Gothic family, who were destined afterwards to avenge the successors of Alexander, and to humble the Roman power, had already formed themselves into communities of considerable extent and regularity; and, from the growing intercourse of war and treaties, they had learned to respect the superiority of civilized life, to reverence the fame of the Macedonian arms, and even to court the benevolence and counsel of the Macedonian government. With such allies, devoted to enterprise, and delighted with the hazards of war, Philip thought it not altogether impracticable to direct into the bosom of Italy, from the countries north and east, a torrent of invasion, which would withdraw the Consuls from the shores of the Ægean, and engage the attention of the Senate in measures of self-defence. But time was necessary for maturing an undertaking at once so arduous and full of peril. To effect his object, therefore, with the greater security, Philip sent to Rome his son Demetrius, who was to plead the cause of Macedon, and to maintain, if possible, the pacific relations which subsisted at that period between the two countries.

Defeated by the discord which prevailed in his family.

These schemes of conquest and revenge were ultimately defeated by the domestic discord which rent the royal family of Pella. The favour with which Demetrius was received at Rome, excited at once the jealousy of his father, and the more dangerous envy of his brother Perseus. The latter saw reason to apprehend, that the right of primogeniture would not secure his succession to the throne, if the popular pretensions of Demetrius should be supported by the influence of the Roman Senate: and Philip himself allowed his hatred and suspicion of his public enemies to poison the paternal sentiments of confidence and affection towards a deserving son, whose only fault consisted in the openness of his character. The treachery and deceit of Perseus at length prevailed. Demetrius was murdered; and the anguish which preyed upon the heart of Philip, joined to the resentment excited by the cruel baseness of his elder son, hurried this unfortunate King into his grave.

Perseus King of Macedon. From A. M. 3826. — B. C. 178. to A. M. 3837. — B. C. 167.

Almost immediately before his death, the Macedonian monarch had sent an embassy to his rude allies northward of the Danube, with the view of hastening their movements towards the upper boundaries of the Roman commonwealth. A whole people obeyed his summons, and advanced into Thrace, on their way to the Adriatic; but his death distracted the counsels of their savage chiefs, and ultimately occasioned their complete overthrow. Wasted by war, and enfeebled by hunger and the severity of the climate, thousands perished before they could reach Illyricum. Nor was their return less disastrous; for, trusting to the ice of the Danube, which they overloaded with their cattle and waggons, they were precipitated into the stream, in which the greater part of them lost their lives; a fate which did not deter their warlike descendants from renewing more fortunate expeditions against the masters of the south, and from impressing the terror of their name in every province which acknowledged the Roman government, from the Rhine to Mount Atlas, and from the Euxine Sea to the Pillars of Hercules.

Accession of Perseus. B. C. 178. — Ol. 150. 3.

The accession of Perseus to the throne of Macedon turned aside, for a time, the calamities of war, as it calmed the jealousy, or allayed the fears of the Romans. The son of Philip, however, received but a feeble sceptre, inasmuch as the untimely death of Demetrius alienated the affections of the nation from his cold-hearted, treacherous brother, and confirmed in the Roman Senate a unanimous determination to visit that murder on the head of him who had contrived it. The barbarian confederates of his father, too, had reason to complain of his weakness or defection, as he afforded them no assistance in their unfortunate expedition into Dardania, and supplied them with no means to facilitate their return, when the object of that expedition was found impracticable.

His wise measures.

To repair the mischief he had done, and to recover the moral influence which he had lost at home, Perseus employed the beginning of his reign in conciliating the affections of his subjects; in restoring to their country and possessions such persons as had fallen victims to the resentment of his predecessor; and in granting to all orders and parties the benefits of equal government, and of impartial preferment.

Attempts to gain allies.

His fear of Rome was chiefly shewn in the assiduity with which he courted her allies in Greece. He was obsequious, in the highest degree, to the Athenians and Achæans, whose fugitive slaves he offered to give up, and to whose tribunals he promised to deliver every such person as had fled from justice, and found an asylum in any part of his dominions. He cultivated with unceasing earnestness the alliance or neutrality of almost all the Grecian states. He applied his solicitations to the people of Thessaly, Bœotia, and Ætolia, and thought his pains amply rewarded, wherever his good offices were not positively rejected or disdained. He formed a close connection with the small states of Epirus, negociated with the King of the Illyrians, and brought over to his views the chief of the Odryssians, the most warlike leader in Thrace. The Rhodians, already not

Biography. From A. M. 3826. — B. C. 178. to A. M. 3837. — B. C. 167.

a little disaffected towards their Italian allies, shewed themselves inclined to listen to the proposals of Perseus. The King of Syria entered into treaty with him, and strengthened this alliance by yielding his daughter in marriage. Prusias of Bithynia, at the same time, manifested a desire to oppose the formidable encroachments of the Romans; and, as a pledge of his sincerity in this point, he solicited the hand of a Macedonian princess.

But these acquisitions were of small weight, when compared with the anger of Rome, and the hostile disposition of the most powerful states in Asia Minor. Eumenes was still the avowed and implacable enemy of Macedon. Instead of sending an embassy to the banks of the Tiber, that monarch proceeded thither in person, with the view of laying before the Senate an exaggerated account of the warlike preparations made by Perseus, and of the menacing and formidable attitude which Macedonia had assumed. Her army, he asserted, could now muster thirty thousand foot and five thousand horse; her magazines were full of corn, and her treasury well stocked with money; and the recruits which her own territory could not supply, would be amply furnished by the hardy natives of Illyricum and Thrace. When, in reply to these inflammatory statements, the Macedonian deputies were allowed to speak, the Senate could hardly refrain from expressing their hatred of Perseus, and their hostile intentions against his country, by the most indecent impatience and ungracious gestures. Such treatment could not fail to rouse indignation in the breasts of the ambassadors; and accordingly giving way to a sentiment so natural and patriotic, they declared that their master having done every thing in his power to prove that his intentions were pacific, would no longer sacrifice his most obvious interests, to preserve the forms of peace with a haughty and unaccommodating republic: and should the Romans persevere in seeking a pretext for war, he would employ his best resources in defence of himself and kingdom, and trust to the determination of fortune for the result.

Eumenes stirs up the Romans against him. B. C. 172. — OL. 152. 1.

The Romans prepare for war.

The Senate could not be ignorant of the ulterior designs of Perseus, whose independence, dignity, and safety were equally concerned in counteracting the growing ascendency of Rome. But their arms, meantime, were engaged in Spain and Liguria; and no occasion sufficiently provoking or plausible had yet presented itself, for turning them directly against the Macedonians. An attempt on the life of Eumenes at length furnished an apology for hostilities, which could not, in any circumstances, have been long averted. Perseus was accused of an intention to murder his rival, as well as of practising by poison against the safety of certain distinguished Romans, who were employed in the public service. Preparations were accordingly made on the shores of the Adriatic for the invasion of Macedon; and two legions of unusual strength were immediately levied, and placed under the command of Licinius Crassus the Consul, to whom the charge of the war was committed. Nor did the Romans neglect recourse to their usual expedient of embassies. Deputies were sent to the Rhodians to recover their wavering affections, and also to several states in Epirus and Thrace. No one, indeed, was commissioned to the court of Perseus; but that monarch, still unwilling to put his fortunes to the hazard of war, solicited an interview with Marcius Philippus, who had been sent to Epirus, in order to exculpate himself from the foul charges with which he had been loaded in the Senate. The King was amused and deceived. Marcius listened to his defence, pronounced it satisfactory, and proposed a truce; but the interval was employed in accelerating the march of the legions, and in rousing the activity of the allies. The fraud of the ambassador prepared the triumph of the general; and the ruin of Perseus was planned by the son of his father's friend, the individual whom he himself selected as most worthy of his confidence.

Perseus King of Macedon. From A. M. 3826. — B. C. 178. to A. M. 3837. — B. C. 167.

Publius Licinius Crassus left Brundusium, at the head of more than twenty-five thousand horse and foot, expecting to be joined by a large body of allies from Achæa, Ætolia, and Pergamus. Perseus likewise took the field with a powerful army, determined to inflict the first miseries of the war on those perfidious Greeks, who invited and sustained the Roman invaders. But the advance of the enemy into Thessaly prevented the revenge meditated by the Macedonians. The hostile armies encamped on either side of the Peneus, the one so nearly equal in strength to the other, that their commanders seemed more inclined to be guided by contingencies, than to hazard a decisive battle. The events of the first campaign were, on the whole, favourable to the cause of Macedon; and if Perseus had possessed any share of the military talent which had been displayed, on so many important occasions, by his royal ancestors, the invaders of his country would have deeply deplored their ambitious enterprise. Winter, however, put an end to the movement of the troops, and the chiefs retired to mature their plans for more effective operations upon the return of the year.

Licinius Crassus invades Macedon. B. C. 171. — OL. 152. 2.

Perseus takes the field.

Aulus Hostilius assumed, with his Consulship, the command of the army in Thessaly. But his character, deficient in almost every civil and military virtue, only strengthened the interests of Perseus, and alienated the allies of Rome. The Macedonians gained several important advantages in the field, and made still greater progress in securing the good-will and cooperation of certain active confederates; and this year, like the last, without producing any decisive event, left the son of Philip in more prosperous and hopeful circumstances than it had found him.

The expedition of A. Hostilius. Success of Perseus.

The third campaign opened, on the part of the Romans, under the auspices and direction of Quintus Marcius Philippus, now enjoying the rank of Consul, and known to the reader as the person who, when discharging the office of ambassador, had deceived the confidence of Perseus at an interview which the latter solicited. But the craft of diplomacy has nothing in common with the ingenuity, firmness, and penetration which command success in war. Marcius achieved nothing in the field that is in the smallest degree worthy of remembrance, if we except a laborious march through certain defiles in the hills of Macedonia, and a retreat equally full of toil and disaster. The ignorant presumption of the Romans saved Perseus, and the groundless fears of the latter saved the former. Had the Macedonians acted with decision, the invading army must either have perished from hunger, or have fallen an easy prey to their enemies; and had the Consul proceeded with firmness, the panic of the King would have resigned into his hands

Third campaign under Marcius Philippus. B. C. 170. — OL. 152. 3.

Biography. From A. M. 3826. — B. C. 178. to A. M. 3837. — B. C. 167.

the Capital and the best provinces of his dominions, and have conferred on Marcius Philippus the laurels which were afterwards secured by the less questionable merit of Æmilius Paulus.

Another year was thus added to the war, without furthering the object which the Senate had contemplated. Three Consular armies had been baffled in the attempt to subdue Macedon, and to confirm the ascendency of Rome among the Grecian states; and the hopes of the Roman people were already turned into the bitterest invective, and the most gloomy forebodings. The appointment of Lucius Æmilius to the command of the army employed against Perseus gave, indeed, new vigour to the war, and revived the expectation, that the legions would finally triumph over the Macedonian phalanx. But so sarcastic and virulent were the remarks of the military critics at home, that the Consul. immediately upon his election, addressed the assembled people; assuring them, that if any individuals in their number thought themselves qualified to give such counsel as would enable him to bring to a fortunate issue the ensuing campaign, he would defray the expense of their journey into Macedon, and retain them near his person as his guides and advisers. If, however, they did not think it expedient to accept his invitation, he hoped they would reserve their strictures on the proceedings of the army till the expiration of his command.

Appointment of Æmilius Paulus. B. C. 169. — OL. 153. 1.

The exertions of Perseus kept pace with the danger to which his kingdom was exposed from the renewed preparations of the Romans, and particularly from the character of the new Consul. He repeated his efforts to rouse the jealousy of the Greek Princes in Asia, whose territories, he assured them, would be the next object of cupidity to his rapacious invaders; and he urged Eumenes, the Cappadocians, Syrians, and Egyptians, to join his standard, in order to repel the ambitious republicans of the west from the shores of the Ægean. But his efforts to obtain allies were attended with little success. His sincerity was doubted, and his selfishness precluded all hearty co-operation; and he was accordingly left to combat, single-handed, with an enemy who had never yet concluded a war but as conquerors.

Æmilius employed some time in restoring the discipline, as well as in increasing the numbers of his army. His vigilance prevented those casual encounters, in which the natives of a hilly country are sure to gain the advantage; and he even repressed the ardour of his troops, by declining battle on terms apparently equal, intending thereby to increase the confidence of Perseus, who had already begun to deride his cautious policy. But the King of Macedon soon discovered that the delays of the Consul did not proceed from fear. A successful movement of the legions compelled the presumptuous monarch to fall back upon Pydna, whither Æmilius instantly followed him, and in one decisive conflict stripped him of his kingdom, put an end to his dynasty, and blotted Macedonia from the list of nations. A rapid flight conveyed Perseus from the immediate pursuit of the conquerors; but he was soon afterwards taken, with his family and treasures, and compelled, in the following year, accompanied by his two sons, to grace the triumph of the victorious Consul.

Battle of Pydna. Perseus taken, and carried to Rome.

Perseus King of Macedon. From A. M. 3826. — B. C. 178. to A. M. 3837. — B. C. 167.

The last of Macedonian sovereigns survived this melancholy change of fortune about the space of four years, which he spent in ungenerous restraint at Alba. Only one of his sons outlived him; and the royal youth, it is said, was reduced to the necessity of earning his maintenance in the humble occupation of a carver and turner, from which he was subsequently raised, by his proficiency in the art of writing, to the appointment of scribe or secretary in one of the public offices.

Vanquished in war, and deprived of their leaders, the people of Macedon waited, with patient humility, the decision of the conquerors, in regard to the future destiny of their country. The deputies from the principal cities and districts met at Amphipolis, where Æmilius, now vested with the authority of Proconsul, proceeded to unfold the will of the Senate. He informed them, that the kingdom was thenceforth to be divided into four separate states or provinces; that the principal city in each of these was to be considered as the Capital, in which a local government would be exercised, laws administered, and the revenue collected, under the superintendence of an authority appointed by Rome. He farther instructed them, that it was the pleasure of the Senate that no troops should be maintained in Macedon, beyond such a force as might be found necessary for the defence of the frontier, exposed to the barbarians; that no timber fit for ship-building should be cut down without permission from the Proconsul; and that the working of the gold and silver mines should be entirely discontinued.

Settlement of Macedon as a Roman province. B. C. 167. — OL. 153. 2.

In this manner was the country of Alexander the Great reduced into the form of a Roman province, by a soldier of fortune; and a successor of that renowned prince was dragged at the chariot wheels of a private citizen, sprung from a race of barbarians, of whose existence the Greek historians had but recently discovered the traces, and whose exploits had but lately reached the ears of Grecian warriors. The ascendency of Rome was now complete, from the remotest point of Peloponnesus to the northern boundaries of Illyricum and Macedonia; and henceforward for awhile, the History of the world is comprised in that of the Republic.

PLATO.

FROM A.M. 3576. B.C. 428. TO A.M. 3656. B.C. 348.

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

HAVING now brought to a close the separate History of Greece, we proceed with our account of Grecian Philosophy. Our readers have been already presented with the particulars of the life of Socrates, whose moral worth illustrated the age in which he lived, and whose pupils and admirers branched out into so many separate families, that he has been very justly entitled the great patriarch of Grecian philosophy. The other schools received further advances or additional importance at different periods of the Roman history. The doctrines of the later Academy may be best delivered when we examine the life of Cicero; and the opinions of the Stoics and of the Epicureans may be examined with the greatest propriety, when, under the Emperors, the greatest geniuses of the nation were willing to console themselves, by resolving all events into an eternal necessity, or into casual combinations; and each extreme of philosophy was alternately tried, to steel the sinking fortitude of human nature, or to justify indifference, where public exertion might have been accompanied with personal danger. The doctrines of the great Stagirite, as connected with the course of history, refer themselves to a still later period, gaining the highest ascendant in public estimation when they were least understood. It is a singularity, indeed, attending the fate of Aristotle's works, which has been often remarked, that in proportion as knowledge and good sense have prevailed, his moral and political writings have been highly appreciated; but that great as is the intrinsic value of these, they have never at any period acquired the same vogue which his physical and metaphysical dreams, and his apparatus of logical chicane, attained in the schools and in the church, during a period of comparative darkness, and under an eclipse of the reasoning and inventive faculties of man. The history of the later Academy will therefore accompany the last period of the Roman republic; the doctrines of the Stoic and Epicurean schools will be connected with the Roman Emperors; and those of the Peripatetic will be introduced after the fall of the empire; and the state of their particular age will be strongly marked by a full investigation of those works of Aristotle which the Scholastics neglected, as well as of those more congenial productions of his which it required equal subtilty either to understand or to misinterpret; and upon which their elaborate commentaries remain as matchless instances of ingenious trifling and misapplied sagacity. But Plato and the earlier Academics stand alone. The school of Alexandria, indeed, adopted what they could find of visionary in the writings of Plato, and incorporated it in their own miscellany of mystical reveries. The importance of that school however, in public history was not equal to its pretensions; but was in truth as fabulous and imaginary as some of its own transcendental doctrines. To have connected the history of Plato with that of persons who depraved and disguised his notions, and who were themselves at the same time comparatively insignificant in the part which they acted in the great theatre of the world, would have been to injure his memory, and to confound rather than to illustrate his system. We have thought it best, therefore, to introduce the life of Plato by itself, as an appendage to the separate history of Greece; so that the impressions of our readers, after that eventful tale, may close with the profound and humane philosophy of a writer who was one of his country's highest ornaments, and whose works remain as the great model of Athenian genius, elegance, and urbanity.

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

Our memoir will contain a bare outline of the principal facts of the life of Plato, as far as they can be authenticated by the concurrent testimonies of Cicero, Apuleius, and Diogenes Laertius. We shall reject all fables; and think it unnecessary, for instance, to trouble our readers with the tale that Plato was born of a virgin mother, and that he had the honour of Apollo for his father, though Diogenes and Apuleius, and Plutarch and Lucian, concur in the story; nor do we think it worth while to stay and inquire whether the fable might not originate in some circumstance of illegitimate birth, or in the fact that Plato was born on one of Apollo's festivals. In like manner, we cannot dwell on the account that a swarm of bees gathered round the cradle, and settled on the infant's lips, though Cicero,* in one passage, assumes the fact. We prefer relating what may be credited, and trust that our readers will approve our caution, though it may deprive us of some amusing materials.

Our narrative will be interspersed with brief abstracts of some of those dialogues of Plato, which we think contain the best views of his sentiments, or in which we suspect the characters and objects of the speakers to have been generally misapprehended. To the narrative we shall subjoin a general outline of Plato's doctrines, with a few general reflections on the bearings of his philosophy: and here we shall maintain the same reserve as in our relation of facts. We shall state Plato's own doctrines from his own writings, and we shall not trouble ourselves with the consideration of notions, (and of such there is abundance,) which are generally attributed to him, but of which we do not find the slightest trace in his own writings.

Plato was born of Athenian parents, in the island of Ægina, in the first year of the eighty-eighth Olympiad, (B.C. 428.) In his early life he devoted himself much to poetry, and is said to have produced an epic poem, which he committed to the flames, and a drama, which was represented. When about the age of twenty, he became a disciple of Socrates, and conti-

* *Platoni cum in cunis parvulo dormienti apes in labellis consedissent, responsum est, singulari illum suavitate orationis fore, ita futura eloquentia provisa in infante est.— De divinat.* lib. i. 36.

tinued with him for eight years, till that great and amiable philosopher fell a sacrifice to the rancour of party, disguised under the pretext of zeal for the national religion. Plato attended his master during his trial, was one of those who offered to speak in his defence, (though the judges would not allow him to proceed,) and to be bound as a surety for the payment of his fine; and after the fatal sentence waited on him in prison, and was present during his last moments.

It appears that Plato had written one or two dialogues in the lifetime of Socrates; and there is much reason to believe, that, if those dialogues exist in the present collection of his works, they are *The Lysis, Phædrus, The Banquet,* and perhaps the *Protagoras.* All these bear strong marks of youthful fancy. In the three first, the dramatic character so completely predominates, that the arguments seem only introduced as illustrative of the manners and temper of the individuals. *The Banquet* is a perfect comedy. The choice phrases and pretty turns of Lysias, the grandeur and affected antitheses of Gorgias, covertly represented in the speeches of their respective admirers, Phædrus and Pausanias, are finely contrasted with the plain severity of Pericles's style, in the speech of Eryxamachus; and the broad humour and wild ribaldry of Aristophanes, are but a foil to the less prominent but more significant irony of Socrates. It is to be lamented that the subject of the dialogue, Love, leads to illustrations from the grossest sensuality and vilest depravity; but Socrates has evidently aims of a high moral cast in the part which he takes in the conversation. Indeed, Alcibiades, whilst he does justice to his preceptor's moral character, has introduced an admirable description of the manner by which Socrates in general proceeded from the most familiar subjects, and from trite and obvious topics to insinuate reflections of a graver nature, and to lead his hearer's mind into a train of useful thought.*

The object of *The Protagoras* seems to be in a great degree to represent the style and doctrines of that ingenious and eloquent declaimer in contrast with those of Socrates. The dialogue, though intending an exposure of the artifices of Rhetoric, and of the trickery of exterior pomp, is written in a grave and dignified style; and the poetical imagery with which it is ennobled is of the highest cast. It is altogether one of the most elegant of Plato's dialogues; and a more plausible or beautiful harangue cannot be imagined than the fine speech delivered by Protagoras. It is a masterpiece of the kind. But the lordly declaimer is much embarrassed by the close mode of combat practised by Socrates; and, the first moment he can disengage himself, expatiates afresh in that amplitude of discourse where the colourings of the imagination can be best used to dazzle and delude, and in which ingenious hypothesis and splendid illustrations may be substituted for proofs with the greatest chance of success. For an outline of this dialogue, sketched by the hand of a master, we would beg to refer our English readers to Mr. Gray's posthumous works, published by Mr. Matthias;* and we only regret that our limits will not permit us to insert an abstract, which is at once so just in the statement of the arguments, and gives such fine glimpses of the original in the colour of the diction.

Another circumstance which makes it probable that these dialogues were written at that period of Plato's life, is, that the poetical splendour with which they abound is rather of a mythological than a metaphysical cast. They are entirely destitute, not merely of the subtilties and of the refined discussions which appear in some of the other productions of Plato, but of those grand and noble reveries into which his soul at a maturer age delighted to throw itself, when he had refuted the Sceptics by a logic of his own, still more subtle than theirs, and when his own system of intellectual existences had been formed and completed. The poetry in these dialogues, on the contrary, is rather popular than philosophical.

Soon after the death of Socrates, Plato retired to Megara; and it is generally believed that he there composed those three simple and beautiful dialogues connected with the fate of his master; *The Defence, The Crito,* and *The Phædo.* The dramatic parts of these dialogues, and particularly that of *The Phædo,* abound with pathetic touches; and there is such an air of nature throughout, that the reader is impressed with a share of the author's sensibility, and is at once present and interested in the scene described. The last conversation of the great patriarch of Grecian philosophy, is recorded by his affectionate pupil with every circumstance which can indicate the writer's devoted veneration and deep regret; or which can conciliate the reader's esteem and admiration. The plain integrity, the cheerful and even playful temper, the genuine intrepidity of Socrates on the eve of death, are so simply and forcibly represented, that we feel that whether imagination or memory supplied the particulars of the conversation recited, all the manners of the dialogue, the attitudes and tones and gestures of the speaker must have been drawn from life; and every little circumstance speaks the language of a heart retracing its fondest recollections.

The argument discussed is suitable to the occasion; the Immortality of the Soul. Upon this momentous subject, which should seem to defy and to confound the powers of human Reason unenlightened by Revelation, Socrates is represented as urging that the soul cannot be a modification of the body, for the soul

* Οἷον δὲ ὀυτοσὶ γέγονε τὴν ἀτοπίαν ἄνθρωπος καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ, οὐδ' ἐγγὺς ἂν εὕροι τίς ζητῶν, οὔτε τῶν νῦν, οὔτε τῶν παλαιῶν· εἰ μὴ ἄρα οἷς ἐγὼ λέγω ἀπεικάσοι τις αὐτὸν· ἀνθρώπων μὲν μηδενὶ, τοῖς δὲ σειληνοῖς καὶ σατύροις, αὐτόν τε καὶ τοὺς λόγους. καὶ γὰρ οὖν καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις πιοέλιπον, ὅτι καὶ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ ὁμοιότατοι εἰσὶ τοῖς σειληνοῖς τοῖς διοιγομένοις. εἰ γὰρ ἐθέλοι τις τῶν Σωκράτους ἀκούειν λόγων, φανεῖεν ἂν πάνυ γελοῖον τὸ πρῶτον· τοιαῦτα καὶ ὀνόματα καὶ ῥήματα ἔξωθεν περιαμπέχονται σατύρου ἄν τινα ὑβριστοῦ δορᾶν· ὄνους γὰρ καν-θηλίους λέγει, καὶ χαλκέας τινὰς καὶ σκυτοτόμους καὶ βυρσοδέψας, καὶ ἀεὶ διὰ τῶν ἀυτῶν τὰ ἀυτὰ φαίνεται λέγειν· ὥστε ἄπειρος καὶ ἀνόητος ἄνθρωπος πᾶς ἂν τῶν λόγων καταγελάσειε. διοιγομένους δὲ ἰδὼν ἄν τις, καὶ ἐντὸς αὐτῶν γιγνόμενος, πρῶτον μὲν νοῦν ἔχοντας ἔνδον μόνους εὑρήσει τῶν λόγων· ἔπειτα θειοτάτους καὶ πλεῖστα ἀγάλματα ἀρετῆς ἐν αὑτοῖς ἔχοντας καὶ ἐπὶ πλειστον τείνοντας μᾶλλον δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶν ὅσον προσήκει σκοπεῖν τῷ μέλλοντι καλῷ κἀγαθῷ ἔσεσθαι· ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ὦ ἄνδρες ἃ ἐγὼ Σωκράτους ἐπαινῶ.—*Convivium,* p. 221, 222.

* In quarto, 1814, vol. ii. p. 387.

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

gives life to the mass which it informs, it controls and regulates the functions of the perishable frame with which it is connected.

The conditions in which beings exist, are but a succession of changes, and an alternation of extremes. Heat succeeds cold, and weakness strength; and the existence of one state infers the succession of its opposite. Life, as it precedes, so it will probably succeed death; and a state of insensibility and inaction is merely to be looked upon as a necessary state of transition to its opposite. But the human soul is capable of contemplating the eternal relations of things, which exist independently of those accidental combinations, and mere casual phenomena which are presented to the senses. The soul has powers of meditating objects unconnected with time or space, and of a nature imperishable; and it should therefore seem, must be itself as imperishable as the objects which it is its divine prerogative to be able to contemplate. The general principles with which the mind is fraught, and which, so far from being acquired in this life by any collection from particulars, are the tests which the mind from our earliest infancy applies in the arrangement of particulars; that inborn and inherent knowledge, which study and investigation do not create but only develope, as they are strong arguments to shew some pre-existent state, so also are they to be considered as indelible attestations of the divine original of the mind. Upon the whole, the particles of the visible world undergo not any destruction, but merely a transformation: the powers and faculties of the mind embrace those universal essences which have a far higher nature than the accidents of this visible world: they bear with them strong marks of a pre-existent state, and are endowed with a divination and strange presentiment of some future state.

What the condition of individuals may be in that future state, must be but matter of conjecture; but the good will safely rely upon the conviction, that in doing what is right they have done what is acceptable to the Deity; and, in the distribution of future conditions, it is not to be apprehended that those will be reduced to a lower state who have done all in their power to deserve a higher. But these difficulties can only be met by conjecture.

Some of these arguments bear the cast of doctrines which are prevalent in those writings of Plato, which are acknowledged to be the productions of a much later period in his life. And though *The Phædo* might be sketched at Megara, it probably received touches from the author's hand at a much more advanced stage of his life than his residence in that state.

We should be inclined to attribute to an early period of Plato's life *The Alcibiades*, (generally termed *The First Alcibiades.*) It is written with much simplicity; and, at the same time that it inculcates the necessity of gaining thorough information of the details of public affairs before a young man enters into political life, it intimates in many marked passages the coincidence between true policy and virtue, and may be read by the students of Plato's works with great propriety, as introductory to and illustrative of the *Books on the Commonwealth.* The notion that virtue is the perfection of a state, just in the same manner that it is the perfection of an individual, is developed in those books at great length; but the great principle, that the duty of justice is invariable and eternal, and that whatever is productive of disorder is as noxious to the exorbitant individual as it is to society; or in the case of a state equally prejudicial to itself as it is encroaching on its neighbours, is glanced at in this dialogue in a manner very forcible. The vanity of Alcibiades is pleasantly flattered by Socrates in the beginning of the dialogue. His spirit and readiness are very characteristic, but his self-sufficiency gradually abates, and he is, before the conclusion, in a manner rebuked and abashed. But a certain liveliness is preserved throughout, and the reader cannot help feeling an interest for the frank and ingenuous youth, in spite of all the embarrassment into which he is thrown, and which is a just punishment for his forwardness and self-complacency.

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

From Megara, Plato proceeded on a course of travels; and first he visited Italy: and perhaps we shall be excused, if we premise here a brief sketch of the opinions which seem to have prevailed in Italy at the time of Plato's visit. In his progress through life, he introduced and ingrafted on the doctrines of Socrates many notions, of which we find no account in Xenophon, as having been entertained by that philosopher; and many of his dialogues, on the other hand, are occupied in controverting other classes of opinions, the nature and bearings of which cannot indeed be understood without particular examination.

The philosophy of Italy seems to have been at this time divided between the opposite schools of Heraclitus and Pythagoras. The former, whilst they reduced all the operations of the mind ultimately to sense, and considered sense as produced by the impression of external species on the animal frame, fixed their attention upon the changes of external phenomena, and the fluctuations and alterations taking place in the animal frame itself; and concluded that there was nothing permanent or settled in nature; that abstract science was a mere pretence, experimental philosophy an arrangement of dreams, sensation itself an illusion; for how could there be any reality, when the things which seemed to impress the body were but the exuviæ, or fleeting shadows of objects which were themselves shadows equally unsubstantial; and when the feeling arising from the impression depended on the momentary and accidental state of the body impressed?

The followers of Pythagoras pursued a directly opposite course in their investigations. Perceiving that, from certain definitions, if the properties assumed were considered as the essential properties of figures, all the other properties might be deduced by an easy method, and a connected system might thus be formed of demonstrable truths, they satisfied themselves that such assumed properties were really original and primary; and that in the course of nature, in like manner as in the course of their studies, the other properties flowed from them as their source. Numbers seemed with them to have been taken for something elementary. These, the earlier Pythagoreans considered not only as the essences, but as the causes and originative producers of all things; and though their theory admitted of divinities, these seem only to have been higher natures, some harmonious products, as it were, of numbers, in the same manner as the visible world was a less harmonious product of the same causes. By what ingenuity the early Pythago-

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 349.

reans could have derived all the qualities of the visible world from combinations of mere numbers, Aristotle confessed himself incompetent to conceive. It is scarcely, therefore, to be hoped that this mystery of antiquity can be solved, when the materials for information are still more deficient. Other followers of Pythagoras seem to have reasoned in a manner less subtle, and to have arrived at some conclusions of the highest moment. These perceived or imagined, in the external world amidst its varying phenomena, the existence of certain substances of a more permanent nature. They perceived that whilst individual objects perish, the classes of objects still remain: that whilst some qualities are transformed by attrition, or fusion, or other operations of nature or art, other properties appear to be inherent and unchangeable. They concluded, therefore, that there exist in nature two distinct classes, one, of variable qualities, and the other, of eternal essences. But, as their principal attention was directed to mathematical studies, and, as they found that in the external world no materials could be found exactly corresponding to their notions of quantity, whether continuous or discrete; that physical squares or circles always involved some disproportion; and that musical instruments, however formed, could never adequately give, through the medium of sense, the relations of their musical scales, though these last were formed of perfect consonances, they inferred that essences exist in some manner independent of phenomena, and that phenomena are but imperfect representatives of essences. They judged that the relations of things are eternal, but the things related fluctuating and accidental. They deemed that there is a perfect intellectual world discoverable by intellect; and also a visible world, which is but a semblance and approximation to the other, the proper object of mere sense.

Whilst these schools, of the physical analysts and annihilators of existence on the one hand, and of the metaphysical realists and assertors of eternal relations on the other, were in full vogue and in daily collision, Plato paid his visit to Italy. He embraced the doctrines of Heraclitus as far as they related to physics; but the sceptical inferences which were attempted to be drawn from those doctrines, met in him with a decided and unwearied opponent. He adopted the notions of the Pythagoreans as to the permanence of essences, but he modified the doctrine considerably, by incorporating with it those notions of a moral system and of an organizing Providence, which he had inherited from Socrates, as part of the purer creed of Anaxagoras. In another very important particular, too, he qualified the metaphysical system of Pythagoras: he considered the intellectual world as being in some degree embodied in the visible one. Instead of inferring, as the Pythagoreans had done, that things related were a semblance of the abstract relations, he thought that they participated in those relations.* Some other differences subsisted between his notions and those of the Pythagoreans, on the origin and the nature of numbers, which are involved in considerable obscurities.* They seem to have merged sensible objects in numbers, or in some manner to have identified them: he, on the contrary, insisted on their separate existence from numbers. In these, as in many other particulars of ancient philosophy, it is to be feared that we must be satisfied with glimpses of meaning, and must be careful of introducing our own conjectures as expositions of what we cannot clearly apprehend. But it may be remarked as singular, that in one case Plato is represented as allowing a greater affinity between sensible objects and their essences, than the Pythagoreans did; and in the other, that he made greater distinctions than they did between sensible things and numbers, when it is admitted by all that the Pythagoreans at least identified numbers with essences.

From Italy, the general account is, that Plato proceeded to visit Egypt; but we have no information which can be depended upon, either as to the circumstances of his visit, or the length of his stay in that country. Some accounts state that this journey was undertaken for the sake of merchandise, and that Plato was there trafficking in oil.† But nothing can be more improbable than such a circumstance. Others relate that he there visited the priests, and was initiated in their most profound mysteries.‡ But Plato himself acquaints us with the reserve maintained in Egypt towards strangers with regard to the peculiar institutions of the country; and assures us, that so far from their mysteries being accessible to foreigners, "the animals of the Nile used to drive foreigners away by their meats and sacrifices, and rude proclamations."§ The most probable ground for his visit, besides general curiosity, is the one stated by Cicero,‖ that he went for the purpose of completing his mathematical studies, and becoming master of their astronomical systems. We must attribute to the ignorance and vanity of the Alexandrians of a later period, the fiction, that during Plato's stay in Egypt the germ of all his knowledge was formed; and that he was indebted to the sages there for those treasures of moral and political wisdom which he afterwards imparted to his countrymen. On this head we have the express authority of Plato, that although some

* Οἱ μὲν γὰρ Πυθαγόρειοι μίμησιν τὰ ὄντα φασὶν εἶναι τῶν ἀριθμῶν· Πλάτων δὲ μέθεξιν, τοὔνομα μεταβαλών· τὴν μὲν τοί γε μέθεξιν ἢ τὴν μίμησιν ἥτις ἂν εἴη τῶν εἰδῶν ἀφεῖσαν ἐν κοινῷ ζητεῖν.—Arist. *Metaph.* lib. 1. c. 6.

* Τὸδὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπείρου ὡς ἑνὸν δυάδα ποιῆσαι, τὸ δὲ ἄπειρον ἐκ μεγάλου καὶ μικροῦ τοῦτ' εἶδον. καὶ ὅτι ὁ μὲν τοῦτ' ἀριθμὸν παρὰ τὰ αἰσθητὰ, οὐδ' ἀριθμοὺς εἶναι φασιν ἀντὰ τὰ πράγματα, καὶ τὰ μαθηματικὰ μεταξὺ τούτων τιθέασι.—Arist. *eadem sententia.*

† Diogenes Laertius. ‡ Apuleius. Plutarch.

§ Τούτοις δὴ τοῖς νόμοις ὑποδέχεσθαι τε χρὴ πάντας ξένους τε καὶ ξένας ἐξ ἄλλης χθονὸς, καὶ τοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκπέμπειν τιμῶντας ξένιον Διὶ μὴ βρώσεσι καὶ θύμασι τὸν ξενηλασίαν ποιουμένους (καθάπερ ποιοῦσι νῦν θράσματα Νείλου) μηδὲ κηρύγμασιν ἀρρίοις.—*De legg.* lib. xii. p. 953. c.

‖ "*Cum Plato Ægyptum peragravit ut a sacerdotibus barbaris numeros et cælestia acciperet?*"—*De finibus*, v. 29. It is strange how this passage has been misinterpreted, and what latitude has been given to the term *cælestia* here, even by some writers who were acquainted with another passage of Cicero, which is the best commentary on this, if indeed it stood in need of any. "*Socrates mihi videtur, id quod constat inter omnes, primus a rebus occultis, et ab ipsa natura involutis, in quibus omnes ante eum philosophi occupati fuerant, evocavisse philosophiam, et ad vitam communem adduxisse, ut de virtutibus et vitiis, omninoque de bonis rebus et malis quæreret; cælestia autem vel procul esse a nostra cognitione censeret, vel si maxime cognita essent, nihil tamen ad bene vivendum conferre.*

of the abstract sciences flourished in Egypt, the other liberal sciences were in his day but at a low ebb there. At the close of his *Fifth Book on Laws*, after descanting on the advantages to be derived to the mind from the study of arithmetic, he remarks, that such studies produce other tendencies, which require to be counteracted, and that the knowledge of numbers may degenerate into mere cunning. "And this," says he, "is the case with the Egyptians and Phœnicians, and in many other countries, from the meanness of their other institutions and acquirements; whether this circumstance is to be attributed to the ignorance of their legislators, or to untoward occurrences, or to some inherent and physical defect."*

Some writers mention Plato's visit to Italy as occurring after his visit to Egypt;† and others suppose that he visited Italy twice, both on his way to, and on his return from Egypt.‡ It seems pretty well established that he visited Italy when he quitted Megara; whether he returned to it or not, when on his way homeward from Egypt, must remain a matter of doubt. But it seems probable that he did so.

On his return to Greece, Plato took possession of a small house and garden, adjoining to the groves and grounds which had been bequeathed by Academus or Ecademus to the public, and indeed as it seems within one common enclosure; and here he opened a public school for disputation and instruction in philosophy, where he was attended during the remainder of his life by a large concourse of auditors. As the earliest productions of Plato after his return from his travels, we should be disposed to mark *The Euthydemus*, *Gorgias*, *Cratylus*, *Io*, *Theætetus*, *The Sophist*, and *The Parmenides*. *The Euthydemus* and *Gorgias* may be considered as satirical dramas upon the fashionable sophists and declaimers of the day. In the first of these dialogues the folly of verbal wranglings is admirably exposed, by introducing Socrates as fighting these retailers of subtilty with their own weapons. Absurdities are heaped on absurdities, until the conceited champion of sounds is reduced to a proper sense of his own insignificancy, and that of his art. In *The Gorgias*, the same method is pursued, to shew the vanity of that art which was taught for Rhetoric in the days of Plato. The inutility of words and set phrases, and balanced sentences, without sterling sense and real knowledge, is shewn in the amplest manner. Sentences of the fairest structure, with all the changes of cadences that can be rung upon them, and crowded with galaxies of imagery, are sifted and subverted by a few plain and direct remarks; and a homely logic soon strips off the splendid trappings of declamation; and exposes all the beautiful turns and elegant contrasts of words, as mere jugglers' tricks, which mislead the understanding by tickling the senses.

The antipathy of Plato to the substitution of sound for sense, and to the artificial mechanism of Rhetoric, is well known to have been inveterate. The style of Lysias seems to have been the object of his particular aversion: he parodied it in his *Phædrus*, and in *The Gorgias*; and it has been conjectured, with great plausibility, that he pursued the same end covertly in *The Menexenus*.

The Cratylus is another dialogue, written in exposure and confutation of the Sophists; but the solemn banter and grave irony used throughout this dialogue in the part of Socrates, have given rise to much misapprehension amongst critics and commentators. The dialogue is throughout refutative of those wranglers, who, as they addicted themselves only to the study of words, had propagated with some complacency a theory of philosophical etymology, and were pleased to think that no names whatever were of arbitrary imposition, but that every word had a sort of mystical propriety. Socrates combats this doctrine by adopting it, and by producing the most absurd etymons which had been then promulgated. He proceeds, too, in an indirect attack on the vulgar mythology, by shewing the suitableness of the names of the heathen gods and goddesses to the actions generally imputed to them. He intersperses hyperbolical eulogies on the Sophists, with which his hearers are represented to be gratified, as indeed they were rather repetitions of, than parodies upon, the pretensions of that fraternity. Socrates closes his attack in a manner more direct, by asking the perplexing question, how, if words were first established from a knowledge of things, and a knowledge of things could be only acquired by the study of words, language could ever have been formed at all. Such seems to be the scope of this dialogue. Socrates, in an early part, after throwing out a few whimsical and mystic derivations, hints that he must have a fit of inspiration on him, which he can only attribute to the benefit of a conversation he had recently had with Euthyphro.* He derives the word hero from (ἔρως,) the love of the gods to mortal damsels or to goddesses; or else from (εἴρειν,) the art of speaking, so as to be synonymous with Rhetorician or Sophist. He brings a confirmation of the doctrine of Heraclitus, from the origin of the word Tethys. He proves Pluto to be the very model of a Sophist and a philosopher. He affects to be rather shy of going on with the etymology of divinities, but begs all his auditors will try the mettle of Euthyphro's horses in any other particular. He then says that he thinks the inventors of names, from the difficulty of the subject, became giddy and sea-sick, and as their heads swam round, they fancied all the objects before them in motion. He illustrates this by shewing how things remote in nature are related in language, till at last he finds a strange affinity between duty (τὸ δέον) and mischief, (τὸ βλαβερὸν.) He observes, that the Greek of his

---

* Ταῦτα δὴ πάντα, ἐὰν μὲν ἄλλοις νομοις τε καὶ ἐπιτηδεύμασι ἀφαιρῆταί τις τὴν ἀνελευθερίαν καὶ φιλοχρηματίαν ἐκ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν μελλόντων αὐτὰ ἱκανως τε καὶ ὀνησίμως κτήσεσθαι, καλὰ τὰ παιδεύματα καὶ προσήκοντα γίγνοιτ' ἄν· εἰ δὲ μὴ τὴν καλουμένην ἄν τις πανουργίαν ἀντὶ σοφίας ἀπεργάσαμενος λάθοι· καθάπερ Αιγυπτίους καὶ Φοίνικας καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα ἀπειργασμένα γένη νῦν ἐστιν ἰέναι, ὑπὸ τῆς, τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιτηδευμάτων καὶ κτημάτων ἀνελευθερίας εἴτέ τις νομοθέτης αὐτοῖς φαῦλος ἂν γενόμενος ἐξειργάσατο τὰ τοιαῦτα εἴτε χαλεπὴ τύχη προσπεσοῦσα εἴτε καὶ φύσις ἄλλη τις τοιαύτη.—*De legg.* lib. v. p. 746. b.

† Diogenes Laertius. ‡ Apuleius.

* Ερμ. καὶ μὲν δὴ ὦ Σώκρατες, ἀτεχνῶς γέ μοι δοκεῖ ὥσπερ οἱ ἐνθουσιῶντες ἐξαίφνης χρησμῳδεῖν; Σω. καὶ αἰτιῶμαί νε, ω Ἑρμόγενες, μάλιστα αὐτὴν ἀπὸ Εὐθύφρονος τοῦ Παντίου προσπεπτωκέναι μοι· ἔωθεν γὰρ πολλὰ ἀντῷ συνῆν, καὶ παρεῖχον τὰ ὦτα. κινδυνεύει οὖν ἐνθουσιῶν οὐ μόνον τὰ ὦτά μου ἐμπλῆσαι τῆς δαιμονίας σοφίας ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆν ψυχῆν ἐπειλῆφθαι.—*Cratyl.* 396.

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

day may probably be as different from the original as from a foreign language; that where any words cannot be traced with ease, it may be convenient to look upon them as of foreign extraction. Socrates, upon being complimented by Cratylus, repeats that he must have been inspired by Euthyphro, and that he could not help wondering at the wisdom he had himself been uttering. He proceeds in tracing verbal affinities, till he finds guilt and intelligence, intemperance and science, altogether synonymous. Although Socrates is well known to have indulged in great latitude of irony; although there is scarcely a page throughout the dialogue which does not bear some intimation of banter, and the above passages are obvious, and in a manner casually extracted, almost every annotator has made up his mind to consider the dialogue as a serious and solemn discussion; and the most ridiculous among the etymons have been quoted by grave authors* with particular approbation.

The Io is throughout a banter on the imposture and the extravagant pretensions of the rhapsodists, interspersed with some oblique insinuations on the inspiration of the poets.

The Parmenides is altogether the most mysterious and incomprehensible of Plato's dialogues. The resolution of all things into one, and the sameness of that one through the changes of all are the grand topic. Great disputes have been maintained about this unity of Parmenides, and some have been willing to identify his notions with the Spinozism of later days. The opinion of Aristotle,† independently of other considerations, seems conclusive on this point, and whatever Parmenides might mean, he certainly did not mean any unity of matter.

It seems well established that Plato, at some period visited the court of Dionysius at Syracuse. One visit only of his is mentioned by Diodorus Siculus; but the spurious letters which have passed under the name of Plato, have given rise to very circumstantial accounts of three different visits.‡ Of that visit which really took place, little can be satisfactorily said; and instead of dwelling on the fictions with which Plato's biographers have embellished their accounts of his stay in Sicily, we turn to the further consideration of Plato's dialogues.

The Philebus bears throughout marks of a judgment strengthened by experience, and of an imagination and feelings mellowed by age. To a student unacquainted with Plato's writings, and desirous of obtaining a full view of the moral doctrines of his mature years, it deserves to be recommended, both for the graces of the composition, and the sanctity of the precepts which it contains. It is a mass of moral wisdom, inculcated with every charm of manner and sentiment, which can captivate the imagination and interest the heart. It is serious and earnest and affecting.

The Commonwealth, or as it is perhaps more properly entitled, *The Dialogue on Justice*, was the production of Plato's mature years, and indeed seems to have been continually revised by him till the last hour of his life. The grand object of this dialogue is to prove, that moral virtue is the excellence of human nature, that moral conduct independently of the accidents of rewards and punishments is suitable to the constitution of man. In the first part he shews that what is just, is not constituted such by arbitrary enactments, for then what was just in one state might be unjust in another, and besides no enactment would then be considered unjust. Inferring that there must be some other test, he proceeds to consider the human mind, and discovers in it three several faculties; the desire of pleasure, the defensive faculty, or the principle of irritation, and Reason. And, as it might be difficult to proceed with the consideration of these, as each balancing the other, or as severally gaining the ascendency in a single mind, he proceeds to examine the analogous parts as they display themselves in that large animal, a commonwealth. The sketch therefore of an ideal commonwealth which is introduced, is merely by way of illustration; and the several deviations from that perfect form, as exhibited in a tyranny, an oligarchy, and a democracy, though displayed at great length, and with admirable graphical effect, are, in reality, only larger exemplars brought in to evince the disproportions and confusion which must ensue, from allowing an ascendency either to the appetite for pleasure, or to the irritable propensities, in that microcosm, the human mind. The dialogue, in short, is throughout of a moral cast, and the political details are merely auxiliary and subsidiary to the moral end. The author shews that Reason must be the sovereign legislator, and that the inferior faculties of the mind must be regulated by the mandates of their Queen; and that happiness is secured to the individual in proportion as the higher faculty is well exercised and enlightened, and as the subject-propensities maintain their due and orderly allegiance.

Independently then of external circumstances, a certain regularity of conduct is required for the peace and harmony of the system within us; but the author proceeds to shew that virtue, besides bearing its own reward here, in the content and self-complacency and happiness which it inspires, has, as far as tradition or conjecture may reach, the fairest chance of a continuance of happiness when this life is closed. In illustration of which a very beautiful fable is introduced.

Whilst Plato considered morality to be founded in the governance of Reason, and government to have its grand aim in the promotion of morality, it is not to be wondered at, that he thought the nature of man and of public societies would mutually illustrate one another; but we think the remark of a learned foreign critic* (in a work which is the best commentary that has yet been published on the design and conduct of this dialogue of Plato) particularly just, that the excursive and illustrative portions of the dialogue have in a manner overtopped those devoted to the principal and direct subject of discussion, partly from the disproportionate extent of those excursive portions, and more particularly from the singularity of some of the

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

* We need only mention the names of the learned and very ingenious Bryant, and of Taylor, to suggest to our readers the extent to which the *eἰρωνεία* of Socrates in this dialogue has been misunderstood.

† Παρμενίδης μὲν γὰρ ἔοικε τοῦ κατὰ λόγον ἑνὸς ἅπτεσθαι. Μέλισσος δὲ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ὕλην.—Arist. *Metaph.* lib. 1. c. 6.

‡ See Mitford's remarks, *History of Greece*, vol. viii.

* Caroli Morgenstein, *de Platonis republicâ commentationes tres.*

theories adopted in them. It is agreed by all, that Plato had great merit in forming to himself the notion of a perfect commonwealth; and in considering not merely existing institutions, but in endeavouring to create some form of ideal excellence, which might serve as a model, and as a constant example not of the practicable but of the desirable. It has however been the misfortune of his system to be judged of, not in the view with which it was formed, but to have its particular parts anatomized without reference to the whole, but as detached principles; and, when so taken, their unsuitableness to society, as it exists, has been proved with much dexterity, and indeed by conclusive arguments. But the object of Plato was to conceive one perfect model to which human institutions might in some remote degree approximate. If the perfection of human nature is the annihilation of every selfish feeling, and the entire ascendency of a sense of duty, it is to be considered, what in existing states of society are the causes that impede that perfection, that men may at least learn not to abandon themselves to those propensities whatever they may be, the indulgence of which is so adverse to their real interests. If free devotion to general good is impeded by the love of lucre, and by the partialities of families and kindred; if avarice is admitted to be vicious, and favour and personal regards mischievous to the public, it seems to result, that in a perfect state all property should belong to the state, and that individuals should rather be members of the great family of the state than of private households. On these grounds, amongst other regulations for citizens educated in a particular manner, brought up in a strict discipline of the passions, Plato modified rather than invented institutions, which had subsisted in some degree among the Cretans and Spartans,* and projected a community of property and of wives. Marriages were to be performed with due ceremonies at seasons to be appointed by the public functionaries; but the nuptials, instead of effecting an appropriation for life, only sanctioned a temporary cohabitation; so that the offspring might not be claimed as the exclusive property of its individual father, but as the offspring of the state. Indeed the remark of Lucian is very just, that Plato's community of wives was quoted as a justification for the vilest prostitution and profligacy, by many persons who never suspected the real meaning of the author, or observed the particular guards and regulations with which Plato had encompassed this rule, even in a state of beings supposed to be exalted by every opportunity and preparation for moral and intellectual excellence.

Connected with this dialogue are two others, *The Timæus* and *The Critias*, the latter of which is left unfinished. The *Timæus* contains a singular history of the Cosmogony. In this dialogue Timæus is introduced, first making the usual distinction between essences, which are the subject of knowledge, and accidents which are the subjects of opinion, and then stating that the divinity found a mass of inordinate and turbulent materials, which he organized and reduced to system. The opposite elements of fire and earth, he consorted by the media of air and water, and a proper temperament was produced by mixing them together in harmonious proportions. One world was the result; which, as it comprehended in itself all the ingredients in existence, and could therefore be subject to no external attrition or concussion, must remain undecaying and imperishable; and, as it comprehended all living beings, must be of that figure which is most perfect, and comprehends within itself all other figures, namely, a sphere. A soul or principle of motion was also created by the eternal intelligent Divinity, with which he caused the universal mass to be pervaded and invested. But Timæus expressly observes, that though in the order of our notions, this soul is conceived as produced subsequently to the mass which it informs, yet, that in fact, this animating principle, as it is more noble in its nature, so must it have been more ancient in its existence. To produce a connection between essences and accidents which seem of opposite natures, the Supreme artificer introduced the medium of similarities and differences, and by this medium many admirable ratios were effected.

Time was produced at the same time with the world, and is, in a manner, a shadow or fleeting image of eternity. It is not, as it were, a particle discerped from eternity, for Eternity is one ever present thing; and our ordinary expressions applicable to time as the past, the future, and the present, so far as used in reference and in contradistinction to the others, are entirely inapplicable to eternity. Eternity is the mighty and the real essence of which Time is the unsubstantial image, which was born with this visible world, and is accommodated to its unsubstantial nature. And to mark the grand periods of Time the Supreme Being produced the sun, and moon, and planets, and allotted them their positions and appropriate revolutions.* The period of a month was produced when the moon had completed her circle, and a year when the sun had perfected his revolution. The courses of the other planets are equally regular and significant; but the negligence or incapacity of men, has caused them hitherto to fail in rendering a perfect description of their periods. Out of each of the four elements, the Supreme Being created living beings; from the fire, the gods or beings indued with self-motion; the revolving souls of the starry sphere, the soul of the earth, which Timæus asserts to be the first and most ancient of the created gods. The origination of demons or demi-gods, though stated with some detail, is prefaced by a declaration that it is founded solely on tradition; and that, as it was given by the personages themselves, it is therefore deserving of credit. The soul of man was next produced, but its high or fiery nature was commingled with desire and anger, and their concomitant passions; of a nature indeed imperishable; but which to attain its perfection must purge off the dross and defilements of these its meaner ingredients, and become purified from the adherence of every gross and sensual tendency. The Supreme Being created all these souls, but indued the inferior gods with the power of accommodating them to their several perishable and material vehicles. Timæus relates with great minute-

* See on this head Cardinal Bessarion's work, *Contra Calumniatorem Platonis*, lib. iv. c. 2. Venet. 1516, p. 69. and Morgenstein's *Commentatio*.

* For the ablest dissertation which has yet appeared on this intricate subject, we would refer our readers to a short tract of Böckh *de Astronomiæ Philolaicæ veræ indole*.

ness, how with cramps and bonds of adamant invisible to human eyes, material and immaterial substances became connected, and the soul incorporated. The nature of the senses, and the reason of the position of the head and body are explained at length; and some profound remarks are interspersed on the benefit which the intellect derives, even in its most abstract speculations, from the suggestions of sight; and grand philosophic excellences are discovered in melody and rhythm. Timæus proceeds to distinguish the qualities of the external world from the essences to which they assimilate, or of which, at most, they only participate. A singular definition is then given of Space.*

As all bodies were resolved into the four elements, so the elementary bodies themselves are now resolved into figures. The different sorts of watery, aerial, earthy, and fiery substances are enumerated; and definitions are given of the opposite properties of heat and cold, hardness and softness, heaviness and lightness, smoothness and roughness, and of the sensations of pleasure and pain. A description ensues of the different senses, and of the whole animal economy; and the subject of divination is transiently glanced at in a manner ambiguous at least, if not ironical.

Several medical observations ensue, particularly on the preferableness of diet and regimen to violent medicines. The distempers of the mind are incidently touched upon, as sometimes connected with physical causes, and as at other times originating in the defects of early education, in which case the parents or guardians are much more blameworthy than the unfortunate subject of the malady. The ascendency of Reason is asserted to be something divine; and the pure enlightened Reason is designated as a demon or superior spirit. The dialogue closes with a scale of the animal creation.

It is somewhat difficult to conjecture for what reason Plato has formed so strict a connection between his *Dialogue on Justice* and *The Timæus*, except perhaps it might be his intention to intimate to his disciples the course in which he wished such studies to be pursued, and that he would have them perfect themselves in morals before they proceeded to the study of these sublime metaphysical investigations.

The scope of *The Critias* seems to have been to introduce the peculiar political sentiments set forth in the *Dialogue on Justice*, and to familiarize them to the Athenians by a sort of popular romance. By assuring his countrymen that his ideal commonwealth once existed, and that their own was the favoured country in which such political institutions had flourished in days of which the memory had long since passed, he might think to propitiate in favour of his scheme, those national vanities and prepossessions, which he before probably offended.

Plato attempted a work of more practical utility, when he wrote his *System of Laws*. The five first books of these, besides containing many profound speculations on the general principles of laws, on the duties of a legislator, on the propriety of accompanying laws with a statement of the reasons which produce them, of visiting offences with proportionate punishments, and of considering punishments as exemplary and admonitory, rather than vindictive; abound with more pithy and pregnant apophthegms of moral wisdom than any equal portion in the works of Plato. The other books contain a system both of municipal and international laws, written with so much comprehensiveness of understanding, and illustrated by so much copiousness and distinctness of reasoning, that whatever helps we may suppose Plato to have received from writings of his predecessors which are now lost, it is impossible to read them without admiration of the author's sagacity and judgment and genuine humanity. As this was the work of Plato's mature years, it may be considered as his last thoughts as a moralist and politician. As a statesman, and speaking with practical views, he never thinks of recommending any community of goods or wives, but he proposes many excellent regulations, considering the condition of females at that time in Greece, for the education and elevation of that sex from the comparative servility in which they lived.

The Minos which is generally prefixed as introductory to the *Book of Laws*, has been shewn to be spurious by an eminent foreign critic; and although Plato did write an *Epinomis*, or supplemental close to his Laws, yet the same learned critic holds the dialogue which we now have under that title to be spurious also.

Plato died at Athens in the first year of the hundred and eighth Olympiad, as it seems, of a general decline, at the advanced age of eighty-one years. A monument was raised to his memory in the Academy, inscribed with an epitaph written by his pupil Aristotle, in terms of gratitude and enthusiastic reverence.

Certain dialogues generally introduced in the editions of Plato, have been long ago admitted to be spurious by general consent. These are *The Axiochus, Demodochus, Eryxias, Sisyphus, Clitopho*, and the two short dialogues on Justice and Virtue. Other dialogues generally received as genuine, the *Hipparchus, The Minos, The Epinomis, The Latter Alcibiades, The Rivals, Clitopho*, and *Theages* bear strong marks of spuriousness. The dialogues last enumerated are accordingly rejected by Böckh,* Bekker,† and Von Ast.‡ Bekker and Von Ast also reject the Letters. Bekker in like manner condemns *The First Alcibiades, The Lesser Hippias*, and *The Io*. Von Ast not only concurs in this judgment, but goes much greater lengths He questions the genuineness of *The Meno, Euthydemus, Charmides, Lysis, Menexenus, Laches, The Greater Hippias, Io, Euthyphro, The Defence of Socrates, The Crito*, and the *Books of Laws*. In the two *Hippias* it is true that the gravity and importance of the Sophist are caricatured with almost too great boldness and freedom of pencilling, and that the touches of satire are not of that more reserved and delicate cast which generally prevails in Plato's style. But we know not any sufficient reason for questioning their

* Τρίτον δὲ αὖ γένος τὸ τῆς χώρας ἀεὶ φθορὰν οὐ προσδεχόμενον ἔδραν δὲ παρέχον ὅσα ἔχει γένεσιν πᾶσιν, αὐτὸ δὲ μετ' ἀναισθησίας ἁπτὸν λογισμῷ τινὶ νόθῳ, μόγις πιστόν, κ. τ. λ. p. 52.

* See Böckh's excellent critical tract, entitled *Commentatio in Platonis qui vulgo fertur Minoem, ejusdemque libros priores de Legibus*, Hal. Sax. 1806.

† In his edition of Plato, Berlin, 1818.

‡ In his *Platons Leben und Schriften, als einleitung in das studium des Platon*, Lips. 1816, 8vo.

authenticity. *The Io* is undoubtedly genuine. But the banter is so admirably disguised, and so well kept up under an appearance of gravity and even solemnity, that critics and commentators have been as much imposed upon, as *Io* was intended to be in the dialogue by that εἴρων Socrates. It is indeed a style of irony the most covert and insidious, and Socrates practises that very method which is said occasionally to have been adopted by a moralist* in more recent times, of the most virtuous character and amiable disposition, "when he found any man invincibly wrong, to flatter his opinions by acquiescence, and sink him yet deeper in absurdity." The resolution of all poetry into a divine inspiration actuating a being otherwise in no respect superior to his fellow-creatures, and in a manner unconscious of the fine phrensy which he is in, and the magnetic process by which the contagion of enthusiasm is communicated, are conceived in the happiest style of humour and ridicule. The interpreter of the poets is played upon throughout the dialogue so skilfully and with such fine effect, that he seems to be flattered by compliments, which reduce not only his art, but that of the objects of his idolatry to phantasy and illusion; and he departs with a conviction readily adopted, of the peculiar favour of heaven, and with every feeling of self-importance mightily increased and confirmed. *The Laches* is probably spurious. *The Euthyphro* is very questionable, but may have been written by Plato at an early period of his life, and before he had become master of the address which he afterwards attained in his mode of attacking vulgar superstitions. *The Crito* and *The Defence of Socrates*, approve themselves genuine by the interesting manner in which they are written, and by the simplicity and elegance of the style. On the same ground we should admit the first *Alcibiades*, the *Charmides* and *Lysis*. The *Alcibiades* is full of good sense. The *Charmides* and *Lysis* though less weighty in argument, abound with delicate raillery, and with exquisite touches of manners. They have not, indeed, the same body with the *Alcibiades*, but they bear with them the same genuine smack and raciness. *The Menexenus* is, we think, a satire on the Rhetoricians, and a parody on Lysias. All the topics, the connective particles, the modes of transition from one topic to another, the antitheses, the measured clauses, have something technical and puerile about them, and are completely alien from the manner and arrangement and general style of Plato. If *The Menexenus* is to be looked upon as a serious performance, we admit at once that it is no production of Plato; but we are inclined to believe that it is genuine, and intended for a parody. With regard to the *Books of Laws*, it is well established that they were not published in the lifetime of Plato, but were given to the world after his death by Philip the Opuntian; and this circumstance is a sufficient reason with us for the difference which appears between them and the generality of the finished productions of Plato. The dramatic parts are very slightly sketched. Von Ast, indeed, considers the characters Megillus, the Athenian stranger, &c. as fictitious; but we see no reason for supposing that they may not have been real personages, and that a further developement would have been given to these points, and a general proem prefixed, if the work had received the last touches of the author's hand. The other arguments of Von Ast relating to the *Books of Laws*, originate, we think, in a misapprehension of Plato's object in his *Commonwealth*; the direct object of which was, as we before observed, of a moral nature, and the political discussions only elucidatory. In a commonwealth, where the individuals had by education been disciplined to a high state of moral perfection, many details might be impertinent or irrelevant, which would not only find their place, but would be absolutely necessary in a political treatise of a practical nature, and in framing a code of laws to be used by men, constituted as men are, and not such as they might be fancied to become. The notion that the *Books of Laws*, whoever they were written by, were intended by the author as supplemental, and to be accommodated to the inhabitants of Plato's ideal commonwealth, is surely not only a gross mistake of the nature of that commonwealth, but a perversion of the object of the *Books of Laws*, as declared and explained by the author himself.

Such are our reasons for considering these dialogues genuine, though doubted or rejected by Mr. Von Ast. And, in our opinions of the object and turn of several of these dialogues, we are sensible that we trench very much upon a certain formal definition, which a writer * of most fastidious taste and timid genius has laid down for the ancient philosophic dialogue. This learned and scrupulous critic defines it to be, "an imitated and mannered conversation between certain real, known, and respected persons, *on some useful or serious subject*, in an elegant and suitably adorned, *but not characteristic* style." And the same author attributes to the Promethean genius of Lucian, the "creation of *a new species*, the merit of which consists in associating two things not naturally allied together, the severity of the philosophic dialogue, with the humour of the comic." That the ancient dialogue was *not* always on serious subjects, and *not* always in a style not characteristic of the speakers, will perhaps be sufficiently obvious to any one who studies *The Banquet*, which is admitted on all hands to be a genuine production of Plato. The characters of the style of the different speakers are there preserved in the closest manner, and were always so understood by the ancients; and, in one place, to set out the buffoon Aristophanes to the very life, his wild rambling wit is thrown into strong relief by preliminary incidents of the most ludicrous nature; for Plato was bent, says Athenæus,† upon comedizing and scoffing the comedian. That Plato parodied Lysias, and mocked his artificial and balanced sentences, his formal antitheses and set cadences, we may rest assured on the evidence of Plutarch, who mentions it as an ingenious way of dealing with an adversary, to surpass him in his own style, as Plato did Lysias. But we are perhaps arguing this point too seriously, and too much at length, since all that the critic

* Addison. See his life by Johnson.

* See Hurd's preface to his *Moral and Political Dialogues*, page 53, 4th. edition.

† Πλάτωνα δὲ τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ λυγγὸς ὀχλούμενον καὶ θεραπευόμενον ἀνακογχυλιασμοῖς ὕδατος· ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποθήκαις τοῦ κάρφους, ἵνα τὴν ῥῖνα κινήσας πτάρῃ παρίημι. κωμῳδεῖν γὰρ ἤθελε, κ. τ. λ.—Deipnosop. lib. v. vol. i. p. 187. Ed. Causabon.

probably intended, was to give a definition of his own dialogues; and, as applied to those refined and most elegant compositions of his, the definition is perfect.

In attempting an outline of Plato's philosophy, we fully admit the justice of Wyttenbach's* remark, that no abstract can give an adequate notion of the merits of the original. Plato has two great excellencies in the highest degree, which any attempt to represent to the reader in the course of an abstract must entirely fail. The first, is his method of opening and investigating his subject, so that unforeseen truths are elicited, in a manner at once surprising and satisfactory, from the most obvious premises, and from axioms which every understanding recognises. The other is, that his diction, figurative as it is, is in the greatest degree proper and philosophical; what is called his poetry, is in fact a chain of continued argument, and of animated illustration. So that his writings, extensive as they are, are really much more incapable of abridgement or condensation, than many persons are inclined to imagine from a first view of their expanded diction and dialogue form. We must honestly confess, therefore, that we can present our readers with little more than a sketch of the most prominent points of Plato's philosophy, which we have collected, however, not from previous compendiums, but from the original works of our author. To enable our learned readers to judge how far we are borne out by the original, we shall support our sketch by quotations or references to the passages upon which we principally rely. One or two translations of a larger nature we shall intersperse, that our English readers may be brought acquainted in some degree with the peculiar manner in which the subject sought is evolved in Plato's dialogues. But the more we study the subject, the more we are convinced of the truth of a remark made by the learned and amiable foreign critic just mentioned, that Plato's system can only be adequately learned by a full and thorough perusal of his dialogues in the original; and that those who wish to master the subject, must have recourse to that means alone, and must not rely upon compendiums, the best of which cannot but be extremely imperfect. We shall be well pleased if the following outline serves the purpose of stimulating curiosity, and of promoting the study of an author, whose merits and beauties have not we think of late been sufficiently appreciated in this country.

Philosophy was divided by Plato into three parts: Morals, Physics, and Dialectic. Under Morals he comprehended Politics; and under Physics, that science which was afterwards distinguished by the name of Metaphysics.

Of Plato's moral doctrines the most important are, that, independently of other ends, virtue is to be pursued as the proper perfection of man's nature; † that vice is a disease of the mind, originating in some delusion or misapprehension of our proper interests; ‡ that the real freedom of a rational being consists in his being able to regulate his conduct by the determinations of his Reason; that every person who is not guided by his Reason, encourages insubordination in the faculties of his mind, and becomes the slave of caprice or passion; * that a course of virtuous conduct, independently of its advantages to society, is beneficial to the individual practising it, as ensuring that regularity of imagination, that tranquillity and internal harmony which is the mind's proper happiness. †

The earnestness of a virtuous mind in the attainment of truth, and the propriety of pursuing the ordinary gratifications of life, only so far as they are subservient to or at least compatible with man's higher and nobler duties, ‡ are topics insisted upon and adverted to with peculiar force and frequency. But perhaps a more complete summary cannot be given of the principal points of Plato's Morals, than is contained in the following passage, extracted from his own writings. It is at the commencement of his fourth *Book of Laws*, and the remarks with which it closes on the coincidence of the precepts of Morality with the conclusions of prudence and enlightened self-love, though written in a more popular manner than most of Plato's Moral dissertations, are very happily conceived.

"It remains to consider by what mode of life a man may best consult his own interests, so that he may not be merely restrained by the necessity of obeying the laws, and by a fear of punishment, but may be influenced by a kindly regard towards the laws, as being sensible that what is established is for his benefit. This point then we proceed to consider. Truth, in the sight of heaven and of man, is the noblest good; and a man who would enjoy happiness, is desirous at the earliest moment to partake of Truth, that he may spend as much of his time as possible in the course of sincerity, for such an one is a sincere character. But he is insincere who practises voluntary falsehood; and he is simple who practises it involuntarily. Nor is either of these conditions to be admired. For every insincere and simple person is friendless, and his true character being detected in course of time, he ends his days in dreary solitude. Since, whether his family and acquaintance still live or not, his life is almost equally lonely. That man is to be respected, who is

* See his *Epistola Critica ad Van Heude*, prefixed to Van Heude's *Specimen Criticum in Platonem*. Lugd. Bat. 1818.

† Ἀρετὴ μὲν ἄρα ὡς ἔοικεν ὑγιειά τέ τις ἂν εἴη καὶ κάλλος καὶ εὐεξία ψυχῆς.—*De republ.* lib. iv. p. 444. *et Gorg.* p. 491, 492.

‡ Κακία δὲ νόσος τε καὶ αἶσχος καὶ ἀσθένεια.—*De republ. quâ supra.*

* Τί οὖν; δούλην ἢ ἐλευθέραν τὴν τοιαύτην φήσεις εἶναι ψυχήν; Δούλην δήπου ἔγωγε.——ἢ τυραννουμένη ἄρα ψυχὴ ἥκιστα ποιήσει ἃ ἂν βουληθῇ ὡς περὶ ὅλης εἰπεῖν ψυχῆς· ὑπὸ δὲ οἴστρου ἀεὶ ἑλκομένη βίᾳ ταραχῆς καὶ μεταμελείας μεστὴ ἔσται.—*De republ.* lib. ix. p. 577.

† Ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς ἡγεῖτο εἶναι δι' αὐτας αἱρετὰς ὡς ἀκόλουθόν γε λεπτέον τῷ μόνον αὐτὸν ἡγεῖσθαι τὸ καλὸν ἀγαθὸν. Καὶ δὴ ἐν πλείστοις τοῦτο αὐτὸ ἐπιδέδεκται καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Πολιτείᾳ.—*Albini, εἰσαγ. εἰς τὰ τοῦ Πλατωνος δόγματα, cap.* 27.

‡ Οὐκοῦν ὅγε νοῦν ἔχων πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ εἰς τοῦτο συντείνας βιώσεται, πρῶτον μὲν τὰ μαθήματα τιμῶν, ἃ τοιάυτην αὐτῷ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπεργάσεται, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἀτιμάζων——ἔπειτά γ' εἶπον τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἕξιν καὶ τροφὴν οὐχ ὅπως τῇ θηριώδει καὶ ἀλόγῳ ἡδονῇ ἐπιτρέψας ἐνταῦθα τετραμμένος ζήσει, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πρὸς ὑγίειαν βλέπων, οὐδὲ τοῦτο πρεσβεύων, ὅπως ἰσχυρὸς ἢ ὑγιὴς ἢ καλὸς ἔσται, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ σωφρονήσειν μέλλῃ ἀπ' αὐτῶν· ἀλλ' ἀεὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ σώματι ἁρμονίαν τῆς ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἕνεκα ξυμφωνίας ἁρμοττόμενος φαίνηται.—*De republ.* ix. p. 591.

guilty of no injustice himself, but doubly or more than doubly does he deserve respect, who will not allow injustice to be committed by others."

"Let that man who assists the magistrates in punishing vice, be proclaimed a great and perfect character, and let him receive the crown of virtue. And let the same praise be given respecting temperance and wisdom, and all other good qualities which a man not only possesses in himself, but is able to impart to others. The person able so to impart, should be respected in the highest degree; and next to him, he who, though unable, is at least willing to impart. But the man of an envious nature, who would grudge to others the blessings which he himself enjoys, deserves reprehension. Nor ought we to disparage any virtue which is misapplied, but rather to be desirous to attain it if we can. And let every one enter on a course of virtuous emulation, but devoid of envy. For, by such conduct, while men improve themselves, instead of engaging in calumnies and detraction against others, they benefit the community. But an envious character, who seeks to raise himself by depreciating others, not only makes no advances himself towards real virtue, but by his aspersions, he does, as far as he has power, discourage others from the pursuit of excellence, and checks the advance of his country towards real eminence."

"It is also right that a man should be at once courageous and mild; for it is impossible to rid oneself of the severe, and extreme or irremediable injuries of others, otherwise than by struggling against them, and by overcoming them, and executing exemplary vengeance. And such a struggle cannot be entered upon without courage and resolution. On the other hand, with regard to such injuries as are remediable, we ought to reflect first of all, that injustice originates not in any perverseness of the will, but in a defect of the understanding; for the perpetrator of evil does the greatest mischief to his own mind; and no one voluntarily and intentionally seeks what is mischievous to himself, least of all, when it is mischievous in the highest degree. But a man's mind, as we before observed, is that which is deserving of the greatest respect. Now, in that part of himself which is deserving of the greatest respect, no one would voluntarily bring on the greatest evil, when that evil too would continue through life. But a man who is unjust, and who is possessed with evil propensities, is truly an object of commiseration; and we ought to pity such a being while the malady is remediable, and restrain our sentiments of resentment, and not be carried off with the violence and zealous indignation of the weaker sex. But, where a man is incurably mischievous, and irretrievably wicked, we ought then to administer justice unmingled with mercy. And for this reason it was, we said, that a virtuous character ought at once to be resolute and mild. But the greatest evil is that which takes deepest root in the heart of man, and for which, whilst each shews some indulgence to himself, no cure can be devised: and this proceeds from that self-love which is supposed to be innate in man's nature, and which, under proper regulations, is itself an important duty. But the excess of this is the source of all crimes, for affection blinds the judgment in this, as in all other cases; and the man who, instead of regarding the real relations of things, is constantly observing his own situation, will very imperfectly discern what is just, or honourable, or proper. For a man who would be really great, ought not to attach his regard to self or his own vulgar interests, but to virtue; whether the results lead to his own personal gratification, or to that of others. But it is from an error on this point that many deem their own folly to be wisdom, and whilst in a state of the grossest delusion believe themselves in a manner omniscient. From the same cause we sometimes undertake what we are incapable of performing, because we will not allow those to perform it who are capable; and would rather blunder ourselves than admit that others are better informed, whilst in truth we ought to feel no shame in following and imitating those who are really our superiors. There are other points too, which, though they are of less importance than those which we have touched upon, and of a very trite nature, may yet be equally serviceable, and which it may be well to recall to mind. For the stream of knowledge, as it seems constantly to flow away from the mind, should be constantly replenished, and recollection is but the reflux of ebbing knowledge. All extremes in the expression of joy and grief are to be avoided, and the excesses of the passions themselves are to be restrained; so that we may acquire and maintain a dignified moderation, whether our fortunes are successful and our guardian spirit seems to smile upon us, or whether the spirits of nature seem to be engaged in opposition to us, compelling us to surmount by our own virtue the arduous and steep ascent. We should then rely on the favour which Providence always shews to the good, that he will smooth the path of pain, and requite grief with gladness, and that the day of prosperity will follow the night of sorrow. Every man should support himself under trials with such hopes, and whether in serious or in cheerful mood, each should revolve in his own mind, and communicate to those around him, such cheering and such consolatory views of the dispensations of Providence."

"So far with regard to models of excellence, and the perfection of the human character. But, since perfection is in fact not attainable by man, we must proceed in a less elevated strain, and consider what is practicable, and give such rules as may be of use in the regulation of conduct. Man's sensations and desires form a very considerable part of his constitution. By these, he is influenced in all he does, and upon the nature of these his happiness in a great degree depends. We certainly ought to commend the most virtuous sort of life, not merely because it is most conducive to good character, but because, if steadily and uniformly pursued from youth upwards, it far exceeds any other in those particulars which are the objects of universal desire, in the attainment of pleasure, and in the exemption from pain. This indeed is evidently the case where a man's desires are well regulated. But by what means this just regulation of desire is effected, whether by the power of some inherent and connate faculties, or by the light of experience, may require some consideration. But we may form a comparative estimate of the pleasurableness or painfulness of some modes of life upon the following grounds. We wish to partake of pleasure, but pain we neither prefer nor desire. A state of indifference we do not wish for, as compared with pleasure, but yet we prefer it to pain. Nor can we say that we wish to have an equal share of pleasure,

if attended with equal pain. In number, therefore, and magnitude and intensity, pleasures and pains surpass or equal, or are less one than another, as objects whether of desire or of aversion."

"Such being the state of things, a life, in which there are many of both sorts, and these great and intense, but where the pleasures predominate, we should wish, but where the contrary, we should not wish. So again, a life in which there were few of each sort, and these small and moderate, but where the pains exceeded, we should not wish; but where the contrary, we should wish. So that where there is an equilibrium of pleasures and pains, the mind feels a kind of indifferency; it would wish a course of life where the objects of desire preponderate, and would decline a course of life where the objects of aversion preponderate.

"These are all the different modes of life; and if we imagine there are any others besides these, we only imagine such things from an ignorance and inexperience of the nature of things. It may be well, therefore, to arrange and classify the different modes of life, that each man, by selecting that which is best calculated to produce a more unalloyed succession of pleasures, or a greater uniformity and permanence of satisfaction, may so best ensure his own general happiness.

"We may term one sort of life a life of temperance, another of prudence, another of valour, another of health. To these we may oppose four others, a life of folly, of cowardice, of intemperance, of disease. Whoever is acquainted with a life of temperance, knows that it is moderate in all particulars, that it affords moderate pleasures, moderate desires and affections. That an intemperate man is violent in all these particulars; that his pains and pleasures are in excess, that his desires are tempestuous, and his affections frantic and irregular. That in a temperate life the pleasures exceed the pains, but that in an intemperate life, the pains exceed the pleasures, in extent, in number, and in intensity. According to the constitution of nature, therefore, one of these modes of life is more agreeable and the other more painful; and no man who desires to live a life of real enjoyment, would voluntarily prefer a life of intemperance. If this be so, every intemperate man is such not by the exercise of a free will; but either from some defect in their understandings, or from the unruliness of their passions, or from a concurrence of these circumstances, the mass of mankind pass their lives, destitute of temperance. With regard to a life of disease or of health, we must form the like reflections; that they both have their pleasures and their pains; that in a state of health the pleasures exceed the pains, but in a state of disease the pains exceed the pleasures. Now the object of our selection with regard to the modes of life, was not one in which pain predominates; but, on the contrary, we agreed that was preferable, in which the pain was surpassed by the pleasures. But a temperate man surpasses an intemperate one, a prudent man an imprudent one, inasmuch as the pains which he has are fewer, and less intense, and of shorter continuance. The modes of life then of the temperate, the brave, the prudent and the healthy, are far more desirable than those of the dastardly, and the intemperate, the imprudent, and the diseased. So that, to sum up all, the man who has any excellence, whether bodily or mental, so far passes a more agreeable life than the man who has any infirmity or depravity. And besides this direct agreeableness, such excellence is preferable on account of its comeliness, its consistency with nature, its serviceableness to others, and the character which accompanies it. So that one who is blessed with virtuous habits, passes a life more happy than one under opposite circumstances in every particular whatsoever."

As a politician, Plato considered that the great object of laws was to provide for the natural accommodation of the members of the community, as subsidiary and in subordination to the cultivation of their moral virtues.* He considered the perfection of the state to consist not solely in the health, beauty, strength, and wealth of the individuals composing it, but also in their prudence, temperance, justice, and fortitude.† He complains that legislators in general had only attended to the inferior qualities, and had neglected all the superior, with the exception of fortitude. In Crete and in Sparta, prudence and justice were notoriously disregarded, and temperance was only so far considered, as the practice of it was necessary to one species of fortitude.‡ Plato illustrates with great ability the decline and decay of states from that momentary elevation and meridian of grandeur which success in arms had obtained, in consequence of sacrificing to vulgar conceptions of interest and policy, and to an overweening ambition, the duty of self-command, and the eternal principles of justice.§

Plato perceived the inconveniences resulting from the Cretan and Lacedæmonian system of public messes and of naked exercises; yet he seemed to think that convivial meetings under proper directions might be of great service both in promoting humanity and fellowship, and in discovering the true characters of individuals.|| He defined education to be that which qualifies men to become good citizens, and renders them fit to govern or to obey.¶ He thought it most important that the early principles instilled into the minds of youth should be those of strict moral virtue, and considered, that if poems and fables early taught were able to impress the mind through life with a belief of the most improbable fictions, that the same means might be applied with not less success for inculcating realities and important truths.** Wine, he was so far from prohibiting, that he recommended the moderate use of it from eighteen to forty, and after that age a more free indulgence.†† He considered idleness as the bane of all virtue, and urged to industry as the grand source not only of wealth but of happiness.‡‡ He perceived with great clearness the advantages resulting from the subdivision of labour, and pointed out the necessity and natural progress of such subdivision in proportion as civilisation advances.§§ As to crimes, Plato considered them as originating in a love of pleasure, in passion, or in ignorance and folly.|||| He esteemed it the duty of every citizen to respect the established religion of the country, and he recommended that the religious ceremonies should be accompanied with festivities, and be enlivened by the association of songs and dances.¶¶ It may however be incidentally

* *De legg.* lib. i.
† Ibid. lib. i.
‡ Ibid. lib. i.
§ Ibid. lib. ii.
|| Ibid. lib. viii.
¶ Ibid. ii.
** Ibid. lib. ii.
†† Ibid. lib. ii.
‡‡ Ibid. lib. viii.
§§ *De republicâ*, lib. i.
|||| *De legg.* lib. ix.
¶¶ Ibid. lib. ix.

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

remarked, as a strong argument against the opinions which many have entertained in modern times, of the nature of the Orphic and Bacchic mysteries; that Plato misses no opportunity of animadverting on the verses which were current under the name of Orpheus,* and that he excludes the Bacchic dance, as something unaccountable and unsuited to any purpose of policy, from any new state that may be established, and barely tolerates it in any old state, in which it may happen already to exist among ancient usages.† Plato observes too, on the necessity of accommodating laws to the character and prevailing temper of the inhabitants, and remarks that there is a great and striking difference between the characters of the inhabitants of different countries, whether the circumstance is to be attributed to the climate, or to some peculiar constitution, or to whatever other cause.‡ Against trade and navigation Plato entertained considerable prejudice. Like all statesmen of old times, he interfered unnecessarily in the detail of personal economy, and proposed the establishment of numerous and trivial sumptuary laws. He considered too, a part of the human race as necessarily destined to slavery, but his regulations in regard to the slaves are full of consideration and humanity.

But Plato's Moral and Political system received its completion from his doctrines of Natural Theology. The Supreme Being was considered by him as a being of perfect benevolence, who willed the good of the system which he had organized, and whose providence was constantly engaged in its superintendence. Negligence, or love of ease, or some other weakness is generally the cause of human indifference or neglect; but such imperfections are inconsistent with the first notions of God.§ He thought that to suppose God intent only on affairs of great moment, and indifferent about minor concerns and petty details, is a mere error, originating in like manner from our imputing to a higher intellect the shortsightedness and distractions incident to ourselves, and from the difficulty of our apprehending the nature of a perfect being.‖ Plato urges too, that, it is a mark of a narrow and contracted mind to infer from any disasters or misadventures which seem to befall individuals, that the world is out of order, and that there is no wise superintending providence. The system of the universe is regulated by general principles, and as far as the nature of the materials would allow, every thing is adjusted so as to produce the highest good both of the whole, and of the parts. But particular must give way to general interests, and each individual should consider that the world was not framed for him alone, but that his good is in a sense merely relative and to be viewed in subordination to the good of the whole system.* Nevertheless, the virtuous man has no ground for doubt as to the conduct he should pursue, or for despair in whatever difficulties he may be circumstanced. For the human mind is so constituted, that virtue brings with it its own satisfactions and consolations; and indeed, the course of human affairs, irregular as it may seem, is so tempered, that virtue will sooner or later prevail, whilst vice brings with it not only its own stings, but also inherent seeds of decay and downfal.† To despair under any circumstances is a mark of self-willedness and of disloyalty to Providence. The good being will never eventually desert that spirit which has aspired as far as its faculties would permit, to assimilate itself in goodness to its great original, or suffer it when thus purified and advanced to a congenial nature, to undergo any real calamity. The virtuous therefore may rely in confidence, that, whatever the appearances of things may be, real worth will never prejudice its possessor; for that it is a general law of nature, that the destinies of men are in some respect or other accommodated to their deficiencies or to their qualifications. The virtuous must ultimately attain conditions where their virtues will have suitable scope and energy; and the vicious may congratulate themselves if visited with speedy punishment, that they are provided with early means and opportunities of being reclaimed from their errors, and disciplined to better habits; but those, on the other hand, are deserving of commiseration who have the misfortune to succeed in purposes of mischief, and who become

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

---

* *De republicâ*, lib. ii.

† Ὅση μὲν βακχεία τ' ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ταύταις ἑπομένων, ἃς Νύμφας τε καὶ Πᾶνας καὶ Σειληνοὺς καὶ Σατύρους ἐπονομάζοντες ὡς φασι μιμοῦνται κατωνειμένους περὶ καθαρμούς τε καὶ τελετάς τινας ἀποτελούντων, ξύμπαν τοῦτο τῆς ὀρχήσεως τό γενος οὔθ' ὡς εἰρηνικον οὔθ' ὡς πολεμικὸν οὔθ' ὅτί ποτε βούλεται ῥᾴδιον ἀφορίσασθαι, διορίσασθαι μην μοι ταύτη δοκει σχεδὸν ὀρθότατον αὐτο εἶναι, χωρὶς μὲν πολεμικοῦ, χωρὶς δὲ εἰρηνικοῦ θέντας εἰπεῖν ὡς οὐκ ἔστι πολιτικὸν τοῦτο της ὀρχήσέως τὸ γένος, ἐνταῦθα δὲ κείμενον ἐάσαντας κεῖσθαι νῦν ἐπὶ τὸ πολεμικὸν ἅμα καὶ εἰρηνικόν ὡς ἀναμφισβήτως ἡμέτερον ὂν ἐπανιέναι.—*De legg.* lib. vii. p. 815.

‡ *Ibid.* lib. v. p. 746. b.

§ *Ibid.* lib. x. p. 900, *et seq.*

‖ Μὴ τοίνυν τόν γε θεὸν ἀξιώσωμέν ποτε θνητῶν δημιουργῶν φαυλότερον οἵ τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτοῖς ἔργα, ὅσῳ περ ἂν ἀμείνους ὦσι τόσῳ ἀκριβέστερα καὶ τελεώτερα μιᾷ τέχνῃ σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἀπεργάζονται· τὸν δὲ θεὸν ὄντα τε σοφώτατον βουλόμενόν τ' ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καὶ δυνάμενον ὧν μὲν ῥᾳον ἦν ἐπιμεληθῆναι σμικρῶν ὄντων μηδαμῇ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καθάπερ ἀργὸν ἤ δειλόν τινα διὰ πόνους ῥαθυμοῦντα, τῶν δὲ μεγάλων.—*De legg.* lib. x. p. 902.

* Πειθωμεν τὸν νεανίαν τοῖς λόγοις ὡς τιῷ τοῦ πάντος ἐπιμελουμένῳ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ ἀρέτην τοῦ ὅλον πάντ' ἔστι συντετάγμενα, ὧν καὶ τὸ μερὸς εἷς δυναμὶν ἕκαστον τὸ προσηκὸν πάσχει καὶ ποίει, τούτοις δ' εἴσιν ἄρχοντες προστεστάγμενοι κ. τ. λ. ὧν ἓν καὶ τὸ σὸν ὦ σχέτλιε μοριὸν εἷς τὸ πᾶν ξυντείνει βλεπὸν ἀεί, καίπερ πανσμικρὸν ὄν, σέ δὲ λέληθε περὶ τοῦτο αὖτο ὡς γενεσὶς ἕνεκα ἐκείνου γιγνεται πᾶσα. ὁπως ἡ ἢ τῳ τοῦ πάντος βίῳ ὑπάρχουσα εὐδαίμων οὖσια οὐχ ἕνεκα σοῦ γιγνομένη· σὺ δὲ ἕνεκα ἐκείνου· σὺ δὲ ἀγανακτήσεις ἀγνόων ὅπῃ τὸ περὶ σε ἄριστον τῷ πάντι ξυμβαίνει, καὶ σοὶ κατὰ δυναμὶν τὴν τῆς κοίνης γενεσέως.—*De legg.* lib. x.

† Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὠφέλειν ἄγαθον ἀει πεφυκος οσον αγαθον ψυχῆς διενοήθη, τὸ δὲ κακὸν βλάπτειν. ταῦτα πᾶντα ξυνέδων ἐμηχανήσατο ποῦ χειμενὸν ἕκαστον τῶν μερῶν, νέκωσαν ἀρέτην, ἠττωμένήν δε κακίαν ἔν τῳ παντι παρέχοε μαλιστ' ἄν καὶ ῥᾶστα καὶ ἄριστα.—ἐν τὲ ζώῃ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι θανατοις πάσχειν τὲ καὶ ποίειν ἃ προσηκὸν ὁρᾶν ἐστὶ τοῖς προσφέρουσι τοὺς προσφερεις. ταύτῃς τῆς δικης οὔτε σὺ μήποτε οὔτε εἷ ἄλλος ἀτύχῃς γενομένος ἐπευξήται περιγένεσθαι θεῶν· ἣν πάσων δικων διαφεροντως ἐταξαν τὲ οἳ ταξαντες χρεων τὲ ἐξευλαβεσθαι τὸ παραπαν, οὗ γὰρ ἀμελῃθήσῃ ὑπ' αὐτης.

rooted in the delusion of vice.* For it is an eternal and immutable law, the operation of which pervades the entire universe, and from which no created being can soar so high as to escape by his elevation, or shrink so low as to skreen himself by his obscurity. That virtue will eventually be rewarded and vice punished.†

It is very difficult to obtain a clear view of Plato's physical system. He seems to have considered all the qualities of the visible world as compounded of two different and indeed opposite ingredients: permanent and invariable essences, and fleeting accidents. His essences seem to have been endued by him with some inherent powers of motion, and his accidents with the property of being acted upon. All qualities he thought might be reduced to the four elements, of fire, air, water, and earth; the two first he considered as active, the two latter as passive elements. But even in these again, he seemed to find certain common properties, till by a further analysis he arrived at some original and primeval thing,‡ which, itself destitute of all qualities, might yet serve as a groundwork, or common *vinculum* for all qualities. This universal recipient and primary component, which is indefinable except by negatives, is what was afterwards by Aristotle termed ὑλη, and is with us in general called *matter*.

This matter he seems to have considered as eternal, and self-existent; and that an eternal mind reduced those ingredients, which afterwards constituted qualities, and which were originally inordinate, by his sovereign will, into system and harmony. Creation therefore, was in his view the organization by mind of an elementary chaos; and he considered the power of the Supreme Being over matter as not entirely absolute, but as limited in some degree by the perverseness or resisting nature of the subject to be actuated. And whether we are to attribute the supposition to some irregularities or occasional deviations, which the ancient philosophers imagined in the motion of the heavenly bodies, or to whatever other cause we are to impute the singular position, so it is, that Plato held the inherent and permanent stubbornness of matter to be such; that at stated and periodic intervals, the Supreme Being intermitted his regular and progressive agency, and the sphere of the universe revolved in a retrograde motion, until the excess of unruliness was exhausted, and the system had reverted to a point where it could resume its orderly obedience, and again revolve in subjection to its mighty ruler.*

In uniting essences with fleeting accidents, Plato found great difficulty in reconciling such opposite subjects, and therefore devised a medium, which he described as being neither uniform in its nature like the one, nor incapable of permanance like the other, but in some respect compound and stable. It is very difficult to collect what Plato meant by these intermediate or connecting materials. And it may perhaps rather obscure than elucidate the subject to remark, that in many passages of Plato,† and in some of Aristotle,‡ connected with this point, the term essences seems to be applied to numbers, and these intermediate materials to quantities. The notion however, of some inherent power in matter of itself tending to confusion and inordinate, and only restrained and subjected to certain rules by a Supreme intelligence, and by a coercing and counteracting providence, was a fixed part of Plato's system, and is glanced at in his moral writings, as well as insisted upon where physical subjects are more directly the subject of his investigation. But wherever complete order prevailed, and regularity was observed in the movement of any body or system, it was inferred by Plato, that that order must have been produced by the infusion of some part of the divine mind; and by the continuing and predominant energy of such infused spirit, overruling the untoward propensities of the material body or system which it informed. Such infused spirits he supposed to regulate the movements of the heavenly bodies, and he inferred them to be akin to the soul of man, when the soul had attained its highest perfection, and had reduced the appetites and passions of the body under its absolute control.§

---

* Κατὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐμὴν δόξαν ὦ πῶλε ὅ ἀδίκων τὲ καὶ ὅ ἄδικος ἀπάντων μὲν ἄθλιος· ἀθλιώτερος μὲν τόινυν ἐὰν μὴ ἐιδω δίκην, μηδε τυγχάνη τιμωρίας ἀδίκων. ἧττον δὲ ἄθλιος ἐὰν ὀιδω δίκην, καὶ τυγχανη δίκης ὑπὸ θεῶν τὲ καὶ ἀνθρωπων.—*In Gorgia.*

† Οὐ γὰρ ἀμεληθήση ποτὲ ὑπ' αὐτῆς [τῆς δίκης] οὐχ οὕτω σμικρὸς ὢν δύσῃ κατὰ τὸ τῆς γῆς βάθος· οὐδ' ὑψηλὸς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναπτήσῃ· τίσεις δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν προσήκουσαν τιμωρίαν εἴτ' ἐνθάδε μένων, εἴτε καὶ ἐν ᾅδου διαπορευθείς, εἴτε καὶ τούτων εἰς αγριώτερον ἔτι ἐιακομισθεὶς τόπον. ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ λογος σοὶ καὶ περὶ ἐκείνων ἂν εἴη τῶν, οὓς σὺ κατιδὼν ἐκ σμικρῶν μεγάλους γεγοκότας ἀνοσιουργήσαντας, ἤ τι τοιοῦτον πράξαντας ᾠήθης ἐξ ἀθλίων εὐδαίμονας γεγονέναι, κᾆτα, ὡς ἐν κατόπτροις αὐτῶν ταῖς πράξεσιν, ἠγήσω καθεωρακέναι τὴν πάντων ἀμέλειαν Θεῶν· οὐκ εἰδὼν αὐτῶν τὴν συντέλειαν, ὅπη ποτὲ τῷ παντὶ ζυμβάλλεται.—*De legg.* x. p. 905.

‡ Διὸ τὴν τοῦ γεγονότος ὁρατοῦ καὶ παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ μητέρα τινα καὶ ὑποδοχὴν μήτε γῆν μήτε αέρα μήτε πῦρ μήτε ὕδωρ λέγομεν μήτε ὅσα ἐκ τούτων μήτε ἐξ ὧν ταῦτα γέγονεν ἀλλ' ἀόρατον εἶδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον πανδεχες.—*In Timæo.*

* Τὸ πᾶν τόδε τοτὲ μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ξυμποδηγεῖ πορεύομενον καὶ συγκυκλεῖ· τοτὲ δ' ἀνῆκεν, ὅταν αἱ περίοδοι τοῦ προσήκοντος αὐτῷ μέτρου εἰλήφασιν ἤδη χρόνου· τὸ δὲ, πάλιν αὐτόματον εἰς τἀναντία περιάγεται, ζῶον ὂν, καὶ φρόνησιν εἰληχὸς ἐκ τοῦ συναρμόσαντος αὐτὸ κατ' ἀρχάς. τοῦτο δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ ἀνάπαλιν ἰέναι διὰ τόδ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔμφυτον γέγονε.—κ. τ. λ. *In Politico*, p. 269.

† *In Timæo.*

‡ Ἔτι δὴ παρὰ τὰ αἰσθητὰ καὶ τὰ εἴδη τὰ μαθηματικὰ τῶν πραγμάτων εἶναί φασι μεταξὺ, διαφέροντα τῶν μὲν αἰσθητῶν τῷ ἀΐδια καὶ ἀκίνητα εἶναι· τῶν δ' εἰδῶν τῷ τὰ μὲν πολλ' ἄττα ὅμοια εἶναι, τὸ δὲ εἶδος αὐτὸ, ἕν ἕκαστον μόνον. ἐπεὶ δ' αἴτια τὰ εἴδη τοῖς ἄλλοις, τὰ ἐκείνων στοιχεῖα πάντων ᾠήθη τῶν ὄντων εἶναι στοιχεῖα· ὡς μὲν οὖν ὕλην τὸ μέγα καὶ τὸ μικρὸν εἶναι ἀρχὰς ὡς δ' οὐσίαν τὸ ἕν. ἐξ ἐκείνων γὰρ τὰ κατὰ μέθεξιν τοῦ ἑνὸς τὰ εἴδη εἶναι τοὺς ἀριθμούς.—Aristotel. *Metaphys.* lib. i. c. 6.

§ Τὸδὲ δὴ περὶ τοῦ κυριωτάτου παρ' ἡμῖν ψυχῆς εἴδους διανοεῖσθαι δεῖ τῇδε, ὡς ἄρα νὺτὸ δαίμονα Θεὸς ἑκάστῳ δέδωκε, τοῦτο ὅ δὴ φαμεν οἰκεῖν μὲν ἡμῶν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ σώματι, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ ξυγγένειαν ἀπὸ γῆς ἡμᾶς αἴρειν, ὡς ὄντας φυτὸν οὐκ ἔγγειον ἀλλ' οὐράνιον, ὀρθότατα λέγοντες. ἐκεῖθεν γὰρ ὅθεν ἡ πρώτη τῆς ψυχῆς γένεσις ἔφυ τὸ θεῖον τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ῥίζαν ἡμῶν ἀνακρε-

remarked, as a strong argument against the opinions which many have entertained in modern times, of the nature of the Orphic and Bacchic mysteries; that Plato misses no opportunity of animadverting on the verses which were current under the name of Orpheus,* and that he excludes the Bacchic dance, as something unaccountable and unsuited to any purpose of policy, from any new state that may be established, and barely tolerates it in any old state, in which it may happen already to exist among ancient usages.† Plato observes too, on the necessity of accommodating laws to the character and prevailing temper of the inhabitants, and remarks that there is a great and striking difference between the characters of the inhabitants of different countries, whether the circumstance is to be attributed to the climate, or to some peculiar constitution, or to whatever other cause.‡ Against trade and navigation Plato entertained considerable prejudice. Like all statesmen of old times, he interfered unnecessarily in the detail of personal economy. and proposed the establishment of numerous and trivial sumptuary laws. He considered too, a part of the human race as necessarily destined to slavery, but his regulations in regard to the slaves are full of consideration and humanity.

But Plato's Moral and Political system received its completion from his doctrines of Natural Theology. The Supreme Being was considered by him as a being of perfect benevolence, who willed the good of the system which he had organized, and whose providence was constantly engaged in its superintendence. Negligence, or love of ease, or some other weakness is generally the cause of human indifference or neglect; but such imperfections are inconsistent with the first notions of God.§ He thought that to suppose God intent only on affairs of great moment, and indifferent about minor concerns and petty details, is a mere error, originating in like manner from our imputing to a higher intellect the shortsightedness and distractions incident to ourselves, and from the difficulty of our apprehending the nature of a perfect being.‖ Plato urges too, that, it is a mark of a narrow and contracted mind to infer from any disasters or misadventures which seem to befall individuals, that the world is out of order, and that there is no wise superintending providence. The system of the universe is regulated by general principles, and as far as the nature of the materials would allow, every thing is adjusted so as to produce the highest good both of the whole, and of the parts. But particular must give way to general interests, and each individual should consider that the world was not framed for him alone, but that his good is in a sense merely relative and to be viewed in subordination to the good of the whole system.* Nevertheless, the virtuous man has no ground for doubt as to the conduct he should pursue, or for despair in whatever difficulties he may be circumstanced. For the human mind is so constituted, that virtue brings with it its own satisfactions and consolations; and indeed, the course of human affairs, irregular as it may seem, is so tempered, that virtue will sooner or later prevail, whilst vice brings with it not only its own stings, but also inherent seeds of decay and downfal.† To despair under any circumstances is a mark of self-willedness and of disloyalty to Providence. The good being will never eventually desert that spirit which has aspired as far as its faculties would permit, to assimilate itself in goodness to its great original, or suffer it when thus purified and advanced to a congenial nature, to undergo any real calamity. The virtuous therefore may rely in confidence, that, whatever the appearances of things may be, real worth will never prejudice its possessor; for that it is a general law of nature, that the destinies of men are in some respect or other accommodated to their deficiencies or to their qualifications. The virtuous must ultimately attain conditions where their virtues will have suitable scope and energy; and the vicious may congratulate themselves if visited with speedy punishment, that they are provided with early means and opportunities of being reclaimed from their errors, and disciplined to better habits; but those, on the other hand, are deserving of commiseration who have the misfortune to succeed in purposes of mischief, and who become

---

* *De republicâ*, lib. ii.

† Ὅση μὲν βακχεία τ' ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ταύταις ἑπομένων, ἃς Νύμφας τε καὶ Πᾶνας καὶ Σειληνοὺς καὶ Σατύρους ἐπονομάζοντες ὡς φασι μιμοῦνται κατωνυμένους περὶ καθαρμούς τε καὶ τελετάς τινας ἀποτελούντων, ξύμπαν τοῦτο τῆς ὀρχήσεως τὸ γενος οὔθ' ὡς εἰρηνικον οὔθ' ὡς πολεμικὸν οὔθ' ὅτί ποτε βούλεται ῥᾴδιον ἀφορίσασθαι, διορίσασθαι μην μοι ταύτη δοκει σχεδὸν ὀρθότατον αὐτο εἶναι, χωρὶς μὲν πολεμικοῦ, χωρὶς δὲ εἰρηνικοῦ θέντας εἰπεῖν ὡς οὐκ ἔστι πολιτικὸν τοῦτο της ὀρχήσέως τὸ γένος, ἐνταῦθα δὲ κείμενον ἐάσαντας κεῖσθαι νῦν ἐπὶ τὸ πολεμικὸν ἅμα καὶ εἰρηνικόν ὡς ἀναμφισβήτως ἡμέτερον ὂν ἐπανιέναι.—*De legg.* lib. vii. p. 815.

‡ *Ibid.* lib. v. p. 746. b.

§ *Ibid.* lib. x. p. 900, *et seq.*

‖ Μὴ τοίνυν τὸν γε θεὸν ἀξιώσωμέν ποτε θνητῶν δημιουργῶν φαυλότερον οἵ τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτοῖς ἔργα, ὅσῳ περ ἂν ἀμείνους ὦσι τόσῳ ἀκριβέστερα καὶ τελεώτερα μιᾷ τέχνῃ σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἀπεργάζονται· τὸν δὲ θεὸν ὄντα τε σοφώτατον βουλόμενόν τ' ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καὶ δυνάμενον ὧν μὲν ῥᾷον ἦν ἐπιμεληθῆναι σμικρῶν ὄντων μηδαμῇ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καθάπερ ἀργὸν ἤ δειλόν τινα διὰ πόνους ῥᾳθυμοῦντα, τῶν δὲ μεγάλων.—*De legg.* lib. x. p. 902.

* Πειθωμεν τὸν νεανίαν τοῖς λόγοις ὡς τῷ τοῦ πάντος ἐπιμελουμένῳ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ ἀρέτην τοῦ ὅλον πάντ' ἔστι συντετάγμενα, ὧν καὶ τὸ μερὸς εἷς δυναμὶν ἕκαστον τὸ προσηκὸν πάσχει καὶ ποίει, τούτοις δ' εἰσὶν ἄρχοντες προστεστάγμενοι κ. τ. λ. ὧν ἓν καὶ τὸ σὸν ὦ σχέτλιε μοριὸν εἷς τὸ πᾶν ξυντέινει βλεπὸν ἀεί, καίπερ πανσμικρὸν ὄν, σέ δὲ λέληθε περὶ τοῦτο αὖτο ὡς γενεσις ἕνεκα ἐκείνου γιγνεται πᾶσα. ὁπως ἡ ἤ τῳ τοῦ πάντος βίῳ ὑπάρχουσα εὐδαίμων οὐσια οὐχ ἕνεκα σοῦ γιγνομένη· σὺ δὲ ἕνεκα ἐκείνου· σὺ δὲ ἀγανακτήσεις ἀγνόων ὅπῃ τὸ περὶ σε ἄριστον τῷ πάντι ξυμβαίνει, καὶ σοὶ κατὰ δυναμὶν τὴν τῆς κοίνῃς γενεσέως.—*De legg.* lib. x.

† Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὠφέλειν ἄγαθον ἀεὶ πεφυκος οσον αγαθον ψυχῆς διενοήθη, τὸ δὲ κακὸν βλάπτειν. ταῦτα πᾶντα ξυνιδων ἐμηχανήσατο ποῦ χειμενὸν ἕκαστον τῶν μερῶν, νέκωσαν ἀρέτην, ἠττωμένην δε κακίαν ἓν τῷ παντι παρέχοι μαλιστ' ἄν καὶ ῥᾶστα καὶ ἄριστα.—ἓν τὲ ζώῃ καὶ ἓν πᾶσα θανατοις πάσχειν τὲ καὶ ποίειν ἃ προσηκὸν ὁρᾶν ἐστὶ τοῖς προσφέρουσι τοὺς προσφερεις. ταύτης τῆς δικης οὔτε σὺ μήποτε οὔτε εἷ ἄλλος ἀτύχης γενομένος ἐπευξήται περιγένεσθαι θεῶν· ἣν πάσων δικων διαφεροντως ἐταξαν τὲ οἱ ταξαντες χρεων τὲ ἐξευλαβεσθαι τὸ παραπαν, οὗ γὰρ ἀμεληθήσῃ ὑπ' αὐτης.

rooted in the delusion of vice.* For it is an eternal and immutable law, the operation of which pervades the entire universe, and from which no created being can soar so high as to escape by his elevation, or shrink so low as to skreen himself by his obscurity. That virtue will eventually be rewarded and vice punished.†

It is very difficult to obtain a clear view of Plato's physical system. He seems to have considered all the qualities of the visible world as compounded of two different and indeed opposite ingredients: permanent and invariable essences, and fleeting accidents. His essences seem to have been endued by him with some inherent powers of motion, and his accidents with the property of being acted upon. All qualities he thought might be reduced to the four elements, of fire, air, water, and earth; the two first he considered as active, the two latter as passive elements. But even in these again, he seemed to find certain common properties, till by a further analysis he arrived at some original and primeval thing,‡ which, itself destitute of all qualities, might yet serve as a groundwork, or common *vinculum* for all qualities. This universal recipient and primary component, which is indefinable except by negatives, is what was afterwards by Aristotle termed ὑλη, and is with us in general called *matter*.

This matter he seems to have considered as eternal, and self-existent; and that an eternal mind reduced those ingredients, which afterwards constituted qualities, and which were originally inordinate, by his sovereign will, into system and harmony. Creation therefore, was in his view the organization by mind of an elementary chaos; and he considered the power of the Supreme Being over matter as not entirely absolute, but as limited in some degree by the perverseness or resisting nature of the subject to be actuated. And whether we are to attribute the supposition to some irregularities or occasional deviations, which the ancient philosophers imagined in the motion of the heavenly bodies, or to whatever other cause we are to impute the singular position, so it is, that Plato held the inherent and permanent stubbornness of matter to be such; that at stated and periodic intervals, the Supreme Being intermitted his regular and progressive agency, and the sphere of the universe revolved in a retrograde motion, until the excess of unruliness was exhausted, and the system had reverted to a point where it could resume its orderly obedience, and again revolve in subjection to its mighty ruler.*

In uniting essences with fleeting accidents, Plato found great difficulty in reconciling such opposite subjects, and therefore devised a medium, which he described as being neither uniform in its nature like the one, nor incapable of permanance like the other, but in some respect compound and stable. It is very difficult to collect what Plato meant by these intermediate or connecting materials. And it may perhaps rather obscure than elucidate the subject to remark, that in many passages of Plato,† and in some of Aristotle,‡ connected with this point, the term essences seems to be applied to numbers, and these intermediate materials to quantities. The notion however, of some inherent power in matter of itself tending to confusion and inordinate, and only restrained and subjected to certain rules by a Supreme intelligence, and by a coercing and counteracting providence, was a fixed part of Plato's system, and is glanced at in his moral writings, as well as insisted upon where physical subjects are more directly the subject of his investigation. But wherever complete order prevailed, and regularity was observed in the movement of any body or system, it was inferred by Plato, that that order must have been produced by the infusion of some part of the divine mind; and by the continuing and predominant energy of such infused spirit, overruling the untoward propensities of the material body or system which it informed. Such infused spirits he supposed to regulate the movements of the heavenly bodies, and he inferred them to be akin to the soul of man, when the soul had attained its highest perfection, and had reduced the appetites and passions of the body under its absolute control.§

---

* Κατὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐμὴν δόξαν ὦ πῶλε ὃ ἀδίκων τὲ καὶ ὃ ἄδικος ἀπάντων μὲν ἄθλιος· ἀθλιώτερος μὲν τόινυν ἐὰν μὴ δίδω δίκην, μηδὲ τυγχάνῃ τιμωρίας ἀδίκων. ἧττον δὲ ἄθλιος ἐὰν δίδω δίκην, καὶ τυγχανῃ δίκης ὑπὸ θεῶν τὲ καὶ ἀνθρωπων.—*In Gorgia.*

† Οὐ γὰρ ἀμεληθήσῃ ποτὲ ὑπ' αὐτῆς [τῆς δίκης] οὐχ οὕτω σμικρὸς ὢν δύσῃ κατὰ τὸ τῆς γῆς βάθος· οὐδ' ὑψηλὸς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναπτήσῃ· τίσεις δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν προσήκουσαν τιμωρίαν εἴτ' ἐνθάδε μένων, εἴτε καὶ ἐν ᾅδου διαπορευθεὶς, εἴτε καὶ τούτων εἰς ἀγριώτερον ἔτι διακομισθεὶς τόπον. ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ λογος σοὶ καὶ περὶ ἐκείνων ἂν εἴη τῶν, οὓς σὺ κατιδὼν ἐκ σμικρῶν μεγάλους γεγονότας ἀνοσιουργήσαντας, ἤ τι τοιοῦτον πράξαντας ᾠήθης ἐξ ἀθλίων εὐδαίμονας γεγονέναι, κᾆτα, ὡς ἐν κατόπτροις αὐτῶν ταῖς πράξεσιν, ἠγήσω καθεωρακέναι τὴν πάντων ἀμέλειαν Θεῶν· οὐκ εἰδὼν αὐτῶν τὴν συντέλειαν, ὅπη ποτὲ τῷ παντὶ ξυμβάλλεται.—*De legg.* x. p. 905.

‡ Διὸ τὴν τοῦ γεγονότος ὁρατοῦ καὶ παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ μητέρα τινα καὶ ὑποδοχὴν μήτε γῆν μήτε αέρα μήτε πῦρ μήτε ὕδωρ λέγομεν μήτε ὅσα ἐκ τούτων μήτε ἐξ ὧν ταῦτα γέγονεν ἀλλ' ἀόρατον εἶδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον πανδεχες.—*In Timæo.*

* Τὸ πᾶν τόδε τοτὲ μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ξυμποδηγεῖ πορεύομενον καὶ συγκυκλεῖ· τοτὲ δ' ἀνῆκεν, ὅταν αἱ περίοδοι τοῦ προσήκοντος αὐτῷ μέτρου εἰλήφασιν ἤδη χρόνου· τὸ δὲ, πάλιν αὐτόματον εἰς τἀναντία περιάγεται, ζῷων ὄν, καὶ φρόνησιν εἰληχὸς ἐκ τοῦ συναρμόσαντος αὐτὸ κατ' ἀρχάς. τοῦτο δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ ἀνάπαλιν ἰέναι διὰ τόδ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔμφυτον γέγονε.—κ. τ. λ. *In Politico*, p. 269.

† *In Timæo.*

‡ Ἔτι δὴ παρὰ τὰ αἰσθητὰ καὶ τὰ εἴδη τὰ μαθηματικὰ τῶν πραγμάτων εἶναί φασι μεταξὺ, διαφέροντα τῶν μὲν αἰσθητῶν τῷ ἀΐδια καὶ ἀκίνητα εἶναι· τῶν δ' εἰδῶν τῷ τὰ μὲν πολλ' ἄττα ὅμοια εἶναι, τὸ δὲ εἶδος αὐτὸ, ἓν ἕκαστον μόνον. ἐπεὶ δ' αἴτια τὰ εἴδη τοῖς ἄλλοις, τὰ ἐκείνων στοιχεῖα πάντων ᾠήθη τῶν ὄντων εἶναι στοιχεῖα· ὡς μὲν οὖν ὕλην τὸ μέγα καὶ τὸ μικρὸν εἶναι ἀρχὰς ὡς δ' οὐσίαν τὸ ἕν. ἐξ ἐκείνων γὰρ τὰ κατὰ μέθεξιν τοῦ ἑνὸς τὰ εἴδη εἶναι τοὺς ἀριθμούς.—Aristotel. *Metaphys.* lib. i. c. 6.

§ Τὸδὲ δὴ περὶ τοῦ κυριωτάτου παρ' ἡμῖν ψυχῆς εἶδους διανοεῖσθαι δεῖ τῇδε, ὡς ἄρα αὐτὸ δαίμονα Θεὸς ἑκάστῳ δέδωκε, τοῦτο ὅ δὴ φαμεν οἰκεῖν μὲν ἡμῶν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ σώματι, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ ξυγγένειαν ἀπὸ γῆς ἡμᾶς αἴρειν, ὡς ὄντας φυτὸν οὐκ ἔγγειον ἀλλ' οὐράνιον, ὀρθότατα λέγοντες. ἐκεῖθεν γὰρ ὅθεν ἡ πρώτη τῆς ψυχῆς γένεσις ἔφυ τὸ θεῖον τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ῥίζαν ἡμῶν ἀνακρε-

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

remarked, as a strong argument against the opinions which many have entertained in modern times, of the nature of the Orphic and Bacchic mysteries; that Plato misses no opportunity of animadverting on the verses which were current under the name of Orpheus,* and that he excludes the Bacchic dance, as something unaccountable and unsuited to any purpose of policy, from any new state that may be established, and barely tolerates it in any old state, in which it may happen already to exist among ancient usages.† Plato observes too, on the necessity of accommodating laws to the character and prevailing temper of the inhabitants, and remarks that there is a great and striking difference between the characters of the inhabitants of different countries, whether the circumstance is to be attributed to the climate, or to some peculiar constitution, or to whatever other cause.‡ Against trade and navigation Plato entertained considerable prejudice. Like all statesmen of old times, he interfered unnecessarily in the detail of personal economy. and proposed the establishment of numerous and trivial sumptuary laws. He considered too, a part of the human race as necessarily destined to slavery, but his regulations in regard to the slaves are full of consideration and humanity.

But Plato's Moral and Political system received its completion from his doctrines of Natural Theology. The Supreme Being was considered by him as a being of perfect benevolence, who willed the good of the system which he had organized, and whose providence was constantly engaged in its superintendence. Negligence, or love of ease, or some other weakness is generally the cause of human indifference or neglect; but such imperfections are inconsistent with the first notions of God.§ He thought that to suppose God intent only on affairs of great moment, and indifferent about minor concerns and petty details, is a mere error, originating in like manner from our imputing to a higher intellect the shortsightedness and distractions incident to ourselves, and from the difficulty of our apprehending the nature of a perfect being.‖ Plato urges too, that, it is a mark of a narrow and contracted mind to infer from any disasters or misadventures which seem to befall individuals, that the world is out of order, and that there is no wise superintending providence. The system of the universe is regulated by general principles, and as far as the nature of the materials would allow, every thing is adjusted so as to produce the highest good both of the whole, and of the parts. But particular must give way to general interests, and each individual should consider that the world was not framed for him alone, but that his good is in a sense merely relative and to be viewed in subordination to the good of the whole system.* Nevertheless, the virtuous man has no ground for doubt as to the conduct he should pursue, or for despair in whatever difficulties he may be circumstanced. For the human mind is so constituted, that virtue brings with it its own satisfactions and consolations; and indeed, the course of human affairs, irregular as it may seem, is so tempered, that virtue will sooner or later prevail, whilst vice brings with it not only its own stings, but also inherent seeds of decay and downfal.† To despair under any circumstances is a mark of self-willedness and of disloyalty to Providence. The good being will never eventually desert that spirit which has aspired as far as its faculties would permit, to assimilate itself in goodness to its great original, or suffer it when thus purified and advanced to a congenial nature, to undergo any real calamity. The virtuous therefore may rely in confidence, that, whatever the appearances of things may be, real worth will never prejudice its possessor; for that it is a general law of nature, that the destinies of men are in some respect or other accommodated to their deficiencies or to their qualifications. The virtuous must ultimately attain conditions where their virtues will have suitable scope and energy; and the vicious may congratulate themselves if visited with speedy punishment, that they are provided with early means and opportunities of being reclaimed from their errors, and disciplined to better habits; but those, on the other hand, are deserving of commiseration who have the misfortune to succeed in purposes of mischief, and who become

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

---

* *De republicâ*, lib. ii.

† Ὅση μὲν βακχεία τ' ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ταύταις ἑπομένων, ἃς Νύμφας τε καὶ Πᾶνας καὶ Σειληνοὺς καὶ Σατύρους ἐπονομάζοντες ὡς φασι μιμοῦνται κατωνυμένους περὶ καθαρμούς τε καὶ τελετάς τινας ἀποτελοῦντων, ξύμπαν τοῦτο τῆς ὀρχήσεως τὸ γενος οὔθ' ὡς εἰρηνικον οὔθ' ὡς πολεμικὸν οὔθ' ὅτί ποτε βούλεται ῥᾴδιον ἀφορίσασθαι, διορίσασθαι μην μοι ταύτη δοκει σχεδὸν ὀρθότατον αὐτο εἶναι, χωρὶς μὲν πολεμικοῦ, χωρὶς δὲ εἰρηνικοῦ θέντας εἰπεῖν ὡς οὐκ ἔστι πολιτικὸν τοῦτο της ὀρχήσέως τὸ γένος, ἐνταῦθα δὲ κείμενον ἐάσαντας κεῖσθαι νῦν ἐπὶ τὸ πολεμικὸν ἅμα καὶ εἰρηνικόν ὡς ἀναμφισβήτως ἡμέτερον ὂν ἐπανιέναι.—*De legg.* lib. vii. p. 815.

‡ *Ibid.* lib. v. p. 746. b.

§ *Ibid.* lib. x. p. 900, *et seq.*

‖ Μὴ τοίνυν τὸν γε θεὸν ἀξιώσωμέν ποτε θνητῶν δημιουργῶν φαυλότερον οἵ τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτοῖς ἔργα, ὅσω περ ἂν ἀμείνους ὦσι τόσῳ ἀκριβέστερα καὶ τελεώτερα μιᾷ τέχνῃ σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἀπεργάζονται· τὸν δὲ θεὸν ὄντα τε σοφώτατον βουλόμενόν τ' ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καὶ δυνάμενον ὧν μὲν ῥᾷον ἦν ἐπιμεληθῆναι σμικρῶν ὄντων μηδαμῇ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καθάπερ ἀργὸν ἢ δειλόν τινα διὰ πόνους ῥᾳθυμοῦντα, τῶν δὲ μεγάλων.—*De legg.* lib. x. p. 902.

* Πειθωμεν τὸν νεανίαν τοῖς λόγοις ὡς τῷ τοῦ πάντος ἐπιμελουμένῳ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ ἀρέτην τοῦ ὅλον πάντ' ἔστι συντετάγμενα, ὧν καὶ τὸ μερὸς εἷς δυναμὶν ἕκαστον τὸ προσηκὸν πάσχει καὶ ποίει, τούτοις δ' εἰσιν ἄρχοντες προστεστάγμενοι κ. τ. λ. ὧν ἓν καὶ τὸ σὸν ὦ σχέτλιε μοριὸν εἷς τὸ πᾶν ξυντέινει βλεπὸν ἀει, καίπερ πανσμικρὸν ὄν, σέ δὲ λέληθε περὶ τοῦτο αὖτο ὡς γενεσὶς ἑνεκα ἐκείνου γιγνεται πᾶσα. ὁπως ἡ ἢ τῳ τοῦ πᾶντος βίῳ ὑπάρχουσα εὐδαίμων οὔσια οὔχ ἕνεκα σοῦ γιγνομένη· σὺ δὲ ἕνεκα ἐκείνου· σὺ δὲ ἀγανακτήσεις ἀγνόων ὅπῃ τὸ περὶ σε ἄριστον τῷ πάντι ξυμβάινει, καὶ σοὶ κατὰ δυναμὶν τὴν τῆς κοίνης γενεσέως.—*De legg.* lib. x.

† Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὠφέλειν ἄγαθον ἀει πεφυκοτ οσον αγαθον ψυχῆς διενοήθη, τὸ δὲ κακὸν βλάπτειν. ταῦτα πᾶντα ξυνίδων ἐμηχανήσατο ποῦ χειμενὸν ἕκαστον τῶν μερῶν, νίκωσαν ἀρέτην, ἡττωμένήν δε κακίαν ἓν τῷ παντι παρέχοι μαλιστ' ἂν καὶ ῥᾶστα καὶ ἄριστα.—ἓν τὲ ζώῃ καὶ ἓν πᾶσι θανατοις πάσχειν τὲ καὶ ποίειν ἃ προσηκὸν ὁρᾶν ἐστὶ τοῖς προσφέρουσι τοὺς προσφερεις. ταύτης τῆς δικης οὔτε σὺ μήποτε οὔτε εἷ ἄλλος ἀτύχης γενομένος ἐπευξῄται περιγένεσθαι θεῶν· ἢν πάσων δικων διαφεροντως ἐταξαν τὲ οἵ ταξαντες χρεων τὲ ἐξευλαβεσθαι τὸ παραπαν, οὐ γὰρ ἀμεληθήσῃ ὑπ' αὐτης.

Theology. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

rooted in the delusion of vice.* For it is an eternal and immutable law, the operation of which pervades the entire universe, and from which no created being can soar so high as to escape by his elevation, or shrink so low as to skreen himself by his obscurity. That virtue will eventually be rewarded and vice punished.†

It is very difficult to obtain a clear view of Plato's physical system. He seems to have considered all the qualities of the visible world as compounded of two different and indeed opposite ingredients: permanent and invariable essences, and fleeting accidents. His essences seem to have been endued by him with some inherent powers of motion, and his accidents with the property of being acted upon. All qualities he thought might be reduced to the four elements, of fire, air, water, and earth; the two first he considered as active, the two latter as passive elements. But even in these again, he seemed to find certain common properties, till by a further analysis he arrived at some original and primeval thing,‡ which, itself destitute of all qualities, might yet serve as a groundwork, or common *vinculum* for all qualities. This universal recipient and primary component, which is indefinable except by negatives, is what was afterwards by Aristotle termed *ὑλη*, and is with us in general called *matter*.

This matter he seems to have considered as eternal, and self-existent; and that an eternal mind reduced those ingredients, which afterwards constituted qualities, and which were originally inordinate, by his sovereign will, into system and harmony. Creation therefore, was in his view the organization by mind of an elementary chaos; and he considered the power of the Supreme Being over matter as not entirely absolute, but as limited in some degree by the perverseness or resisting nature of the subject to be actuated. And whether we are to attribute the supposition to some irregularities or occasional deviations, which the ancient philosophers imagined in the motion of the heavenly bodies, or to whatever other cause we are to impute the singular position, so it is, that Plato held the inherent and permanent stubbornness of matter to be such; that at stated and periodic intervals, the Supreme Being intermitted his regular and progressive agency, and the sphere of the universe revolved in a retrograde motion, until the excess of unruliness was exhausted, and the system had reverted to a point where it could resume its orderly obedience, and again revolve in subjection to its mighty ruler.*

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656 — B. C. 348.

In uniting essences with fleeting accidents, Plato found great difficulty in reconciling such opposite subjects, and therefore devised a medium, which he described as being neither uniform in its nature like the one, nor incapable of permanance like the other, but in some respect compound and stable. It is very difficult to collect what Plato meant by these intermediate or connecting materials. And it may perhaps rather obscure than elucidate the subject to remark, that in many passages of Plato,† and in some of Aristotle,‡ connected with this point, the term essences seems to be applied to numbers, and these intermediate materials to quantities. The notion however, of some inherent power in matter of itself tending to confusion and inordinate, and only restrained and subjected to certain rules by a Supreme intelligence, and by a coercing and counteracting providence, was a fixed part of Plato's system, and is glanced at in his moral writings, as well as insisted upon where physical subjects are more directly the subject of his investigation. But wherever complete order prevailed, and regularity was observed in the movement of any body or system, it was inferred by Plato, that that order must have been produced by the infusion of some part of the divine mind; and by the continuing and predominant energy of such infused spirit, overruling the untoward propensities of the material body or system which it informed. Such infused spirits he supposed to regulate the movements of the heavenly bodies, and he inferred them to be akin to the soul of man, when the soul had attained its highest perfection, and had reduced the appetites and passions of the body under its absolute control.§

---

* Κατὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐμὴν δόξαν ὦ πῶλε ὅ ἀδίκων τὲ καὶ ὅ ἄδικος ἁπάντων μὲν ἄθλιος· ἀθλιώτερος μὲν τόινυν ἐὰν μὴ δίδω δίκην, μηδὲ τυγχάνῃ τιμωρίας ἀδίκων. ἧττον δὲ ἄθλιος ἐὰν δίδω δίκην, καὶ τυγχανῃ δίκης ὑπὸ θεῶν τὲ καὶ ἀνθρωπων.—*In Gorgia.*

† Οὐ γὰρ ἀμεληθήσῃ ποτὲ ὑπ' αὐτῆς [τῆς δίκης] οὐχ οὕτω σμικρὸν ὢν δύσῃ κατὰ τὸ τῆς γῆς βάθος· οὐδ' ὑψηλὸς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναπτήσῃ· τίσεις δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν προσήκουσαν τιμωρίαν εἴτ' ἐνθάδε μένων, εἴτε καὶ ἐν ᾅδου διαπορευθεὶς, εἴτε καὶ τούτων εἰς ἀγριώτερον ἔτι διακομισθεὶς τόπον. ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ λογος σοὶ καὶ περὶ ἐκείνων ἂν εἴη τῶν, οὓς σὺ κατιδὼν ἐκ σμικρῶν μεγάλους γεγονότας ἀνοσιουργήσαντας, ἤ τι τοιοῦτον πράξαντας ᾠήθης ἐξ ἀθλίων εὐδαίμονας γεγονέναι, κᾷτα, ὡς ἐν κατόπτροις αὐτῶν ταῖς πράξεσιν, ἠγήσω καθεωρακέναι τὴν πάντων ἀμέλειαν θεῶν· οὐκ εἰδὼν αὐτῶν τὴν συντέλειαν, ὅπη ποτὲ τῷ παντὶ ζυμβάλλεται.—*De legg.* x. p. 905.

‡ Διὸ τὴν τοῦ γεγονότος ὁρατοῦ καὶ παντὸς αἰσθητοῦ μητέρα τινα καὶ ὑποδοχὴν μήτε γῆν μήτε αέρα μήτε πῦρ μήτε ὕδωρ λέγομεν μήτε ὅσα ἐκ τούτων μήτε ἐξ ὧν ταῦτα γέγονεν ἀλλ' ἀόρατον εἶδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον πανδεχες.—*In Timæo.*

* Τὸ πᾶν τόδε τοτὲ μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ξυμποδηγεῖ πορεύομενον καὶ συγκυκλεῖ· τοτὲ δ' ἀνῆκεν, ὅταν αἱ περίοδοι τοῦ προσήκοντος αὐτῷ μέτρου εἰλήφασιν ἤδη χρόνου· τὸ δὲ, πάλιν αὐτόματον εἰς τἀναντία περιάγεται, ζῷον ὂν, καὶ φρόνησιν εἰληχὸς ἐκ τοῦ συναρμόσαντος αὐτὸ κατ' ἀρχάς. τοῦτο δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ ἀνάπαλιν ἰέναι διὰ τόδ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔμφυτον γέγονε.—κ. τ. λ. *In Politico*, p. 269.

† *In Timæo.*

‡ Ἔτι δὴ παρὰ τὰ αἰσθητὰ καὶ τὰ εἴδη τὰ μαθηματικὰ τῶν πραγμάτων εἶναί φασι μεταξὺ, διαφέροντα τῶν μὲν αἰσθητῶν τῷ ἀΐδια καὶ ἀκίνητα εἶναι· τῶν δ' εἰδῶν τῷ τὰ μὲν πολλ' ἄττα ὅμοια εἶναι, τὸ δὲ εἶδος αὐτὸ, ἕν ἕκαστον μόνον. ἐπεὶ δ' αἴτια τὰ εἴδη τοῖς ἄλλοις, τὰ ἐκείνων στοιχεῖα πάντων ᾠήθη τῶν ὄντων εἶναι στοιχεῖα· ὡς μὲν οὖν ὕλην τὸ μέγα καὶ τὸ μικρὸν εἶναι ἀρχὰς ὡς δ' οὐσίαν τὸ ἕν. ἐξ ἐκείνων γὰρ τὰ κατὰ μέθεξιν τοῦ ἑνὸς τὰ εἴδη εἶναι τοὺς ἀριθμούς.—Aristotel. *Metaphys.* lib. i. c. 6.

§ Τὸδὲ δὴ περὶ τοῦ κυριωτάτου παρ' ἡμῖν ψυχῆς εἴδους διανοεῖσθαι δεῖ τῇδε, ὡς ἄρα αὐτὸ δαίμονα Θεὸς ἑκάστῳ δέδωκε, τοῦτο ὅ δὴ φαμεν οἰκεῖν μὲν ἡμῶν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ σώματι, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ ξυγγένειαν ἀπὸ γῆς ἡμᾶς αἴρειν, ὡς ὄντας φυτὸν οὐκ ἔγγειον ἀλλ' οὐράνιον, ὀρθότατα λέγοντες. ἐκεῖθεν γὰρ ὅθεν ἡ πρώτη τῆς ψυχῆς γένεσις ἔφυ τὸ θεῖον τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ ῥίζαν ἡμῶν ἀνακρε-

No trace is to be found in Plato of the existence of malignant spirits. His doctrine of the resistance of matter, may, perhaps, be looked upon as an ingenious theory, adopted in an imperfect state of knowledge, to solve the great problem of the existence of evil. In the sense which we have explained, Plato taught the existence of actuating spirits or divinities; but the passages in which he seems to adopt in the number of these, the deities of the popular mythology, are generally prefaced by words of reserve; and may, perhaps, be justly considered as instances of cautious, if not honourable, accommodation to popular superstition. With the fate of Anaxagoras and of Socrates but too strongly impressed on his memory, Plato may perhaps be excused for not openly defying and exposing the vulgar polytheism.

The more gross and practically mischievous effects of the superstition that prevailed among his countrymen, he reprobates on every occasion. He incessantly ridicules that weakness, which instead of the offering of a pure heart, would attempt to propitiate a perfect being by gifts and sacrifices, and would make such bargains with an all-just God as would be an insult if proposed to any of their fellow-creatures.* He rebukes the poets for creating or giving popularity to the idlest and most impure fictions of the ancient mythology. If Plato considered the gods of his country as having permanent existence, as embodied powers of nature and tutelary divinities, or as having had a mortal existence, as departed heroes and benefactors of mankind, he at least did not at the same time consider, that beings so superior were or had been capable of the grossest crimes, and of the greatest inconsistency of character. But we confess it seems to us most probable, that Plato entirely disbelieved the whole mass of the current fictions; and the difference of style observable in his writings upon this subject, so distinguishable from his solemn and earnest manner when discoursing on the Supreme divinity, seems strongly to confirm our opinion of his disbelief in the polytheism of his countrymen even in a modified sense.†

The art of communicating knowledge, or the science of language and reasoning, is intimately connected with philosophy or the art of acquiring knowledge. As knowledge according to Plato's doctrine consisted in rejecting accidental particulars, and in contemplating those essences or general principles which always existed in the mind, but which only required the suggestion of particular occasions to unfold and develope them at large; so he considered the art of communicating knowledge to consist in exciting the power of abstraction, and in awakening in the understanding those inherent but dormant notions, which only require proper excitement to become expanded in their due proportions. As the objects of knowledge can only be clearly distinguished from one another, by separating their permanent natures from their accidental circumstances and combinations, he considered definitions as the grand instrument for communicating knowledge; since, by means of them, we can limit the subject of inquiry to a distinct point; and by words defined and adhered to in the sense given as a definition, can at once explain what we consider the permanent and inherent properties of any thing, and can also converse of them as separated from their accidental adjuncts.*

With men indeed of sound understandings and candid tempers, plain and direct reasoning is the most proper mode of proceeding, and knowledge is best communicated by simple methods, and with as little of the circuits and perplexities of language as the nature of the subject will admit. But with different tempers, and on different occasions, other methods of communicating knowledge, and leading on to just sentiments must be adopted. Some minds must be first cleared and purified from idle prepossessions, from vain conceits, from the arrogant imagination that they are already in possession of that very knowledge from which their hearts and understandings are in fact entirely alien. The subtle must be met with subtilty, the fantastical must be indulged a little in their whimsies, and be enticed and allured to more substantial entertainment. The art of conviction is very closely connected with the art of persuasion. And although without a true and sound logic no man can acquire knowledge worth imparting, so on the other hand, without proper rhetorical skill the most important knowledge of a practical nature must remain unimparted or imparted to little purpose.

Such seem to have been Plato's general notions on the subjects of logic and rhetoric. But it has so happened, that his animadversions on the technical refinements, the jingling tricks, and fopperies of contemporary rhetoricians have been misconceived, as if they involved a general and indiscriminate censure on the art of rhetoric. The object of Plato was very different, as will appear to any one who carefully studies his dialogues connected with that subject. He merely endeavours to inculcate, that the faculty of using words without a real knowledge of the subjects discussed, is but empty babbling; and that any art which would attempt to show, that the opposite sides of every question are equally capable of argument and proof, must be grounded either in the ignorance or in the imposture of its professors.

That the view which we have taken of Plato's doctrine on this head is the just one, will be seen at once from the following abstract or condensed arrangement of the principal arguments used in the

---

μαννὺν ὀρθοῖ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα—et postea—τῷ δὲ περὶ φιλομάθιαν καὶ περὶ τὰς τῆς ἀληθείας φρονήσεις ἐσπουδακότι καὶ ταῦτα μάλιστα τῶν αὐτῷ γεγυμνασμένῳ φρονεῖν μὲν ἀθάνατα καὶ θεῖα, ἂν περ ἀληθείας ἐφάπτηται πᾶσα ἀνάγκηπου, καθ' ὅσον δ' αὖ μετασχεῖν ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις ἀθανασίας ἐνδέχεται, τούτου μηδὲν μέρος ἀπολείπειν, ἅτε δὲ ἀεὶ θεραπεύοντα τὸ θεῖον ἔχοντά τε αὐτὸν εὖ μάλα κεκοσμημένον τὸν δαίμονα ξύνοικον ἐν αὑτῷ διαφερόντως εὐδαίμονα εἶναι.—In Timæo. p. 90. These passages seem strongly illustrative of the nature of Socrates's *demon*, at least as understood by Plato.

* *De legg.* lib. x. and lib. xii.

† *Sciendum est tamen non in omnem disputationem philosophos fabulosa admittere, sed his uti solent cum vel de animâ, vel de aerilis, ætherlisve potestatibus vel de cæteris Dis loquuntur: cæterum cum ad summum et principem omnium Deum tractatus se audet attollere, nihil fabulosum penitus attingunt.*—Macrobius *in Somn. Scip.* lib. i. c. 2.

* Βούλει οὖν ἐνθένδε ἀρξώμεθα ἐπισκοποῦντες ἐκ τῆς εἰωθυίας μεθόδου; εἶδος γάρ που τι ἓν ἕκαστον εἰώθαμεν τίθεσθαι περὶ ἕκαστα τὰ πολλὰ οἷς ταὐτὸν ὄνομα ἐπιφέρομεν. *De Republ.* x. p. 596.

Phædrus, for which we are principally indebted to an essay by Mr. Geddes, on the composition of the Dialogues, which contains amongst other things some very valuable illustrations of Plato.

"I ask you, says Socrates, does not eloquence allure and persuade the mind, not merely in courts of justice, and other public assemblies, but in private parties likewise, where men discuss topics of more or less importance? Is it not for their honour to deliberate justly in matters of small as well as of great moment? By Jove, answered Phædrus, I never heard that oratory was displayed anywhere else than at public trials, or in speeches addressed to the people.—What then, Phædrus, is it the opposite parties do in courts of justice? Do they not *contradict* one another? They do.—With regard to what is just, and to what is unjust? Yes.—He who does this by art can make the same things appear just to the same persons at one time, and at another, unjust? He can. And in a public oration, he can represent the same things, useful to the public this day, and the next, injurious? This art then of debating or contradicting being in fact one and the same, may not only be exercised in public meetings, and the business transacted there, but likewise in every other affair? Answer me, then, and say, whether does a deception happen in things which differ widely, or in things which differ but little? In the latter.—If, in going from a thing to its opposite, you proceed gradually, will not the transition be more insensible than if made suddenly? Certainly.—He, therefore, who would impose upon another, without being himself deceived, must have an accurate knowledge of things which resemble, and things which do not resemble one another? He must.—Is it possible for a person who is ignorant of the truth, in any one thing, to judge of its greater or less similitude with other things? By no means.—Consequently, those who are deceived, and who form opinions contrary to the nature of things, are led astray by false appearances or similitudes? They are.—Well then, is it in the power of any man who does not himself understand the nature of things, artfully and insensibly to draw off his hearers by delusive resemblances from truth to falsehood? Not at all.—Whoever, therefore, my friend, is ignorant of truth, and guided by *opinions*, must appear ridiculous, and unacquainted with his art when he attempts to persuade; he, who would excel in oratory, ought first, to form just notions, and to understand the true character of every species of things, and hence be enabled to judge when the people are likely to be deceived, and when not? He would be a happy man, Socrates, who possessed that knowledge.—Moreover, when he has to describe any thing, none of its properties ought to escape him, but he ought at one glance to discover to what species his subject belongs; an oration ought in its composition to resemble an animal, which has its own body, head, and feet, and its middle extremities, and every member and part correspondent to each other, and to the whole. It ought not to be a matter of indifference, whether what is said first might as well be last, or the contrary. These observations, Phædrus, are not however so important as the two following ones. What are these? First, it would be well for us if we could collect many remote qualities, and reduce them into one kind; and by defining every thing, give a distinct idea of the subject: in this manner we have endeavoured to define love, and ascertain its meaning.—Well what is the other? It is this. To be capable of subdividing each species into its natural and peculiar division without, like an unskilful artizan, breaking any of its parts. I am in love, Phædrus, with such divisions and compositions, as by them I am enabled to reason, and to speak justly; if I find a person, who can discover one and many, as they are in nature, I follow him step by step as a kind of deity: God knows if I am right for esteeming those so highly who argue in this manner, and in calling them as I do, masters in the dialectic. But we have not yet discovered what rhetoric is.—How do you mean, Socrates? We must pronounce what remains to be said upon oratory.—You know, Socrates, there are many famous treatises written upon this subject? Well suggested.—The proem is the first part of an oration, and is frequently adorned with great art? It is.—The second part contains a narration with the evidence of the facts; the third and fourth parts consist of conjectures and presumptions, arguments and confirmations. I might also take notice of those, who have taught how a plaintiff and defendant are to manage their accusations and defences, replies and rejoinders; and those who invented panegyric and invective. We dismiss *Lysias* and *Gorgias*, who prefer an appearance of truth to the reality, and by the force of their eloquence can make small things look great, old things new, and the contrary; value themselves, sometimes on conciseness, at other times on prolixity; at which Prodicus laughed heartily one day, and said, this art neither required very long nor very short sentences, but moderate ones. He was right.—Polus ought also to be praised, for having added several graces to oratory. Protagoras likewise was very elegant in his discourses; Chalcedonius excelled in moving our pity and compassion, in raising or calming our anger, and in raillery and repartee; they all agreed as to the nature of the conclusion which some call a recapitulation.—You mean, Socrates, one ought to sum up the whole of his arguments in the end of his speech? I do.—Well, continued Phædrus, I see you look on all these precepts of these rhetoricians as no more in effect than the first rudiments, but pray inform me how shall one become perfect in the true art of persuasion? Perhaps, Phædrus, 'tis possible to become a master in this as well as any other exercise: nay, you cannot fail if nature has bestowed a genius, and you take care to cultivate it right.

"In acquiring this art I am not for following the method of Lysias and Thrasymachus, but another.—What other? Pericles my friend seems to be reckoned the most perfect orator.—Why? The more excellent arts demand constant meditation, and an accurate inquiry into the powers of nature; hence we acquire true grandeur of mind, and a capacity of performing every thing in the best way. Pericles had a fine natural genius, and improved it to the utmost by these studies; he was a constant companion of Anaxagoras, heard his lectures on natural philosophy, on the temper of the human mind and its disorders, became well acquainted with both, and drew from this fountain the noblest helps to eloquence.—How so? The art of medicine and rhetoric are, in this respect, the same.—In what? You must attentively consider the nature of the body in the one, of the mind in the other: this, I say, you must do, if you

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

are resolved, not empirically but scientifically, to confer health and strength on the body by diet and medicine: and by reason, and legitimate discipline to instil virtue into the mind, and gain it by persuasion.—That is highly probable, Socrates. Do you think you can understand the nature of the human mind, without knowing the nature of the whole? If we believe Hippocrates, the successor of Æsculapius, we cannot know the nature of the body, without applying to that study.—His notion is just, Phædrus: let us hear, then, in our researches into nature, what Hippocrates and right reason suggest. Are not we to consider the nature of every thing in this manner? First, whether what we ourselves desire to know, and teach others, be simple or various; if simple, we must learn its active and passive powers of operation; if compound, we must enumerate its different kinds, and accurately distinguish the virtues of each, how they operate, and by what they are affected? So I think.—Without this method, our progress will be like that of a blind man; now he, who performs any thing, according to art, cannot be compared to the blind or the deaf: is it not therefore evident, whoever speaks with true art must understand well the nature of that which he addresses? Now this is the mind. Undoubtedly.—Does not the whole labour of the pleader tend to this, that he may persuade the hearer? Yes.—It follows from all this, that Thrasymachus, or any other teacher of rhetoric, ought with the utmost assiduity to investigate and declare, whether the mind is by nature simple and uniform, or compound, as the body; this is what we mean by explaining nature. I understand you.—Secondly, he is to shew, how the mind acts, and how it is acted upon. Right.—Thirdly, having regularly taught the different kinds of speech, and various passions of minds, and examined the motives, which influence them, he is to adapt the one to the other, and teach how, and for what reason, a mind of such a temper is necessarily persuaded by such an argument, while another one is not in the least moved by it. A noble method, indeed, Socrates.—Believe me, neither the art of rhetoric, nor any science whatever, can be taught, or explained to advantage any other way than this; our modern rhetoricians, whom we daily hear, are men of shrewd parts, they keep to themselves their knowledge of the human heart, and will not communicate it to the world: but till they teach and write in the manner we have mentioned, I shall never be convinced they are skilful in their art.—What manner do you mean? It will not be easy, Phædrus, to explain this fully; but I shall briefly intimate, what method the true teacher of this science is to follow.—Pray let me hear it. Since eloquence is nothing else than pleasing and convincing the mind, a good orator ought surely to know, how many sorts of minds there are, so many of one, so many of another quality; whence men are of opposite tempers and characters: these distinctions being made, 'tis next to be observed, there are different kinds of speech too; each of which has its own peculiar quality. Some men will be persuaded by one kind of speech and motives, which will hardly have any influence on others. One of a ready capacity, who has been taught this art, will be able, on proper occasions, to bring it readily into practice, and see at first sight when and how to apply it; if he cannot, he will be little wiser for his knowledge of the theory; but if he knows that such a person will be prevailed on by such a speech, and can in practice penetrate into the mind, and discern at once, that now occurs the character which is to be persuaded, by such an argument to such an action; he, I say, who is master of this art, and nice discernment, and can, in an easy and elegant manner introduce the different ornaments and figures of diction, the pathetic, sublime, and vehement, is the consummate orator! Whoever is defective in any of these respects, either as a speaker, writer, or teacher, and says he is good in his art, is mistaken."

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656 — B. C. 348.

In criticising the philosophy of Plato, it is but just to advert to the uncertain state of knowledge at the time when he wrote. If the plain and sober sense of Socrates had struck out some sterling truths of morality, and had struggled to catch at some general principles, and to lay a firm groundwork for human virtue, it is the merit of Plato to have followed up the same track, and to have directed the great powers of his understanding and of his imagination, and the prodigious acquirements of long and varied research, to the illustration of the proper end and aim of man? There is scarcely a dialogue of his, however different its principal or professed object may be, in which something is not adduced or insinuated in relation to this important subject. It is this circumstance indeed beyond all others, which gives that apparent uniformity and coherence and system to all the writings of Plato; they all, in a greater or less degree, tend to elucidate the problem, what is the true happiness of man, and what are the best means of attaining it, considering the constitution of human nature, and the circumstances in which man is placed. His ultimate views on this subject are perhaps the most just that unassisted reason can arrive at. His arguments and his conclusions have been adopted by Lord Shaftesbury in his *Inquiry concerning Virtue and Merit*, the ablest and most unexceptionable of his performances. They have been explained and illustrated with more precision and perspicuity by Bishop Butler, in his three admirable sermons *On Human Nature;* and that learned writer has successfully combated the most ambiguous and noxious of Hobbes's positions, by girding on the armoury of ancient lore, and proving against all the cavils of the advocates for confusion, that man is naturally a law to himself. The conclusions indeed of Plato and other ancient writers, on the fundamental questions of morality, are so clear and satisfactory, that whilst we feel the greatest admiration of the reasoning process by which they arrived at such truths, yet we should be almost inclined to say, that the primary distinctions of virtue and vice, when once expounded, are in a manner self evident to human reason,* if we did not see the characters of Polus and Euthydemus revived in almost every age among mere speculative inquirers.

Upon Plato's physical system, or the mysteries of his numbers, we have little to observe in addition to the remarks we have before incidentally made. We frankly confess, that there is much in these parts of his writings that we do not understand; and, indeed,

* *Nam neque tam est acris acies in naturis hominum et ingeniis ut res tantas quisquam nisi monstratas possit videre: neque tantæ tamen in rebus obscuritas ut eas non penitus acri vir ingenio cernat, si modo aspexerit.*—Cicero.

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

that his grand periodical revolutions and calculations* which he has introduced, as connected with political subjects, seem to us utterly incapable of solution.

On his dialectics we have but one remark to make; that the difficulty experienced by Plato, whenever he has occasion to advert to the mere arrangement of arguments and the process of reasoning, confirms us in an old opinion, which indeed we never doubted, but which of late years some attempts have been made to shake, that Aristotle was strictly correct in announcing himself as the author of that logical system which he afterwards communicated to his countrymen. The same persons who are sagacious enough to discover the essences of Plato in the reveries of eastern sages, may be somewhat perplexed to account why he did not at the same time borrow that logical system which they will have it prevailed among the same sages, and why it should be left to Aristotle to introduce that verbal machinery, of which he forsooth falsely claimed the invention.

Such was the life, and such seem to have been the doctrines of Plato: and we feel it a matter of sincere concern, that so little has been handed down that can be depended upon, relating to the personal character of so illustrious a man. The idlest inferences have been drawn from misinterpretations of particular passages in his works; and tales of jealousy and rivalship have been invented by the scandal-mongers of antiquity, and retailed by the moderns. By some writers he has been described as vain and ostentatious, and as one who was bloated up to pride and arrogance by the attentions he received at the Court of Syracuse. By some he has been represented as the tyrant's parasite; by others, as a political intriguer and factionary. That he was not a vain man, however, sufficiently appears from the course of his writings; where, with an amiable devotedness, he attributes to Socrates not only the simple truths of that excellent man's plain and sound morality, but all the rich and rare illustrations which his own genius, and the amplitude of his research had discovered, or the prodigality of his fancy bestowed. And this respect for his master was, if we may place any faith in Plutarch, exemplified also in his life, in an assimilation of manners, in his equanimity of temper, and in that uniformity of character, which is the best proof of sincerity and integrity. "Plato," says he,† "was the same person in the Academy and at Syracuse, and exhibited the same character towards Dionysius and towards Dion."

The doctrines of Plato were, after his death, expounded in the Academy by his nephew Speusippus, who continued his duties as a public professor for eight years, when he resigned in favour of Xenocrates, who had been one of Plato's most esteemed pupils. The integrity of Xenocrates is well known, and his personal chastity has been celebrated by the retailers of anecdotes‡ in a particular tale connected with the courtezan Lais. Neither Speusippus nor Xenocrates appear to have deviated in the slightest degree from the general system of Plato. But Polemo, who succeeded Xenocrates, atoned for a youth of intemperance, by rushing in his more sedate years into an extreme bordering on asceticism. The austerities of his own practice, the strictness of his sense of duty, and the ambiguous language which he seems to have employed as to the soul of the universe, almost make one imagine that he anticipated the system of Zeno. Polemo was succeeded by his intimate friend Crates, who had long been connected with him by congeniality of disposition, but who died after a short sway in the Academy. It is not improbable, indeed, that the positive and dogmatic manner of Polemo and Crates produced that revulsion which ensued upon the death of the latter, and occasioned their successors to indulge in greater latitude of speculation, and in more of that temperate and modest suspense of judgment, which is content to consider the conclusions of practical reason as merely approximations to certainty; but is at the same time willing to act upon probabilities, since man must act somehow or other, and it is most reasonable to act according to such semblances of truth as the mind can arrive at.

Plato. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

Such was the course of the old Academy. The history of the new Academy, (for we agree with Middleton in rejecting the distinction of a middle Academy,) beginning with Arcesilas, will be connected with the history of its great ornament, Cicero. Some account of the later Platonists will be presented to our readers when the course of history brings us to the life of Plotinus, who wasted a genius of the highest order in idle reveries, and whose writings, clouded as they are with mysticism and the spirit of ascetical illusion, occasionally glow with the fervour of the richest imagination, and with an exuberance of philosophic imagery. Indeed, without a powerful genius, he could never have effected that wonderful change in the Platonic school which he did effect, though to us it appears a lamentable corruption. From his time, Plato has seldom been studied except with the aid of the commentaries, or in conjunction with the treatises of this later school; and at the revival of learning, the learned Florentine, Ficino, who procured the printing of Plato, performed the same service for the illustrious leaders of the later school, and illustrated his edition of Plato with many commentaries, in which he shewed himself at least an equal adept in the mysteries of Plotinus and Porphyry, as in the sense of Plato. Cardinal Bessario was a Platonist of more discrimination, and one whose intercourse with the world had perhaps given him more tact and address in selecting the practical works of Plato, and in illustrating those of a more obscure cast than the learned but recluse Florentine. Bessario's work, in reply to George of Trebizond, "the calumniator of Plato," is a very masterly performance, but its celebrity has not continued equal to its merit. Bessario has there fully developed many of those arguments which have been used of late years by the admirers of Plato, particularly among the German controvertists. Serranus has conferred great obligations by his excellent edition of Plato; and as the paging of that edition has been universally adopted by scholars for reference, it has been very judiciously continued in the margin of the Bipont edition, and of the edition which is at present

* Schneider however is of a different opinion, and we have studied the explanation which he attempts, but without becoming converts. See Schneider's *Commentationes duæ de numero Platonis.* Wratislaviæ, 1821, quarto.

† Οὕτω καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Συρακούσαις οἷος ἐν ἀκαδημίᾳ καὶ πρὸς Διονύσιον οἷος πρὸς Δίωνα.—Plutarch. *in opp.* vol. 8. p. 193. ed. Reiske.

‡ Diogenes Laertius, Valerius Maximus, Bayle.

Biography. From A. M. 3576. — B. C. 428. to A. M. 3656. — B. C. 348.

under publication at Leipsic by Mr. Bekker. The abstract of Plato's *Dialogues* by Mr. Tiedemann, annexed to the Bipont edition, is executed with considerable ability; but the author is somewhat too fond of deviating into mystical disquisitions, and has rendered the work less intelligible and less generally useful than it otherwise would have been, by a constant reference to the philosophy which then prevailed in Germany. The text only of Mr. Bekker's edition has yet appeared.

In Germany, indeed, Plato has uniformly been the favourite of the ablest philosophers; and whether the mystic Reuchlin, or Leibnitz,* or Kant, brought their own theories to light, they all equally acknowledged Plato to be the great object of their admiration among ancient writers. In Britain, the professed translators of Plato have been Sydenham, Spens, and Taylor. Of Sydenham's translation, every scholar will speak with respect, and every man of taste with regard and fondness. Its imperfect and unfinished condition bears with it a deep interest as a memorial of Sydenham's melancholy fate; when a man of the highest talents, and the most elegant accomplishments, after struggling with the inequalities of fortune, and suffering mortifications not the less galling because concealed and uncommunicated, gave way to the sudden impulse of his indignant spirit, and quitted a world which he disdained to flatter. Spens' work bears marks of being a version from the French, and not from the original. It is impossible to speak otherwise than with respect of Mr. Taylor, as a self-taught scholar, and a student of unwearied industry; but his translation of Plato is in every higher quality a lamentable contrast to the work of his predecessor Sydenham. It is written without spirit, without taste, without, as it should seem, even a suspicion of the lighter shades of language, and it is disfigured throughout with the unintelligible jargon of the Alexandrian school.

Among the British admirers of Plato, besides the cabalists Gale and More, and the indefatigable and eloquent pupil of the Alexandrian school, Cudworth, we may mention several of our ablest philosophers and poets. Bacon never speaks of the political or moral works of Plato without marked respect. Berkeley's enthusiastic admiration is well known, and his dialogues are perhaps the only productions in the language which can give to a mere English reader a sense of the art, the dignity, and the gracefulness of his Athenian model. Lord Shaftesbury's essays on the contrary, though written more with the air of a professed imitation, have about them an inflation and a stilted grandeur, which never deforms the serious works of Plato. The minds, both of Milton and Gray, were thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Plato's writings. The whole of the *Comus*, and particularly the beautiful eulogy upon Philosophy, the solemn introduction of the unsphering Plato's spirit in the *Penseroso*, and the express praise of the remnants of the Socratic school in the *Tractate on Education*, and *The Answer to Smectymnus*, shew at once how fully Milton's mind had been stored with the sublimer parts of Plato's philosophy, and how great his admiration was of the plainer and more practical parts. His larger poems breathe every where, as it were, inadvertently, intimations of the deep fountains of ancient wisdom, in which his genius had delighted to refresh and invigorate itself; and every casual turn displays glances of the sky robes of the Athenian sage, and drops rich distillations of the choicest dew from Hymettus. The poems of Gray, in like manner, bear a strong tincture from their author's studies; and the intelligent to whom they are addressed,* would need no further evidence than the colour of the language, and imagery with which they abound, to satisfy them that Plato was Gray's favourite author. This point, however, has been put out of all question by the publication of his posthumous works before referred to; which show, not only his earnest study of Plato's own writings, but his minute and laborious research into other writers of antiquity, to procure illustration even of the most petty particulars of dates or characters anywise connected with them.

Plato From A. M. 3576 — B. C. 428. to A. M 3656 — B. C. 348.

But we perceive that we are dwelling too long upon details, which at best can be considered but as an appendage to a sketch of Plato's life. The neglect, however, with which Plato's writings are in the present day indiscriminately treated, even among persons of general learning and intelligence, must be our excuse for resting on the names of any who have entertained a different opinion of his writings, although they were not themselves deficient in genius, or accustomed to any servile admiration of antiquity. But upon this head, of the disregard shewn to Plato in our public schools and universities, upon which it might seem impertinent or presumptuous for us to enlarge further, we willingly shelter ourselves under the authority of Berkeley, and close our sketch with recommending the perusal of Plato's writings, in the words of that learned and virtuous dignitary:

"It might very well be thought serious trifling to tell my readers, that the greatest men had ever an high esteem for Plato; whose writings are the touchstone of a hasty and shallow mind; whose philosophy has been the admiration of ages; which supplied patriots, magistrates, and lawgivers to the most flourishing states, as well as fathers to the church, and doctors to the schools. Albeit, in these days, the depths of that old learning are rarely fathomed, and yet it were happy for these lands, if our young nobility and gentry, instead of modern maxims, would imbibe the notions of the great men of antiquity. But in these freethinking times, many an empty head is shook at Aristotle and Plato, as well as at the Holy Scriptures. And the writings of those celebrated ancients are by most men treated on a foot, with the dry and barbarous lucubrations of the schoolmen. It may be modestly presumed there are not many among us, even of those who are called the better sort, who have more sense, virtue, and love of their country than Cicero, who, in a letter to Atticus, could not forbear exclaiming, *O Socrates et Socratici viri! Nunquam vobis gratiam referam.* Would to God many of our countrymen had the same obligations to those Socratic writers,"—*Siris*, in Berkeley's *Works*, vol. ii. p. 613.

* The testimony of Leibnitz is very explicit. In one letter to Bierling, after making some remarks on Cicero's *Dialogues*, he continues thus—*Platonis dialogi paulo minus accommodati sunt ad ingenium nostri sæculi. Mihi tamen vix quicquam in illis spernitur; adeo multa agnosco consideratione profundiore digna.* And in another letter, in reply to some vague remarks made by the same correspondent, he observes, *De Platone non sentio tam contemtim. Meditationes ejus mihi et profundæ passim et utiles videntur. Et habeo Ciceronem non malum judicem mecum sentientem. Non ita pridem didicimus plus Platonem in recessu habere quam vulgo apparet.*—Leibnitii. *Epistol. in opp.* vol. v. p. 368.

* Φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσι.

ARISTOTLE.*

Biography. In the account which we are about to give of the founder of the Peripatetic school, we shall confine ourselves strictly to the province of the biographer, reserving the discussion of his philosophical tenets for the place where we before observed (*Life of Plato*, p. 72. col. 1.) that they would be most appropriately treated of. We shall naturally be compelled in the prosecution of our plan to notice several of his works, but it will be in the character of literary historians, and not as historians of philosophy. On the other hand, we shall enter more into detail respecting the documents which exist for our purpose than has been done in the lives of Plato and Socrates, and in the sketch of the earlier philosophers of Greece, because an acquaintance with this subject is absolutely necessary for estimating the value of any information relative to the lives of these remarkable men, and the existing sources of all our possible knowledge in any one case, are very nearly the same as those for every other.

If the acquaintance we possessed with the private life of individuals were at all proportioned to the influence exerted by them on the destinies of mankind, the biography of Aristotle would fill a library; for without attempting here to discuss the merits of his philosophy as compared with that of others, it may safely be asserted that no man ever yet lived who exerted so much influence upon the world. Absorbing into his capacious mind the whole existing philosophy of his age, he reproduced it, digested and transmuted, in a form of which the main outlines are recognised at the present day, and of which the language has penetrated into the inmost recesses of our daily life. Translated in the Vth Century of the Christian era into the Syriac language by the Nestorians who fled to Persia, and from Syriac into Arabic four hundred years later, his writings furnished the Mohammedan conquerors of the East with a germ of science which, but for the effect of their religious and political institutions, might have shot up into as tall a tree as it did produce in the West; while his logical works in the Latin translation which Boethius, "the last of the Romans," bequeathed as a legacy to posterity, formed the basis of that extraordinary phenomenon, the philosophy of the schoolmen. An empire like this, extending over nearly twenty centuries of time, sometimes more sometimes less despotically, but always with great force, recognised in Bagdat and in Cordova, in Egypt and in Britain, and leaving abundant traces of itself in the language and modes of thought of every European nation, is assuredly without a parallel. Yet of its founder's personal history all that we can learn is to be gathered from meager compilations, scattered anecdotes, and accidental notices, which contain much that is obviously false and even contradictory, and from which a systematic account, in which tolerable confidence may be placed, can only be deduced by a careful and critical investigation. It is not, however, to the indifference of his contemporaries, or to that of their immediate successors, that the paucity of details relating to Aristotle's life is due. Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second of the Macedonian dynasty in Egypt, not only bestowed a great deal of study upon the writings of the great philosopher, but also is said to have written a biography of him.* About the same time Hermippus of Smyrna, one of the Alexandrine school of learned men, whose research and accuracy is highly praised by Josephus,† composed a work extending to considerable length, *On the Lives of Distinguished Philosophers and Orators*, in which Aristotle appears to have occupied a considerable space.‡ Another author, whose date there is no direct means of ascertaining, but who probably is to be placed somewhere about the end of the IIId Century before the Christian era,§ Timotheus of Athens, is also to be added to the number of his early biographers. But independently of such works as these, antiquity abounded in others which contained information on this subject in a less direct form. Aristoxenus of Tarentum, who during a part of his life was himself a pupil of Aristotle, in his biographies of Socrates and Plato had frequent occasion to speak of the great Stagirite.‖ Epicurus, in a treatise which is cited under the title of *A Letter on the Pursuits and Habits of former Philosophers*, related several stories to his disparagement.¶ The same, perhaps, was the case with Aristippus (apparently the grandson of the founder of the Cyrenean school) in his work *On the Luxury of Antiquity*.** And yet more valuable materials than were furnished by the two last-mentioned works, of which at least the former appears to have been composed in the vulgar spirit that delights in finding something to degrade to its own level all that is above it,†† probably were contained in the treatises of Demetrius the Magnesian and Apollodorus the Athenian. The first of these was a contemporary of Cicero and his

Aristotle.

Early histories of Aristotle and other philosophers.

Indirect information in ancient writers on the subject.

* The promised life of Aristotle having been delayed till some changes have taken place in the plan originally projected, it has been thought best, upon the whole, to place it immediately after his great predecessor in philosophy, although originally intended for another position.

* David the Armenian, in a commentary on the Categories, cited by Brandis in the *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. i. p. 250, and since published from two Vatican MSS., says, Τῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν συγγραμμάτων πολλῶν ὄντων χιλίων τὸν ἀριθμόν, ὡς φησι Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Φιλάδελφος, ἀναγραφὴν αὐτῶν ποιησάμενος καὶ τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν διάθεσιν. κ. τ. λ. (p. 22. ed. Bekker.) an important passage, showing who the Ptolemy was that is elsewhere cited in connection with Aristotle's works.

† *Contr. Apion.* lib. i. ἀνὴρ περὶ πάσαν ἱστορίαν ἱκανώτατος.

‡ Athenæus (xiii. p. 589. xv. p. 696.) cites him, ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ Ἀριστοτέλους.

§ This seems to follow from the fact that Diogenes only quotes him in the lives of Plato, Speusippus, Aristotle, and Zeno of Cittium. He is therefore no authority for any thing later than the time of the last. Zeno was an old man B. C. 260. (Diog. Laert. vii. 6.) Timotheus's work is quoted under the title Περὶ Βίων.

‖ See p. 97*, col. 1.

¶ *Ap.* Athen. *Deipnosoph.* p. 354.

** Diog. Laert. ii. 23. v. 3.

†† See the stories which he related in it of Protagoras, also mentioned by Athenæus, *loc. cit.*

Biography.

celebrated friend Atticus,* and appears to have exercised his acumen in detecting such erroneous stories prevalent in his time as arose from the confusion of different poets and philosophers who had borne the same name;† a cause which with us would hardly be adequate to produce any great effect, but formerly, in the absence of hereditary surnames, and under the operation of many motives for falsification, was much more fertile in its results than can now be easily imagined.‡ The second is an authority who for the purposes of the modern biographer of Aristotle is the most important of all. He, like Hermippus, was an Alexandrine scholar, and pupil of the celebrated editor and commentator of the Homeric poems, Aristarchus.§ Among his voluminous works was one *On the Sects of Philosophers*, which no doubt contained much that was interesting on our subject; but what renders him valuable above any other of these lost writers, and makes us treasure up with avidity the slightest notices by him which have come down to us, is his celebrated *Chronology*, a composition in iambic verse, often cited under the title of Χρονικὰ, or Χρονικὴ σύνταξις by that compiler whose treatise is unfortunately the most ancient systematic account of Aristotle's life which has escaped the ravages of time. These citations are invaluable, not merely for the positive information which we gain from them, but because they serve also, as we shall have occasion to observe in the sequel, for a touchstone of anecdotes whose authority is otherwise uncertain.‖

Gradual degeneracy of the literature on these subjects.

The foregoing list of authors, which might be yet further enlarged did we not fear to exceed the due limits of this occasion, abundantly shows that in the beginning of the Ist Century before Christ there were materials for compiling a biography of Aristotle as detailed as one of Newton or Young could be in the present day. This, however, soon afterwards ceased to be the case. When the only means of obtaining the copy of a book was by the laborious process of transcription, the expense necessarily confined its acquisition to comparatively few persons, and when to this drawback we add those arising from voluminous size and but partially interesting subject, the circulation would be very limited indeed. It may be questioned, perhaps, whether some of the works we have noticed ever found their way beyond the walls of the royal library at Alexandria, except in the shape of extracts. If this were the case, the destruction of the whole or a great part of that library ¶ in the siege of the city by Julius Cæsar (B. C. 48.) would very probably cause their annihilation. At all events, in the subsequent times, when Rome was the centre of civilization as well as of empire, works of such a description became totally unfit to satisfy the wants of the age. A certain acquaintance with Greek literature, Greek philosophy, and Greek history, became an essential accomplishment for the fashionable Roman, but this acquaintance was nothing like the one which Cato and Scipio, which Atticus and Cicero possessed. It was expected to be extremely comprehensive,* and, as all comprehensive knowledge must be when popularized, it was proportionally superficial. To feed this appetite for general information was the work of the needy men of letters under the empire. In the time of the early Ptolemies and of the Kings of Pergamus their energies had been directed by the munificence of those monarchs to the accumulation of vast stores of erudition on particular subjects. The number of monographies, and the minute subdivision of intellectual labour which prevailed under their patronage, is scarcely equalled by the somewhat similar case of Germany at the present day. Homer, a sacred book for the Greeks, was the principal subject of their labours; but indeed there was no classical author and no literary or scientific question which did not employ the abilities of a crowd of antiquarians or commentators. The prodigious stores thus accumulated † formed the stock from which the *littérateurs* of Rome derived materials for the new species of intellectual repast demanded by the taste of their times. In the first generation of compilations which were composed for this purpose, the writers of course made use of the existing sources of information, and fortified their statements by citations of their authority in each particular instance. But as the real love for literature declined before the debilitating influence

Literature fashionable in Rome.

Aristotle.

Compilations.

* Cicero, *Brut.* 91. He is alluded to in *Epp. ad Attic.* iv. 11. but in viii. 11. ix. 9. xii. 6. it is Demetrius the Syrian, a rhetorician, who is referred to. This latter is also spoken of in *Brut.* 91.

† Diog. Laert. v. 3.

‡ See Galen, *Comment. in Hippocr. de Nat. Hom.* ii. p. 105, 109, and *in Hippocr. de Humor.* i. p. 5, ed. Kuehn.

§ Suidas, *sub v.* Ἀπολλόδωρος.

‖ See with reference to Apollodorus and his works, Voss, *De Historicis Græcis*, p. 132. *et seq.* Heyne, *ad Apollodori Bibliothec.* vol. i. pp. 385, 457, and Brandis in the *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. iii. p. 110. in whose opinion the chronology of Apollodorus is founded on that of Eratosthenes.

¶ Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticæ*, vi. 17.

* See Juvenal, *Satir.* vii. 229—236. of the masters of his time:—

Vos sævas imponite leges,
Ut præceptori verborum regula constet,
Ut legat historias, auctores noverit omnes
Tanquam ungues digitosque suos; ut forte rogatus
Dum petit aut thermas aut Phœbi balnea, dicat
Nutricem Anchisæ, nomen patriamque novercæ
Anchemori; dicat, quot Acestes vixerit annos,
Quot Siculus Phrygibus vini donaverit urnas.

Make it a point that all, and every part
Of their own science be possessed by heart;
That general history with our own they blend,
And have all authors at their fingers' end:
That they may straight inform you, should you meet,
And ask them at the bath, or in the street,
Who nurs'd Anchises? from what country came
Archim'rus' stepmother, and what her name?
How long Acestes flourished? and, in short,
With how much wine Æneas left his court?

Gifford's *Version*, p. 264.

† The number of volumes at Alexandria in the time of Callimachus (about 259 B. C.) amounted to five hundred and thirty-two thousand, or according to the explanation of Ritschl, (*Die Alexandrinischen Bibliotheken*, p. 28,) four hundred and thirty-two thousand. At the time of the destruction of the great part by fire, they had reached seven hundred thousand. The difference was caused in a great measure by the accumulation of commentatorial or antiquarian works. Thus Aristarchus is said to have written more than eight hundred volumes of commentaries alone. (Suidas, *sub v.*) Some are said to have spent their whole lives on the elucidation of single questions relative to Homer. (See Wolf, *Prolegomena in Homerum*, sec. 45, 51.) Under Ptolemy Philadelphus an immense number of original works were collected, and the arrangement, description, and illustration of these became the principal business of men of letters under his successors. Under Ptolemy the accumulation was so rapid that there was no time for this. Galen relates that when any merchant-vessels put into the harbours of Egypt, all manuscripts which happened to be on board were taken to the royal library and transcripts of them sent back to the owners. In default of time to examine what the originals were, they were laid up in the collection under the title of τὰ ἐκ πλοίων, "the books taken out of the ships." (Galen, cited by Wolf, *Proleg.* sec. 42.) It is hardly necessary to remark that the word "volume," in reference to this time, applies to the papyrus rolls, of which none perhaps contained more than a couple of closely printed octavo sheets, while some were very much less.

Biography. of luxury, while at the same time the fashion of literary accomplishments remained, it became necessary that information should be furnished in a more generally palatable form. Hence out of the first crop of compilations, a new generation of writers composed a sort of Miscellanies. Omniana, (παντοδαπαὶ ἱστορίαι,) a species of composition which became exceedingly popular as it combined a loose kind of information on those points of which everybody was expected to possess some knowledge, with the piquancy of memoirs, and the variety of subject which is so pleasant to a frivolous and indolent reader. It very soon overlaid and destroyed the learned labours of the preceding age, and from the time at which it began to prevail, it becomes very questionable whether a writer, when he quotes an authority of a date earlier than the empire, ever has cast eyes upon him, or even wishes his readers to believe that he has done so. One of the earliest as well as most original works of this description was the production of a female hand. Pamphila, a lady of Egyptian extraction, in the time of Nero had married at a very early age a person of considerable literary tastes and attainments, whose house was the resort of many persons distinguished for the same, either for the purposes of education or of social intercourse. During thirteen years she states that she was never separated from her husband's side for an hour, and that it was her habit to take notes of any thing which she might learn either from him or from any of his literary circle, which appeared worth recording. Out of these materials, together with extracts made by herself from authors which she had read, she composed eight books of miscellaneous historical memoirs, (σύμμικτα ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα,) purposely abstaining from any thing like an arrangement according to subjects, that her readers might enjoy the pleasure arising from the variety. This work Photius, from whom we have taken this notice of it, describes as being "a most useful one for the acquirement of general information." *

Pamphila.

Phavorinus, a native of Arles, who flourished in the reign of the Emperor Hadrian, was the compiler of another work of the same description, but not composed under such interesting circumstances. His *Miscellaneous Historical Questions* (παντοδαπὴ ὕλη ἱστορική, or παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία) were, as well as the works of Pamphila, a mine much worked by subsequent writers. But the degenerate taste which had caused the production of such works as these, or at least as the latter, did not stop here. Still declining, it called for yet more meager and worthless compilations, which were furnished by drawing from the confused and turbid Miscellanies those parts which referred to any particular subject on which the writer thought proper to make collections. To this stage belongs the work of Diogenes Laertius, a part of which forms the nucleus of all modern biographies of Aristotle, as well as of Plato and most of the early Greek philosophers; and to a yet later period, after the processes which we have been describing had been again and again repeated, the Lives by the Pseudo-Ammonius and his anonymous Latin translator and interpolater.

Phavorinus.

Later compilations.

Criterion of the relative value of the later writers.

If we were to estimate the relative importance of these later authorities by the quantity of critical discernment or sound erudition which they display, there would be little to choose between the contemporary of Severus, and his followers of some centuries later. But Diogenes, although devoid of all historical or philosophical discrimination, although sometimes contradicting himself within the limits of a single biography, and confusing the tenets of Peripatetics and Epicureans without the least consciousness of his own indistinct views,* is distinguished by the circumstance that in his narrative the names of the earliest authorities still appear, while from the rest they have in most cases dropped out. With the use, therefore, of due caution and diligence, we are frequently enabled to arrive at the views entertained on a given point by individuals of four centuries earlier date, who possessed both the wish and the means to ascertain truth where the later writers were deficient in both. This is particularly the case with certain classes of facts. Anecdotes illustrative of individual character or habits of life readily spring up and have a rapid growth, if the smallest nucleus of truth exist as a foundation for them. But dry and uninteresting statements, such as the date of an insulated event, will very rarely be falsified except by accidents attending transcription, or unless their determination is distinctly felt to affect the decision of some more obviously important question. When, therefore, such statements coupled with the name of an early authority have been preserved, there is a fair presumption that we have firm standing ground, and other notices of uncertain origin will possess a greater or less claim to our consideration, as they appear more or less adapted to make parts of that body of which, as it were, a few fossil bones have been preserved. These we shall first present collectively to the view of our readers, and then proceed step by step in the process of redintegration.

Aristotle.

Summary of Aristotle's life on the authority of Apollodorus.

On the authority then of Apollodorus,† we may fix the birth of Aristotle in the first year of the ninety-ninth Olympiad, (B. C. 384—3,) and his arrival at Athens as a scholar of Plato when seventeen years old. After remaining there twenty years he visited the court of Hermias, (a prince of Asia Minor of whom we shall say more in the sequel,) in the year after his master's death, Theophilus being then archon, (*i. e.* B. C. 348—7,) and staid there for three years. In the archonship of Eubulus, the fourth year of the hundred and eighth Olympiad, (B. C. 345—4,) he passed over to Mytilene. In that of Pythodotus, the second year of the hundred and ninth, (B. C. 343—2,) he commenced the education of Alexander the Great at his father's court; and in the second year of the hundred and eleventh, returned to Athens and taught philosophy in the school of the Lyceum for the space of thirteen years; at the expiration of which time he crossed over to Chalcis in Eubœa, and there died from a disease in the archonship of Philocles, the third year of the hundred and fourteenth Olympiad, (B. C. 322—1,) at the age of about sixty-three, and at the same time that Demosthenes ended his life in Calauria.

Birthplace of Aristotle.

Its situation.

Stagirus, (or, as it was later called, Stagira,) the birthplace of one of the most extraordinary men, if not the very most, that the world has ever produced, was a petty town in the north of Greece, situated on the western side of the Strymonic gulf, just where the general line of coast takes a southerly direction. It

* Photius, *Biblioth.* p. 119. ed. Bekker.

* See Casaubon's note on Diog. Laert. v. 29

† *Ap.* Diog. Laert. *Vit. Arist.* sec. 9. Compare Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Epist.* i. *ad Ammæum*, p. 727, 728, whose account agrees with that of Diogenes, and is itself probably based on the chronology of Apollodorus. See Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, 2. 320. B. C. col. 3.

Biography.

lay in the midst of a picturesque country, both in soil and appearance resembling the southern part of the bay of Naples. Immediately south a promontory, like the Punta della Campanella and nearly in the same latitude, ran out in an easterly direction, effectually screening the town and its little harbour Capros, formed by the island of the same name, from the violence of the squalls coming up the Ægean, a similar service to that rendered by the Italian headland to the town of Sorrento. In the terraced windings, too, by which the visitor climbs through the orange groves of the latter place, he may without any great violence imagine the "narrow and steep paths" by which an ancient historian and chorographer describes those who crossed the mountains out of Macedonia as descending "into the valley of Arethusa, where was seen the tomb of Euripides and the town of Stagira."* The inhabitants possessed all the advantages of civilization which Grecian blood and Grecian intercourse could give; the city having been originally built by a colony of Andrians, and its population subsequently replenished by one from Chalcis in Eubœa.† The mouth of the Strymon and the important city of Amphipolis was within three hours' sail to the north; and every part of the Chalcidic peninsula, a district full of Greek towns,‡ among which were Olynthus and Potidæa, was readily accessible. With the former of these Stagirus appears to have been leagued as a humble ally§ in that resistance to the ambitious designs of Philip which terminated so calamitously. In the year 348 B. C. it was destroyed by him,‖ and the inhabitants sold as slaves.

Civilization.

Fate.

Aristotle's childhood.

Aristotle, however, did not share the misfortunes of his native town, to which it is probable he had been for many years a stranger. His father, Nicomachus, one of the family or guild of the Asclepiads, in which the practice of medicine was hereditary, had taken up his residence at the court of Philip's father, Amyntas, to whom he was body surgeon, and whose confidence he appears to have possessed in a high degree.¶ He did not confine himself to the empirical practice of his art, for he is related to have written six books on medical and one on physical subjects,** which latter head would in that age include every department of natural history and physiology, no less than those investigations of the properties of unorganic matter to which the term is appropriated in the present day. Now this circumstance is much more important in its bearing upon the intellectual character of Aristotle than may at first appear. In his writings appears such a fondness for these pursuits as it seems impossible not to believe must have been imbibed in his very earliest years, and most probably under the immediate superintendence of this parent. For although he was an orphan at the age of seventeen, (and how much earlier we cannot say,) yet it is well known that education in the "art and mastery of healing," and such subjects as were connected therewith, was commenced by the Asclepiads at a very early age. "I do not blame the ancients," says Galen,* "for not writing books on anatomical manipulation; though I commend Marinus, who did. For it was superfluous for them to compose such records for themselves or others, *while they were from their childhood exercised by their parents in dissecting just as familiarly as in writing and reading; so that there was no more fear of their forgetting their anatomy than of their forgetting their alphabet.* But when grown men as well as children were taught, this thorough discipline fell off; and the art being carried *out of the family of the Asclepiads*, and declining by repeated transmission, books became necessary for the student." And we have another, although slighter, presumptive evidence that the childhood of the great philosopher was spent with his father at the Macedonian court, in the circumstance of his being selected by Philip, at a period long subsequent, to conduct the education of Alexander. This we shall find an opportunity of reverting to in the sequel. Whatever influence, however, was exercised by Nicomachus over the future fortunes of his son, he had not the happiness of living to be a witness of its effects. He, as well as his wife Phæstis, a descendant of one of the Chalcidian colonists of Stagirus, died while Aristotle was yet a minor, leaving him under the guardianship of Proxenus, a citizen of Atarneus in Asia, who appears to have been settled in the native town of his ward. How long this person continued in the discharge of his trust, we have no means of determining; it was sufficiently long, however, to imbue the object of it with a respect and gratitude which endured throughout life. At the age of seventeen, however, it terminated, and Aristotle, master of himself and probably of a considerable fortune, came to Athens, the centre of the civilization of the world, and the focus of every thing that was brilliant in action or in thought. It is not probable that any thing but the thirst for knowledge which distinguished his residence there, was the cause of its commencement. Plato was at that time in the height of his reputation, and the desire to see and enjoy the intercourse of such a man would have been an adequate motive to minds of much less capacity and taste for philosophy than Aristotle's to resort to a spot, where, besides, every enjoyment which even an Epicurean could desire was to be found.† It was reserved for the foolish ingenuity of later times, when all real knowledge of this period had faded away, to invent the absurd motive of "a Delphic oracle, which commanded him to devote himself to philosophy.‡" For another account, scarcely less absurd, the excuse of ignorance cannot be so easily made. Epicurus, in the work we have before spoken of, related that Aristotle after squandering his paternal property adopted the profession of a mercenary soldier, and failing in this, afterwards that of a vender of medicines; that he then took advantage of the free manner in which Plato's instructions were given to pick up a knowledge of philosophy, for which he was not without talent, and thus gradually arrived at his

Aristotle

Becomes an orphan at an early age.

Comes to Athens.

Absurd accounts of the reason.

Calumny of Epicurus.

Early education.

* Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii. 4. The similarity in the name of the island Capri, which lies off Sorrento, is curious, and seems to favour the account of Frontinus, that Surrentum was originally colonized by Greeks.

† Thucyd. iv. 88. Dionys. Halic. *Ep.* i. *ad Amm.* p. 727.

‡ Demosthenes (*Philipp.* iii. p. 117.) says that Philip destroyed thirty-two there. Some of these were doubtless mere hamlets.

§ Dio Chrysost. *Or.* ii. p. 36.

‖ ἐκάστατον. Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* sec. 7. If Aristotle's will, however, preserved by Diogenes Laertius, be genuine, this term must be considerably qualified: for in it he speaks of his πατρῷα οἰκία in Stagirus. One naturally expects the description of Demosthenes (*loc. cit.*) to be overcharged.

¶ ἰατροῦ καὶ φίλου χρείᾳ, is the expression of Diogenes.

** Suidas, *sub v.* Νικόμαχος.

* Cited and translated by Whewell, *History of the Inductive Sciences*, vol. iii. p. 385. See also Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* sec. 8.

† See Xenophon, *Rep. Ath.* cap. ii. sect. 7, 8.

‡ Pseudo-Ammonius, *Vit. Arist.*

Biography. Refuted.

views.* It is at once manifest that this story is incompatible with the account of Apollodorus, according to which Aristotle attached himself to the study of philosophy under Plato, before he had completed his eighteenth year. Independently of the difficulty of conceiving that a mere boy should have already passed through so many vicissitudes of fortune, it is obvious that he could not before that time have squandered his property, except through the culpable negligence of his guardian, Proxenus; and any supposition of this sort is precluded by the singular respect testified for that individual in his ward's will, the substance of which—or perhaps a codicil to it—has been preserved to us by Diogenes Laertius.† In it he directs the erection of a statue of Proxenus and of his wife, he appoints their son Nicanor (whom he had previously adopted) to be joint guardian with Antipater, of his own son Nicomachus, and also bestows his daughter upon him in marriage. It is impossible to conceive that such feelings could have been aroused in the ward by a negligent or indiscreetly indulgent guardian; and we should hardly have reverted to the story in question, except to remark how the very form of the calumny seems to indicate that the favourite studies of Aristotle, in the early part of his life, were such as his father's profession would naturally have led him to, Physiology and Natural History.‡ Indeed, nothing is more probable than that he might have given advice to the sick, science and practical skill being in those times so inseparably connected, that the Greek language possesses no terms which formally distinguish them,—and from this circumstance the report may have arisen, that he attempted medicine as a profession.

Aristotle's affection for his parents.

Other discordant accounts.

There are some other accounts equally discrepant with the chronology of Apollodorus, which we have taken as our standard. One of these is, that Aristotle did not attach himself to Plato until he was thirty years of age: another, that on his first arrival at Athens he was for three years the pupil of Socrates.§ The first of these, which rests on the sole authority of one Eumelus,‖ a writer of whom nothing more whatever is known, may perhaps be a feature of the story of Epicurus which we have just discussed: it has been conjectured, however, with great appearance of probability, that its sole foundation is the well-known maxim of Plato, that the study of the higher philosophy should not be commenced before the thirtieth year. The second, as it stands, is absolutely unintelligible, Socrates having been put to death in the archonship of Laches, (B. C. 400—399,) that is, fifteen years before the birth of Aristotle. But it has been ingeniously remarked,* that at the time when Aristotle first came to Athens, Plato was absent in Sicily, from whence he did not return till Olymp. ciii. 4, the third year afterwards;† so that if Aristotle was then introduced to the philosophy of the Academy, it must have been under the auspices of some other of the Socratic school, whom the foolish compilers of later times mistook for its founder. Under this natural explanation, the absurd story becomes a confirmation of the account of Apollodorus, which we have followed—a coincidence the more satisfactory as it is quite undesigned.

Aristotle.

We shall now proceed, as well as the scanty information which has come down to us will allow, to sketch the course of Aristotle's life during the ensuing period of nearly twenty years which he spent at Athens. It appears to have been mainly, although not entirely, occupied in the acquisition of his almost encyclopædic knowledge, in collecting, criticising, and digesting. Of his extraordinary diligence in mastering the doctrines of the earlier schools of philosophy we may form some notion from the notices of them which are preserved in his works, which indeed constitute the principal source of our whole knowledge upon this subject. That this information should have been acquired by him during this part of his life is rendered likely both by the nature of the case and by the scattered anecdotes which relate that his remarkable industry and intelligence elicited the strongest expressions of admiration from Plato, who is said by Pseudo-Ammonius to have called Aristotle's house "the house of *the reader*." The Latin translator adds, that in his absence his master would exclaim, "that the intelligence of the school was away, and his audience but a deaf one!"‡ A treatise on Rhetoric, not that which has come down to us, but one which, as we shall have occasion to show in the sequel, was probably written during this period of his life, is described by Cicero§ as containing an account of the theories of all his predecessors upon this subject, from the time of Tisias, the first who wrote upon it,—so admirably and perspicuously set forth, that all persons in his time who wished to gain a knowledge of them, preferred Aristotle's description to their own. We may take occasion to remark by the way that this taste for reading could not have been gratified without very ample means. A collection of books was a luxury

Aristotle at Athens. B. C. 367-347.

His industry.

Works of this time.

* Athenæus, *Deipnosoph.* viii. p. 354. Ælian, *Var. Hist.* v. 9. That these two accounts are derived from the same source appears no less from their similarity of phrase than from the remark of Athenæus, "that Epicurus was the only authority for this story against Aristotle."

† *Vit. Arist.* sec. 11—16. The genuineness of this document is confirmed by the notice which Athenæus (xiii. p. 589) gives from Hermippus, relative to the provision for Herpyllis, which quite agrees with what we find in it. Compare, too, the author of the Latin Life, (*ad fin.*) from whom it appears that Ptolemy and Andronicus had each of them inserted a testament of Aristotle in their works.

‡ Athenæus tells the story, after mentioning several tenets of Aristotle on matters of Natural History, in reference to which he calls him "the medicine-vender," (ὁ φαρμακοπώλης.) There is a curious passage, too, in a work of Aristotle's, the *Politics*, (p. 1258, line 12, ed. Bekker,) which seems to have some bearing upon this matter. It may almost be taken as an explanation of his conduct, if it was such as we have supposed. Timæus of Tauromenium related that at a late period of his life (ἐπὶ τῆς ἡλικίας) he served an obscure physician in a menial capacity. (Aristocles, *ap.* Euseb. xv. 2.) For the character of Timæus, see Casaubon *ad* Diog. Laert. x. 8.

§ Pseudo-Ammonius.—*Vita Latina.*

‖ *Ap.* Diog. Laert. *Vit. Arist.* sec. 6. All other accounts are unanimous in representing him as becoming Plato's disciple while very young.

* Stahr, *Aristotelia*, i. p. 43.

† Corsini (*De die n. Platonis*) cited by Ast. *Platons Leben und Schriften*, p. 30. Heraclides of Pontus presided in the school of Plato during his absence. But Xenocrates, who is known to have been an intimate associate of Aristotle in after life, may possibly have been the means of drawing his attention to intellectual philosophy; the social intercourse in which this might be effected would to later ages appear in the light of formal instruction, and when this was the case, the name *Xenocrates* would readily by the carelessness or meddling criticism of a transcriber be altered into *Socrates*.

‡ *Intellectus abest; surdum est auditorium.* This story is probably only an expansion of a saying of Plato's, recorded by Philoponus, (*De Æternitate Mundi*, vi. 27.) that Aristotle was "the soul of his school," (ὁ νοῦς τῆς διατριβῆς.)

§ *De Oratore*, ii. 38. compared with *De Inventione*, ii. 2.

Biography. which lay within the reach of as small a portion of the readers of that day, as a gallery of pictures would of the amateurs of this.* This circumstance, then, is calculated to throw additional discredit on the story told by Epicurus of Aristotle's youth. A bankrupt apothecary could never have been a book collector. Another work of Aristotle's, which is unfortunately lost, was compiled during this same time. It was a collection of Proverbs (παροίμιαι,) a species of literature to which he, like most other men of reflection, attached great value. Two other most important works, both of which are likewise lost, we may, from what we know of their nature, probably refer to the same period, at least as far as their plan and commencement are concerned. The first of these was a work on the fundamental principles on which the codes of law in the States of his time were severally based.† The second was an account of no less than one hundred and fifty-eight (according to others one hundred and seventy-one or two hundred and fifty-five) States, which, judging from some fragments which have been preserved, involved their history from the earliest known times to his own.* Of this invaluable work a great many scraps remain. On those which relate to Athens, Sigonius is said to have based his account of that commonwealth.† And another, (or the draught of it,) for which this apparently formed the foundation, the *Politics*, has come down to us in all probability in the state in which it was left at the moment of the author's death. We may conclude the evidence which these productions afford of their writer's activity and industry with an anecdote preserved by Diogenes, (*Vit. Arist.* sec. 16.) Apparently to prevent the remission of attention which results from nature insensibly giving way under the pressure of extremely laborious study, he was accustomed to read holding a ball in one hand, under which was placed a brazen basin. On the slightest involuntary relaxation of the muscles, the ball would fall, and by the sudden noise which it made, at once dissipate the incipient drowsiness of the student. Aristotle.

His genius. But this intense love of knowledge had not the common effect of converting him into a mere bookworm. In his works we see nothing like an undue depreciation of the active forms of life, or even of its pleasures. And this is the more remarkable, as we know that his frame was delicate, and his constitution weakly, and that in the latter part of his life he suffered much from bad health,‡ —circumstances which in general lead to an under estimate of those pursuits for which a certain robustness of body is a necessary condition. His attention to neatness of person and dress was very considerable; indeed it is said that he carried it to an extent which Plato considered unworthy of a philosopher.§ Whether this account be true or not, it is certain that his habits and principles were the reverse of cynical, that he enjoyed life, and was above any unnecessary affectation of severity. "Not apathy, but moderation," is a maxim ascribed to him by Diogenes.‖

Plato's sentiments towards him. We have seen that Plato felt and testified the highest admiration for the talents of his pupil. But it appears that in spite of this there was by no means a perfect congeniality in their feelings. Aristotle is said to have offended his master not only by the carefulness respecting his personal appearance which we have just spoken of, but by a certain sarcastic habit, (μωκία,)¶ which showed itself in the expression of his countenance. It is difficult to imagine that he should have indulged this humour in a greater degree than Socrates is by Plato himself represented to have done. However a vein of irony which would appear very graceful in the master whom he reverenced, and whose views he enthusiastically embraced, might seem quite the reverse in a youthful pupil who promised speedily to become a rival. An anecdote is related by Ælian,** from which we should infer that overt hostility broke out between them. Aristotle, it is said, taking advantage of the absence of Xenocrates from Athens, and of the temporary confinement of Speusippus by illness, attacked Plato in the pre-

His reputed ingratitude to Plato.

---

* The facilities for obtaining the copy of a book were very much increased after the extensive manufacture of papyrus at Alexandria under the Ptolemies, and when transcription had become a profitable and widely practised profession. Yet we find Polybius (iii. 32.) at some pains to take off the objection to his work arising from its costliness. But in the time of Aristotle's youth, the expense must have been far greater. He, probably in the latter part of his life, possessed a very large library, (*Athenæi Epitom.* p. 3.) which he left to his successor, Theophrastus. (Strabo, xiii. p. 608.) The philosophers after him appear likewise to have made collections. We know this for certain of Theophrastus, Strato, and Lycon; (Diog. Laert. v. sec. 52, 62, 73.) and such were probably used under greater or less restrictions by their respective scholars. But nothing of this sort is related of the earlier philosophers, whose systems indeed did not require (at least to any thing like the extent of Aristotle's) any previous historical investigation. And Plato, if he really did purchase the work of Philolaus, as he was said by Satyrus and Timon the Sillographer (Aulus Gellius, iii. 17. Diogenes Laert. iii. 9, viii. 15. 85.) to have done, and to have reproduced the philosophy of it in his *Timæus*, certainly had no intention of communicating it to his scholars. Hence it appears unlikely that Aristotle could have obtained the use of the greater part of the works which the plan of his studies required by other means than purchase.

† The title of the treatise was Δικαώματα πόλεων. (See Casaubon and Menage on Diog. Laert. v. 26.) Grotius, deceived by the corrupt reading, πολίμων for πόλεων, in Ammonius (*sub v.* νῆσις,) and Sir James Macintosh (*Discourse on the Law of Nature and Nations*, p. 16.) implicitly following him, conceived that the work was "a treatise on the laws of war." But any one who will peruse attentively the third book of the *Politics*, will see that it would be much more accurately described by calling it "a treatise on the spirit of laws." In the small States of Greece it was not difficult to reduce all the existing laws, or at any rate those which related to the political constitution, to some one axiom, which was regarded as the generative principle, the *idée-mère* of the whole code. For this axiom, whether explicitly stated, or only to be gathered from the common and statute law, the technical term in Aristotle's time was τὸ δίκαιον, "the rule of right." This was different in different States: he speaks of τὸ δίκαιον ὀλιγαρχικὸν, τὸ δίκαιον ἀριστοκρατικὸν, and τὸ δίκαιον δημοκρατικὸν, "the oligarchal, aristocratic, and democratic rules of right." Such assertions of political claims as might be considered obvious applications of these fundamental axioms were called by the name δικαώματα, "prerogatives," or "pleas of right." Thus in our own country, the right of the crown to dissolve parliament, that of the subject to be tried by jury and to be held innocent of any charge till found guilty, that of the peers to demand an audience of the sovereign, and to be the ultimate court of appeal in civil cases, are so many δικαώματα. They are not referable to one standard of political justice, because our constitution contains monarchical, aristocratic, oligarchal, and democratic elements. But the Greek States were almost always pure oligarchies or pure democracies.

* Diog. Laert. *Vit.* Pseudo-Ammon. and *Vit. Lat.* Compare Cicero, *De Fin.* v. 4. 10. Varro, *De L. L.* vii. 3.

† Nunnez, *ad Vit.* Pseudo-Ammon. p. 59.

‡ Censorinus, *De die natali*, cap. xiv. *Aristotelem ferunt naturalem stomachi infirmitatem cerebrasque morbidi corporis offensiones, adeo virtute animi diu sustentasse, ut magis mirum sit ad annos* lxiii *eum vitam protulisse, quam ultra non pertulisse.* Compare Gellius, xiii. 5.

§ Ælian, *Varia Historia*, iii. 19. Diog. Laert. *Vit. Arist. init.*

‖ *Vit.* sec. 31.

¶ Ælian, *loc. cit.*

** *Ibid.*

sence of his disciples with a series of subtle sophisms, which, his powers being impaired by extreme old age, had the effect of perplexing him and obliging him to retire in confusion and shame from the walks of the Academy. Xenocrates, however, returning three months after, drove Aristotle away, and restored his master to his old haunts. On this or some other occasion it is said that Plato compared his pupil's conduct to that of the young foals who kick at their dam as soon as dropped.* And the opinion that Aristotle had in some way or other behaved with ingratitude to his master certainly had obtained considerable currency in antiquity; but it is probable that this in a great measure arose from the false interpretation of a passage in the biography of Plato by Aristoxenus the musician, whom we have noticed in the early part of this essay.† This writer had related that "while Plato was absent from Athens on his travels, certain individuals, who were foreigners, established a school in opposition to him." "Some," adds Aristocles, the Peripatetic philosopher,‡ after quoting this passage, "have imagined that Aristotle was the person here alluded to, but they forget that Aristoxenus, throughout the whole of his work, speaks of Aristotle in terms of praise." Every one who is conversant with the productive power of Greek imagination, and the rapidity with which anecdotes in that fertile soil sprang up and assumed a more and more circumstantial character on repetition, will not wonder that in the course of the five centuries which intervened between Aristoxenus and Ælian, the vague statement of the first should have bourgeoned into the circumstantial narrative of the second.§ Indeed, independently of the vulgar insolence with which this story

invests the character of Aristotle,—a quality of which there is not a trace in his writings,—there is much about it which may render us extremely suspicious of receiving it. In the first place, other stories of equal authority represent his feelings towards his master as those of ardent admiration and deep respect. His biographer informs us that he dedicated an altar (by which he probably means a cenotaph) to Plato, and put an inscription on it to the purport that Plato "was a man whom it was sacrilege for the bad even to praise." There is certainly not much credit to be attached to the literal truth of this story;* but its character may be considered to indicate the view which the authority followed by the biographer took of Aristotle's sentiments towards his master. Still better evidence exists in the way in which Plato is spoken of in the works of his pupil that have come down to us. His opinions are often controverted, but always with fairness, and never with discourtesy. If he is sometimes misapprehended, the misapprehension never appears to be wilful. In one rather remarkable instance there is exhibited a singular tenderness and delicacy towards him. The passage in question is near the commencement of the Nicomachean Ethics.† To the doctrine of *Ideas* or *Archetypal Forms*, as maintained by Plato, Aristotle was opposed. It became necessary for him, in the treatment of his subject, to discuss the bearing of this doctrine upon it, and he complains that his task is an unwelcome one, from the circumstance of persons to whom he is attached (φίλους ἄνδρας) having originated the theory. "Still," he adds, "it seems our duty even to slay our own flesh and blood"—an allusion to such cases as those of Iphigenia, Polyxena, and Macaria,—"where the cause of truth is at stake, especially as we are philosophers: where we love both parties, it is a sacred duty to prefer the truth." The delicacy which prompted such a preface as this would surely have restrained its author from such coarseness as is attributed to him in Ælian's story.

Refutation of the story.

The way in which Xenocrates is mixed up with this affair is not to be overlooked. He is represented as the vindicator of his master's honour, and the punisher of the insolence and vanity of his rival. But we shall see presently this same Xenocrates in the character of Aristotle's travelling companion during the three eventful years of his life which immediately followed the death of Plato, consequently at no long period after the alleged insult took place and was revenged; a circumstance which certainly is very far from harmonizing with that conduct of the two philosophers towards each other which Ælian's narrative represents.

We must not forget either that Aristotle, although probably possessed of considerable wealth, and perhaps also of some influence from his Macedonian connections, was still only a METIC, or *resident alien*. How sensitive the pride of the Athenian citizen was to any appearance of pretension on the part of these, is notorious.‡ In

---

* Ælian, *Var. Hist.* iv. 9.

† Page 91*.

‡ *Ap. Eusebium, Præparatio Evangelica*, xv. 2. Aristocles, a native of Messina, was the preceptor of the virtuous Emperor Alexander Severus, not of Alexander Aphrodisiensis, and consequently lived in the first half of the IIId Century of the Christian era. The work from which Eusebius extracts a passage of some length relating to Aristotle, was a kind of History of Philosophy, in ten books. Eusebius's extract is a part of the seventh. The learning and discrimination of the writer is very great. He traces the stories which he has occasion to mention up to their earliest origin, and refutes them in a masterly manner. There is a literary notice of him in Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Græca*, iii. c. viii., where see Heumann's note. It is curious that in the Latin Life Aristocles is cited together with Aristoxenus as an authority for the very story which he is concerned to refute.

§ The literary men of the declining period considered it a part of their duty to supply all the details which their readers might desiderate in the more general notices of the classical writers. An amusing instance of this kind of writer is Ptolemy, the son of Hephæstion, whose book is described by Photius, (*Biblioth.* p. 146—153. Bekker,) and strongly praised by him for its utility to those who were desirous of πολυμαθίαν ἱστορικήν. Not to mention the secret history of the death of Hercules, Achilles, and various other celebrated characters, we are informed of the name of the Delphian, whom Herodotus abstains from mentioning, (i. 51.) and of that of the Queen of Candaules, which latter it seems was Nysia. The reason of Herodotus abstaining from giving it was, that a youth named Plesirrhoüs, to whom he was much attached, had fallen in love with a lady of that appellation, and, not succeeding in his suit, had hanged himself. This Ptolemy related in his fifth book. In the third he had informed his readers that this very Plesirrhoüs inherited Herodotus's property, and wrote the preface to his History, the commencement of it as left by the author having been with the words Περσέων δὲ λόγιοι. He probably knew that the readers for whom he wrote, even if they read both anecdotes, would have forgotten the first by the time they reached the second. Yet the age, whose taste could render books of this description popular, was no more recent than that of Hadrian, at whose court Ælian and Phavorinus lived and wrote.

* The phrase in question is also found in an elegy to Eudemus, cited by Olympiodorus, *Comment. ad Platon. Gorgiam.* (Bekker, p. 53.)

† P. 1096, col. 1, c. 11, ed. Bekker.

‡ Eurip. *Suppl.* 892.

πρῶτον μὲν, ὡς χρὴ τοὺς μετοικοῦντας ξένους,
λυσπηροὺς οὐκ ἦν, οὐδ' ὑπέφθονος πόλει
οὐδ' ἰξιώστης τῶν λόγων, ἥδιον βαρὺς
μᾶλλον' ἂν εἴη δημότης τε καὶ ξένος.

Aristoph. *Acharn.* 58. τοὺς γὰρ μετοίκους ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν λέγω, which after all, was doubtless meant and taken as a compliment.

certain public festivals duties of an inferior, not to say menial, character were assigned to them.* They could hold no land; they could not intermarry with citizens, nor even maintain a civil action in their own persons, but were obliged for this purpose to employ a citizen as their patron or sponsor, (προστάτης.†) Plato, on the contrary, was of one of the most illustrious families in Athens, and, if we may judge by the anecdotes of his connection with Chabrias and Timotheus, possessed friends among the most influential public characters of the day.‡ It is scarcely credible therefore, even had all better motives been wanting, that fear of making a powerful enemy should not have restrained Aristotle from behaving to his master in the way which has been described.

Uncongeniality of Plato and Aristotle.

It is not difficult to imagine how such stories grew up. There is a most marked contrast observable in the modes of thought of the two philosophers, such a difference indeed as seems incompatible with congeniality, although quite consistent with the highest mutual admiration and respect. It manifests itself in their very style; Aristotle's being the dryest and most jejune prose, while that of Plato teems with the imagery of poetry. The one delights to dress his thoughts in all the pomp of as high a degree of fancy as one can conceive united to a sound judgment; the other seems to consider that the slightest garment would cramp their vigour and hide their symmetry. In Aristotle we find a searching and comprehensive view of things as they present themselves to the understanding, but no attempt to pass the limits of that faculty,—no suspicion indeed that such exist. Plato, on the contrary, never omits an opportunity of passing from the finite to the infinite, from the sensuous to the spiritual, from the domain of the intellect to that of the feelings: he is ever striving to body forth an *ideal*, and he only regards the *actual* as it furnishes materials for this. Hence he frequently forgets that he violates the conditions to which the actual world is subjected; or perhaps we should rather say, he disregards the importance of this. A striking exemplification of the essential difference between the two great philosophers is afforded by the *Republic* of Plato compared with the criticism of it by Aristotle. (*Pol.* ii.) The former seems to have grown up out of a wish to embody an *ideal* of justice, and is the genuine offspring of a vigorous and luxuriant imagination reviewing the forms of social life and seeing in all analogies to the original conception which it was the aim of the artist to set forth. But from this point of view it is never once contemplated by its critic. Essentially a *picture*, it is discussed by him as if it were a *map*.§ The natural consequence of these different bents is that Aristotle's views always form parts of a system intellectually complete, while Plato's harmonize with each other morally; we rise from the study of the latter with our feelings purified, from that of the former with our perceptions cleared; the one strengthens the intellect, the other elevates the spirit. Consistently with this opposition it happened that in the early centuries Christianity was often grafted on Platonism, and even where this was not the case, many persons were prepared for its reception by the study of Plato; while in the age of the schoolmen—an age when religion had become theology—Aristotle's works were the only food which the philosophy of the time could assimilate.

Misinterpreted by inferior minds.

The difference which is so strikingly marked between the matured philosophical characters of these two giant intellects is of a kind which must have shown itself early. Neither could have entirely sympathized with the other however much he might admire his genius; and this circumstance may very well have produced a certain estrangement, which by such of their followers as were of too vulgar minds to understand the respect which all really great men *must* entertain for each other, would readily be misinterpreted. Difference of opinion would, if proceeding from an equal, be represented in the light of hostility,—if from a former pupil, in that of ingratitude. The miserable spirit of partisanship prevailing among the Greeks, which is so strongly reprobated by Cicero,* rapidly gave birth to tales which at first probably were meant only to illustrate the preconceived notions which they were in course of time employed to confirm. And so, if Plato had ever made a remark in the same sense and spirit as Waller's Epigram to a Lady singing one of his own Songs,† this might very easily in its passage through inferior and ungenial minds have been distorted into the bitter reflection we have noticed above.

Hostility between Aristotle and Isocrates.

Respecting the relation between Aristotle and another celebrated contemporary of his, there can be no manner of doubt. All accounts agree with the inference we should draw from what we find on the subject in his works, that between him and Isocrates the rhetorician there subsisted a most cordial dislike, accompanied, on the part of the former at least, with as cordial a contempt. Isocrates was in fact a sophist of by no means a high order. He did not possess the cleverness which enabled many of that class to put forth a claim to universal knowledge, and under many circumstances to maintain it successfully. He professed to teach nothing but the art of oratory: but his want of comprehensiveness was not compensated by any superior degree of accuracy or depth. Oratory, according to his view, was the art of making what was important appear trivial, and what was trivial appear important,—in other words, of proving black white and white black. He taught this accomplishment not on any principles even pretending to be scientific, but by mere practice in the school,‡ like fencing or boxing. Indignation at this miserable sub-

---

* They were the σκαφηφόρου, σκιαδηφόρου, and ὀθνειοφόρου.

† See the authorities collected by Schoemann. *Jus publicum Græcum*, p. 190.

‡ Diog. Laert. *Vit. Plat.* sec. 1, 23. Ælian, *Var. Hist.* ii. 18.

§ The sacred subjects, as they were treated by the early Italian painters,—indeed down to the time of Raffaelle and Correggio,—present an analogy to this work. There is in them a certain dominant thought, which it is the artist's problem to embody, and which all the details, however incongruous they may be in all other respects, assist in bringing out more fully and clearly. Thus in the celebrated *Vierge au Poisson* there is a real unity of feeling to which each of the particulars contributes its share. But a spectator who misses this will at once remark on the glaring absurdity of the evangelist, an old man, reading his gospel to the subject of it, an infant in arms; and of Tobias presenting a fish of the size of a mackerel, as that one which "leaped out of the river and would have devoured him." Exactly on such principles does Aristotle's critique on the *Republic* proceed.

* *Sit ista in* Græcorum levitate *perversitas, qui maledictis insectantur eos, a quibus de veritate dissentiunt.*

De Finibus, ii. 25.

† The eagle's fate and mine are one,
Who, on the shaft that made him die
Espied a feather of his own,
Wherewith he wont to soar so high.

‡ οὐ μιᾷδὴ ἀλλ' ἀσκήσει. Pseudo-Plutarch, *Vit. Isocr.* p. 838. Compare Cicero, *De Invent.* ii. 2. *Brut.* 12.

stitute for philosophical institution, and at the undeserved reputation which its author had acquired, found vent with Aristotle in the application of a sentiment* which Euripides in his *Philoctetes*, a play now lost, put into the mouth of Ulysses. He resolved himself to take up the subject, and his success was so great that Cicero appears to regard it as one of the principal motives which induced Philip to intrust him with the education of Alexander.† The expressions which Cicero uses in describing Aristotle's treatment of the subject imply rather lectures combined with rhetorical practice and historical illustration than a formal treatise.‡ And this is an important point, inasmuch as it proves that Aristotle assumed the functions of an instructor during this his first residence at Athens. However, such part of his subject as embraced the early history of the art, and might be regarded in the light of an introduction to the rest, would very likely appear by itself; and this is exactly the character of the work so highly praised by Cicero, but unfortunately lost, to which we have before alluded, (p. 95*.) It was purely historical and critical, and contained none of his own views. These were systematically developed in another work,§ perhaps the one which we possess, which was certainly not written at this early period.‖ Apparently, in this lost work the system of Isocrates was attacked and severely handled. The assailed party does not seem to have come forward in person to defend himself; but a scholar of his, Cephisodorus, in a polemical treatise of considerable length, did not confine himself to the defence of his master's doctrines, but indulged in the most virulent attacks upon the moral as well as intellectual character of his rival.¶ Upon this work Dionysius of Halicarnassus, perhaps sympathizing with a brother rhetorician, passes a high encomium.** But from the little which we know of it, there is but scanty room for believing that its author carried conviction to the minds of many readers not predisposed to agree with him. One of the grounds on which he holds his adversary up to contempt is the having made a collection of proverbs, an employment, in the opinion of Cephisodorus, utterly unworthy of one professing to be a philosophical. Such as have not, like Cephisodorus, an enemy to overthrow by fair means or foul, will be inclined to smile at such a charge, even if indeed they do not view it in something like the contrary light. "Apophthegms," says Bacon, "are not only for delight and ornament, but for real businesses and civil usages; for they are, as he said, *secures aut mucrones verborum*, which by their sharp edge cut and penetrate the knots of Matters and Business; and occasions run round in a ring, and what was once profitable may again be practised, and again be effectual, whether a man speak them as ancient or make them his own." Proverbs are the apophthegms of a people, and from this point of view Aristotle appears to have formed his estimate of their importance. He is said to have regarded them as exhibiting in a compressed form the wisdom of the age in which they severally sprang up; and as in many instances having been preserved by their compactness and pregnancy through vicissitudes which had swept away all other traces of the people which originated them.*

Aristotle gives lectures.

Cephisodorus.

His book against Aristotle.

We now pass to another stage in the life of Aristotle. After a twenty years' stay at Athens, he, accompanied by the Platonic philosopher Xenocrates, passed over into Asia Minor, and took up his residence at Atarneus or Assos, (for the accounts vary,) in Mysia, at the court of Hermias.† Of the motives which impelled him to this step we have, as is natural, very conflicting accounts. His enemies imputed it to a feeling of jealousy, arising from Speusippus having been appointed by Plato, who had died just before, as his successor in the school of the Academy.‡ Others attributed it to a yet more vulgar motive, a taste for the coarse sensualities and ostentatious luxury of an Oriental court.§ But the first of these reasons will seem to deserve but little credit, when we consider that the position which Plato had held was not recognised in any public manner; that there was neither endowment nor dignity attached to it; that all honour or profit arising from it was due solely to the personal merits of the philosopher; that in all probability Aristotle himself had occupied a similar position before the death of Plato; and, that if he felt himself injured by the selection of Speusippus, (Plato's nephew,) he had every opportunity of showing by the best of all tests, competition, how erroneous a judgment had been formed of their respective merits. And with regard to the second view, it will be sufficient to remark, that for the twenty years preceding this epoch, as well as afterwards, he possessed the option of living at the court of Macedonia, where he probably had connections, and where there was equal scope for indulging the tastes in question. We shall, therefore, feel no scruple in referring this journey to other and more adequate causes. The reader of Grecian history will not fail to recollect that the suspicions which the Athenians had for some time entertained of the ambitious designs of Philip received a sudden confirmation just at this moment by the successes of that monarch in the Chalcidian peninsula. The fall of Olynthus and the destruction of the Greek con-

Aristotle at the court of Hermias. B. C. 348–7. 345–4.

---

* *αἰσχρὸν σιωπᾶν, βαρβάρους δ' ἐᾶν λέγειν.* Aristotle substituted the word *Ἑλληνίζειν* for *βαρβάρους*.

† *De Orat.* iii. 35.

‡ *Itaque ornavit et illustravit doctrinam illam omnem,* rerumque cognitionem *cum orationis exercitatione conjunxit*' ..... *Hunc Alexandro filio doctorem accivit, a quo eodem ille et* agendi *acciperet præcepta et* eloquendi. Cicero, *loc. cit.*

§ *Cujus* [*Aristotelis*] *et* illum legi librum, *in quo exposuit dicendi artes omnium superiorum,* et illos, *in quibus ipse sua quædam de eadem arte dixit. De Orator.* ii. 38.

‖ See Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, a. 334.

¶ *Aristocles ap.* Euseb. *loc. cit.* Athenæus, p. 60.

** *De Isocrate judicium,* sec. 18. He calls it *πάνυ ἀκμαιοτάτην.* But Dionysius utterly fails where he attempts literary criticism. Witness the absurd principles on which he proceeds in his comparison of Herodotus and Thucydides.

* Synesius, *Encom. Calvitii*, p. 59, ed. Turneb.

† Strabo, xiii. p. 126, ed. Tauchnitz. Diodorus Siculus, xvi. 53.

‡ Ælian, *Var. Hist.* iii. 19. Eubulides (*ap.* Aristocl. Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* xv. 2.) alleged that Aristotle refused to be present at Plato's deathbed.

§ To this the Epigram of Theocritus of Chios (*ap.* Aristocl. *loc. cit.*) perhaps alludes:

> Ἐμμεν ὑπούχου τι καὶ Εὐβούλου τόδε δούλου
> Μνῆμα κενὸν κενόφρων θῆκεν Ἀριστοτέλης·
> Ὃς διὰ τὴν ἀκρατῆ γαστρὸς φύσιν ἤλιτε καίπα
> Ἀντ' Ἀκαδημείας βαρβάρου ἐν μεσογαίᾳ.

although Plutarch applies it to his residence in Macedonia. The cenotaph spoken of in the second line is probably the foundation for the "altar" to Plato, of which the later writers speak. See above, p. 7. Theocritus of Chios was a contemporary of Aristotle. The Syracusan poet of the same name, in an Epigram ascribed to him, protests against being identified with him.

Biography.

federacy, of which that town was the head,* produced at Athens a feeling of indignation mixed with fear, of which Demosthenes did not fail to take advantage to kindle a strong hatred of any thing belonging to Macedon. The modern example of France will enable us readily to understand how dangerous must have been the position of a foreigner, by birth, connections, or feelings in the slighest degree mixed up with the unpopular party, especially when resident in a democratic State, in which the statute laws were every day subject to be violated by the extemporaneous resolutions (ψηφίσματα) of a popular assembly. Philip indeed was accustomed—or at any rate by his enemies believed—to make use of such aliens, as from any cause were allowed free ingress to the States with which he was not on good terms, as his emissaries.† It is scarcely possible under these circumstances to conceive that the jealousy of party hatred should fail to view the distinguished philosopher, the friend of Antipater, and the son of a Macedonian court-physican, with dislike and distrust, especially if, as from Cicero's description appears highly probable, political affairs entered considerably into the course of his public instructions.

Here, then, we have a reason, quite independent of any particular motive, for Aristotle's quitting Athens at this especial time. And others, little less weighty, existed to take him to the court of Hermias. For some time before, the gigantic body of the Persian empire had exhibited symptoms of breaking up. Egypt had for a considerable period maintained itself in a state of independence, and the success of the experiment had produced the revolt of Phœnicia. The cities of Asia Minor, whose intercourse with Greece Proper was constant, naturally felt an even greater desire to throw off the yoke, and about the year 349 before the Christian era, most of them were in a state of open rebellion. Confederacies of greater or less extent for the purpose of maintaining their common independence were formed among them; and over one of these, which included Atarneus and Assos, one Eubulus, a native of Bithynia, exercised a sway which Suidas represents as that of an absolute prince.‡ This remarkable man, of whom it is much to be regretted that we know so little, is described as having carried on the trade of a banker§ in one of these towns. If this be true, the train of circumstances which led him to the pitch of power which he seems to have reached was probably such a one as, in more modern times, made the son of a brewer of Ghent Regent of Flanders, and the Medici Dukes of Tuscany. A struggle for national existence calls forth the confidence of the governed in those who possess the genius which alone can preserve them, as unboundedly as it stimulates that genius itself; and there appears no reason why the name of *tyrant* or *dynast* should have been bestowed upon Eubulus more than upon Philip van Artevelde or William of Orange. He was assisted in the duties of his government, and afterwards succeeded, by Hermias, who is termed by Strabo his slave,—a term which a Greek would apply no less to the Vizier than to the lowest menial servant of an Asiatic potentate. He is also described as an eunuch, but, whether this was the case or not, he was a man of education and philosophy, and had during a residence at Athens attended the instructions of both Plato and Aristotle.* By the invitation of this individual the latter, accompanied by Xenocrates, passed over at this particular juncture into Mysia; and it will surely not seem an improbable conjecture that the especial object for which their presence was desired was to frame a political constitution, in order that the little confederacy, of which Hermias may perhaps be regarded as the general and stadtholder, might be kept together and enabled to maintain its independence in spite of the formidable power of the Persian empire. Ably as such a task would doubtless have been executed by so wise a statesman, as even the fragmentary political work that has come down to us proves Aristotle to have been, it was not blessed with success. Fortune for a time favoured the cause of freedom, but the barbarian's hour was not come. The treachery of a Rhodian leader of condottieri in the service of the revolted Egyptians enabled the Persian king, Artaxerxes Ochus, rapidly to overrun Phœnicia and Egypt, and to devote the whole force of his empire to the reduction of Asia Minor. Yet Hermias made his ground good, until at last he suffered himself to be entrapped into a personal conference with the Greek general Mentor, the traitor whose perfidy had ruined the Egyptian cause, and who now commanded the Persian army that was sent against Atarneus. In spite of the assurance of a solemn oath, his person was seized and sent to the court of the Persian king, who ordered him to be strangled;—the fortresses which commanded the country surrendered at the sight of his signet; and Atarneus and Assos were occupied by Persian troops.† The two philosophers were only enabled to save themselves by a precipitate flight to Mytilene, taking with them Pythias, the sister and adopted daughter of Hermias.‡ It is singular that Aristotle's intercourse with the Prince of Atarneus, and more especially that part which related to his connection with this woman, whom he married, should have brought more calumny upon him than any other event of his life; and the strangest thing of all, according to our modern habits of thinking, is that he himself should have thought it necessary, for the satisfaction of his own friends, to give a particular explanation of his motives to the marriage. In a letter to Antipater, which is cited by Aristocles,§ he relates the circumstances which induced him to take this step; and they are calculated to give us as high an opinion of the goodness of his heart as his works do of the power of his intellect. The calamity which had befallen Hermias would necessarily have entailed utter misery, and in all probability death, upon his adopted daughter, had she been left behind. In this conjuncture, respect for the memory of his murdered friend, and compassion for the defenceless situation of the girl, induced him, knowing her besides, as he says, to be modest and amiable,‖ to take her as his wife. It is a striking proof of the utter want of sentiment in the intercourse between the sexes in Greece, that this noble and generous conduct, as every European will at once confess it to have been, should have drawn down

Revolt of Persian dependencies.

Eubulus.

Hermias.

Aristotle.

Death of Hermias.

Aristotle flies to Mytilene. Olymp. cviii. 4. B. C. 345—4.

Marries Pythias.

* Above, p. 94*.

† The case of Anaximus (see *Æschines c. Ctes.* p. 85. Demosth. *De Cor.* p. 272.) may serve as one instance among many.

‡ *Ἑρμείου.*

§ *τραπεζίτου.* Strabo, xiii. vol. iii. p. 128.

* Strabo. *loc. cit.*

† *Ibid. loc. cit.* Diodorus, xvi. sec. 52, 53, 54.

‡ Aristocles, *ap.* Euseb. *loc. cit.*

§ *Ap.* Euseb. *loc. cit.*

‖ *ἄλλως σώφρονα καὶ ἀγαθὴν οὖσαν.*

obloquy upon the head of its actor; while, if he had left the helpless creature to be carried off to a Persian harem, or sacrificed to the lust of a brutal soldiery, not a human being would have breathed the slightest word of censure upon the atrocity. Even his apologists appear to have considered this as one of the most vulnerable points of his character. When Aristocles* discusses the charges which had been made against him, he dismisses most of them with contempt as carrying the marks of falsehood in their very front. "Two, however," he adds, "do appear to have obtained credit, the one that he treated Plato with ingratitude, the other that he married the daughter of Hermias." And indeed the relation of Aristotle to the father furnished a subject for many publications† in the IId and IIId Centuries before Christ, and appears to have excited as much interest among literary antiquarians of that day, as the question, who wrote *Icon Basilike*, or the *Letters of Junius*, might do in modern times. The treatise of Apellicon of Teos, a wealthy antiquary and bibliomaniac contemporary with Sylla, was regarded as the classical work among them. We shall have occasion, in the sequel, to say something more about this personage. Aristocles‡ speaks of his book as sufficient to set the whole question at rest, and silence all the calumniators of the philosopher for ever. Indeed, if we may judge of the whole of their charges from the few specimens that have come down to us, a further refutation than their own extravagance was hardly needful. The hand of Pythias is there represented as purchased by a fulsome adulation of her adopted father,§ and a subserviency to the most loathsome vices which human nature in its lowest state of depravity can engender; and the husband is said, in exultation at his good fortune, to have paid to his father-in-law a service appropriated to the gods alone, singing his praises, like those of Apollo, in a sacred pæan. Fortunately this composition has come down to us, and turns out to be a common *scolium*, or drinking song, similar in its nature to the celebrated one, so popular at Athenian banquets, which records the deserts of Harmodius and Aristogiton. It possesses no very high degree of poetical merit, but as an expression of good feeling, and as a literary curiosity, being the only remaining specimen of its author's powers in this branch, it perhaps deserves a place in the note.‖ The perfection of the manly character is personified as *a virgin, for whose charms it is an enviable lot to die, or to endure the severest hardships. The enthusiasm with which she inspires the hearts of her lovers is more precious than gold, than parents, than the luxury of soft-eyed sleep! For her it was that Hercules and the sons of Leda toiled, and Achilles and Ajax died! her fair form, too, made Hermias, the nursling of Atarneus, renounce the cheerful light of the sun. Hence his deeds shall become the subjects of song, and the Muses, daughters of memory, shall wed him to immortality when they magnify the name of Jupiter Xenius*, (*i.e.* Jupiter as the protector of the rights of hospitality,) *and bestow its meed on firm and faithful friendship!* By comparing this relic with the scolium to Harmodius and Aristogiton, which Athenæus has preserved on the page preceding the one from which this is taken, the reader will at once see that Hermias is mentioned together with Achilles and Ajax, and the other heroes of mythology, only in the same manner as Harmodius is; yet not only did this performance bring down on its author's head the calumnies we have mentioned, but many years after it was even made the basis of a prosecution of him for blasphemy: such straws will envy and malice grasp at!

Is calumnisted in consequence.

The respect of the philosopher for his departed friend was yet further attested by the erection of a statue, or, as some say, a cenotaph, to him at Delphi, with an inscription, in which his death was recorded "as wrought in outrage of the sacred laws of the gods, by the monarch of the bow-bearing Persians, not fairly by the spear in the bloody battle-field, but through the false pledge of a crafty villain!"* And "the nearer view of wedded life" does not seem in any respect to have diminished the good opinion he had originally formed of his friend's daughter. She died,—how soon after their marriage we cannot say,—leaving one orphan daughter; and not only was her memory honoured by the widower with a respect which exposed him, as in the former instance of her father, to the charge of idolatry,† but, in his will, made some time afterwards, he provides that her bones should be taken up and laid by the side of his, wherever he might be buried, as, says he, she herself enjoined.‡

At this epoch of Aristotle's life, when the clouds of adversity appeared to be at the thickest, his brightest fortunes were about to appear. He had fled to Mytilene an exile, deprived of his powerful friend, and apparently cut off from all present opportunity of bringing his gigantic powers of mind into play. But in Mytilene he received an invitation from Philip to undertake the training of one who, in the World of Action, was destined to achieve an empire, which only that of his master in the World of Thought has ever surpassed. A conjunction of two such spirits has not been yet twice recorded in the annals of mankind; and it is impossible to conceive any thing more interesting and fruitful than a

Aristotle goes to Macedon to educate Alexander. Olymp. cix. 2. B. C. 343–2.

---

* *Ap.* Euseb. *loc. cit.*

† Aristocles, *loc. cit.*

‡ *Ap.* Euseb. *loc. cit.*

§ She is in some accounts represented, not as his sister, but his concubine. Others, not considering him an eunuch, call her his daughter. One, probably to reconcile all accounts, calls her his daughter, ἢν καὶ θλαδίας ἐν ἔστιμεν. (Pseudo-Ammon.)

Ἀρετὰ πολύμοχθε γένος βροτοῖς
βίστοτον πάλλιστον βίῳ!
σοῖς πυρὶ, παρθένε, μορφῆς
καὶ ἐπαθλεῖν ζηλωτὸς ἐν Ἑλλάδι πέπρωσε,
καὶ πόνους τλῆναι μαλερούς ἀναμέτρους.
σοῖσιν ὑπὲρ φρεσὶ ἔρωτα βάλλεις
ἀκρητὸν φίρεως τ' ἀθάνατον
χρυσοῦ τε κρίσσω καὶ γονέων
μαλακαυγητοῖο θ' ὕπνου.
σοῦ δ' ἕνεκ' οὐκ Διὸς Ἡρακλῆης
Λήδας τε κοῦροι πάλλ' ἀνέτλασαν,
ἔρωτος σὺν ἀγχεύοντες νίκαις·
σοῦ τε πάθεις Ἀχιλλεὺς
Αἶαντ' ἐπ' ἀὶ ἔδυ δόμους ἄιδου·
σοῦ τ' ἕνεκεν φιλίου μορφῆς
καὶ Ἀταρνέως ἔντροφος
ἀιλίου χήσατεν αὐγάς.
τοιγὰρ ἀοίδιμος ἔργοις·
ἀθάνατόν τε μιν αἰξήσουσι
μοῦσαι, Μνημοσύνης θύγατρες,
Διὸς ξενίου σέβας αὔξουσαι
φιλίης τε γάρας βεβαίου.

This Scolium is preserved in Diogenes Laert. *Vit. Arist.* sec. 7; Athenæus, p. 696; and Stobæus, *Serm.* i. p. 2. From the first, sec. 27, we learn that Aristotle also composed some epic and some elegiac poetry.

* Diog. *Vit.* sec. 6.

† *Ibid.* sec. 4.

‡ *Ibid.* sec. 16.

Biography.

good contemporary account of the intercourse between them would have been. But, although such a one did exist, (see below, p. 104*,) we are not fortunate enough to possess it. The destroying hand of time has been most active exactly where we should most desire information as to details, and almost all the description we can give of this period is founded upon the scanty notices on the subject furnished by Plutarch in his biography of the Great Conqueror.

Philip's probable acquaintance with Aristotle.

How far the mere personal character of Aristotle contributed to procuring him the invitation from Philip, it is difficult to say. Cicero represents the King as mainly determined to the step by the reputation of the philosopher's rhetorical lectures.* A letter preserved by Aulus Gellius, (ix. 3.) which is well known, but can scarcely be genuine, would induce us to believe that, from the very birth of Alexander, he was destined by his father to grow up under the superintendence of his latest instructor. It is, indeed, not unlikely that, at this early period, Aristotle was well known to Philip. We have seen that, in all probability, his earliest years were passed at the court, where his father possessed the highest confidence of the father of Philip. Moreover, he is said, although neither the time nor the occasion is specified, to have rendered services to the Athenians as ambassador to the court of Macedon.† But if this letter be genuine, how are we able to account for the absence of the philosopher from his charge during the thirteen years which elapsed between its professed date and the second year of the 109th Olympiad, in which we know for certain that he entered upon his important task? For that it was not because he considered the influences exerted upon this tender age unimportant, is clear from the great stress he lays upon their effect in the eighth book of his *Politics*, which is entirely devoted to the details of this subject.‡ And although Alexander was only thirteen years old when his connection with Aristotle commenced, yet the seeds of many vices had even at that early period been sown by the unskilful hands of former instructors; and perhaps the best means of estimating the value of Aristotle's services, is to compare what his pupil really became with what he would naturally have been had he been left under the care of these. Two are particularly noticed by Plutarch,§ of totally opposite dispositions, and singularly calculated to produce, by their combined action, that oscillation between asceticism and luxury which, in the latter part of his life especially, was so striking a feature in Alexander's character. The first was Leonidas, a relation of his mother Olympias, a rough and austere soldier, who appears to have directed all his efforts to the production of a Spartan endurance of hardship and contempt of danger. He was accustomed to ransack his pupil's trunks for the purpose of discovering any luxurious dress or other means of indulgence which might have been sent by his mother to him: and, at the outset of Alexander's Asiatic expedition, on the occasion of an entertainment by his adopted mother, a Carian princess, he told her that Leonidas's early discipline had made all culinary refinements a matter of indifference to him; that the only cook he had ever been allowed to season his breakfast was a good night's journey; and the only one to improve his supper, a scanty breakfast.* An education of which these traits are characteristic might very well produce the personal hardiness and animal courage for which Alexander was distinguished;—it might enable him to tame a Bucephalus, to surpass all his contemporaries in swiftness of foot, to leap down alone amidst a crowd of enemies from the ramparts of a besieged town, to kill a lion in single combat;†—it might even inspire the passion for military glory which vented itself in tears when there was nothing left to conquer;‡—but it would be almost as favourable to the growth of the coarser vices as to the developement of these ruder virtues, and we learn that, to the day of his death, the ruffianly and intemperate dispositions which belong to barbarian blood, and which the influences of Leonidas had tended rather to increase than diminish, were never entirely subdued by Alexander.§ The character of Lysimachus, the other instructor especially noticed by Plutarch, was very different, but hardly likely to have produced a much more beneficial effect. He was by birth an Acarnanian, and an expert flatterer, by which means he is said to have gained great favour. His favourite thought appears to have been to compare Alexander to Achilles, Philip to Peleus, and himself to Phœnix, as the characters are described in the epic poetry of Greece, and this insipid stuff it was his delight to act out in the ordinary business of life. At a later period, this passion for scene-making nearly cost poor Phœnix and his master their lives;‖ and to it is probably due, in a great measure, the cormorant appetite for adulation which is the most disgusting feature in the history of the latter. To neither then of these two individuals,—and if not to these, of course much less to the crowd of masters in reading, writing, horsemanship, harp-playing, and the other accomplishments included by ancient education in its two branches of μουσική and γυμναστική,—can we ascribe a share in the production of that character which distinguishes Alexander from any successful military leader. But to Aristotle some of the ancients attribute a degree and kind of merit in this respect which is perfectly absurd. Plutarch says that his pupil gained from him more towards the accomplishment of his schemes than from Philip.¶ Alexander himself was accustomed to say, that he honoured Aristotle no less than his own father, that to the one he owed life, but to the other all that made life valuable;**—and it is very likely that the misinterpretation of such phrases as these led to the belief that the conqueror had received from his instructor direct advice for the accomplishment of the great exploit which has made him known to posterity. But the obligations to which he really alluded were probably

Aristotle

Lysimachus.

His obligations to Aristotle.

Alexander's early masters.

Leonidas.

* *De Oratore*, iii. 35.

† Diog. *Vit.* sec. 2.

‡ See especially p. 1334, col. 2, line 25, *et seq.*; p. 1338, col. 1, line 5, *et seq.* ed. Bekker.

§ *Vit. Alex.* sec. 5.

* Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 22.

† *Ibid.* 6—40, &c.

‡ *Unus Pellæo juveni non sufficit orbis.*—Juv. *Sat.* x. 168.

§ *Leonidas Alexandri pædagogus, ut a Babylonio Diogene traditur, quibusdam cum vitiis imbuit, quæ robustum quoque et jam maximum regem ab illâ institutione puerili sunt prosecuta.* Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* i. 1, 8. Is it not probable that Aristotle, in the seventh book of his *Politics*, (p. 1324, col. 1, line 23, *et seq.*, and p. 1333, col. 2, line 10, *et seq.*) has a particular reference to the views of Leonidas? See also above, col. 1, note ‡.

‖ Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 24.

¶ Plutarch, *De Fortun. Alexandri.* See Ste. Croix, *Examen Historique*, p. 84. Such expressions as these led later writers to yet more extravagant ones; such as Roger Bacon's, *per vias sapientiæ mundum Alexandro tradidit Aristoteles;* and probably to the same source is to be traced the romance of the philosopher having personally attended his pupil in his expedition.

** Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* sec. 8.

of a totally different kind. Philip is said to have perceived at a very early age that his son's disposition was a most peculiar one, sensible in the highest degree of kindness, and tractable by gentle measures, but absolutely ungovernable by force, and consequently requiring, instead of the austerity of a Leonidas, or the flattery of a Lysimachus, the influence of one who could, by his character and abilities, command respect, and by his tact and judgment preserve it. Such qualifications he found in Aristotle, and the good effects seem to have speedily shown themselves. From a rude and intemperate barbarian his nature expanded and exhibited itself in an attachment to philosophy, a desire of mental cultivation, and a fondness for study. So completely did he acquire higher and more civilized tastes, that being at the extremity of Asia, in a letter to Harpalus he desires that the works of Philistus the historian, the tragedies of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, and the dithyrambs of Telestes and Philoxenus, should be sent to him. Homer was his constant travelling companion. A copy, corrected by Aristotle, was deposited by the side of his dagger, under the pillow of the couch on which he slept;* and, on the occasion of a magnificent casket being found among the spoils of Darius's camp, when a discussion arose as to how it should be employed, the King declared that it should be appropriated to the use of containing this copy.† But his education had not been confined to the lighter species of literature; on the contrary, he appears to have been introduced to the gravest and most abstruse parts of philosophy, to which the term of *acroamatic* was specifically applied. We shall in the sequel examine more fully what exact notion is to be attached to this term:‡ in the mean time, it will be sufficient to observe that it included the highest branches of the science of that day. In a letter, then, preserved by Plutarch and Aulus Gellius,§ Alexander complains that his preceptor had published those of his works to which this phrase was applied. "How," he asks, "now that this is the case, will he be able to maintain his superiority to others in mental accomplishments, a superiority which he valued more than the distinction he had won by his conquests?" Gellius likewise gives us Aristotle's answer, in which he excuses himself by saying, "that although the works in question were published, they would be useless to all who had not previously enjoyed the benefit of his oral instructions." Whatever may be our opinion as to the genuineness of these letters, which Gellius says he took from the book of the philosopher Andronicus, (a contemporary of Cicero's, to whom we shall on a future occasion again revert,) it is quite clear that if they are forgeries, they were forged in accordance with a general belief of the time, that there was no department of knowledge however recondite to which Aristotle had not taken pains to introduce his pupil.

His literary tastes.

His mental cultivation.

Rapidity of his education.

But the most extraordinary feature in the education of Alexander is the short space of time which it occupied. From the time of Aristotle's arrival in Macedonia to the expedition of his pupil into Asia there elapsed eight years, (*i. e.* from Olymp. cix. 2. to Olymp. cxi. 2.) But of this only a part, less than the half, can have been devoted to the purpose of systematic instruction. For in the fourth year of this period,* we find Philip during an expedition to Byzantium leaving his son sole and absolute regent of the kingdom. Some barbarian subjects having revolted, Alexander undertook an expedition in person against them, and took their city, which he called after his own name, Alexandropolis. From this time he was continually engaged in business, now leading the decisive charge at Chæronea, and now involved in court intrigues against a party who endeavoured to gain Philip's confidence and induce him to alter the succession.† It is clear therefore that all instruction, in the stricter sense of the word, must have terminated. Yet that a very considerable influence may have been still exerted by Aristotle upon the mind of Alexander, is not only in itself probable, but is confirmed by the titles of some of his writings which are now lost. Ammonius, in his division of the works of the philosopher, mentions a certain class‡ as consisting of treatises written for the behoof of particular individuals, and specifies among them those books "which he composed at the request of Alexander of Macedon, that *On Monarchy*, and *Instructions on the Mode of establishing Colonies.*" The titles of these works may lead us to conjecture that the distinguishing characteristics of Alexander's subsequent policy, the attempt to fuse into one mass his old subjects and the people he had conquered, the assimilation of their manners, especially by education and intermarriages, the connection of remote regions by building cities, making roads, and establishing commercial enterprises, may be in no small measure due to the counsels of his preceptor. A modern writer indeed has imagined an analogy between this assimilative policy of the conqueror, and the generalizing genius of the philosopher.§ And there really does seem some ground for this belief, in spite of an observation of Plutarch's,‖ which is at first sight diametrically opposed to it. After speaking of the Stoical notions of an universal republic, he says, that magnificent as the scheme was, it was never realized, but remained a mere speculation of that school of philosophy; and he adds that Alexander, who nearly realized it, did so in opposition to the advice of Aristotle, who had recommended him to treat the Greeks as a general, (ἡγεμονικῶς,) but the barbarians as a master, (δεσποτικῶς,)—the one as friends, the other as instruments. But there is no other authority than Plutarch for this story; and it seems far from improbable that it is entirely built upon certain expressions used by Aristotle in the first book of his *Politics*. In that place he recognises the relation between master and slave as a natural one; and he also maintains the superiority of Greeks over barbarians to be so decided and permanent as to justify the supremacy of the one over the other. Of the latter he argues that they have not the faculty of governing in them, and that therefore the state of slavery is for them the natural and proper form of the social relation.¶ But

Aristotle's influence over Alexander.

His views respecting slavery.

* Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 7, 8.

† Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 26. Strabo, xiii. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* v. 30.

‡ See below, p. 129*, col. 2.

§ Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* sec. 7. Gellius, *Noc. Att.* xx. 5

* Plutarch, *Vit*, sec. 9. Diodorus, xvi. 77. See Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* a. 340, 339.

† Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 9, 10.

‡ τὰ Μειρικά. Ammon. *Hermeneut. ad Aristot. Categor.* p. 7. ed. Ald. The two works alluded to are cited by the anonymous author of the Life printed by Buhle in his edition of Aristotle, p. 60—67, under the titles περὶ βασιλείας and Ἀλέξανδρος, ἢ ὑπὲρ ἀποικιῶν. Diogenes mentions the latter by the same name, and Pseudo-Ammonius the former. The anonymous writer adds a third [περὶ] Ἀλεξάνδρου, ἢ περὶ ῥήτορος ἢ πολιτικοῦ, by which he probably means the ῥητορικὴ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον, which we have.

§ Joh. von Mueller, *Allgemeine Geschichte*, i. p. 160.

‖ *De Virt. et Fort. Alexandri*, p. 329.

¶ P. 1252, col. 1, lin. 34, *et seq.*

Biography.

it should not be overlooked, as by some modern writers it has been,* that Aristotle explicitly distinguishes between a slave *de facto* and a slave *de jure*, and that he grounds his vindication of slavery entirely on the principle that such a relation shall be the most beneficial one to *both* the parties concerned in it. Where this condition is wanting, wherever the party governed is susceptible of a higher order of government, he distinctly maintains that the relation is a false and unnatural one.† If therefore his experience had brought him into contact with the highly cultivated and generous races of upper Asia to which Alexander penetrated, he must in consistency with his own principle, that every man's nature is to be developed to the highest point of which it is capable, have advised that these should be treated on the same footing as the Greeks, and Alexander's conduct would only appear a natural deduction from the general principles inculcated by his master.‡ As far as concerned the barbarians with whom alone the Greeks previously to Alexander's expedition had been brought into contact, the neighbours of the Greek cities in Asia Minor and the Propontis, the savage hordes of Thrace, or the Nomad races inhabiting the African Syrtis, Aristotle's position was a most reasonable one. Christianity seems the only possible means for the mutual pacification of races so different from one another in every thought, feeling, and habit, as these and the polished Greeks were: and Christianity itself solves the problem not by those modifications of social life through which alone the statesman acts, or can act; but by awakening all to the consciousness that there exists a common bond higher than all social relations; it does not aim at obliterating national peculiarities, but it dwarfs their importance in comparison with the universal religious faith. If we would really understand the opinions of a writer of antiquity, we must understand the ground on which he rests, and *must* rest. We have no right to require of a pagan philosopher three centuries before Christ, that in his system he should take account of the influences of Christianity; and they who scoff at the importance which he attaches to the difference of race, would do well to point out any instance in the history of the world of a barbarous people becoming amalgamated with a highly civilized one by any other agency.

Misrepresented.

Exculpated.

Stagirus rebuilt.

If Aristotle might reasonably feel proud of the talents and acquirements of his pupil, his gratification would be yet more enhanced by the nature of the reward which his services received. We have mentioned above the unhappy fate of Stagirus, Aristotle's birthplace. Although his own fortunes were little affected by this calamity, his patriotism, if we may believe the account in Plutarch, induced him to demand as the price of his instructions, the restoration of his native town. It was accordingly rebuilt, such of the inhabitants as were living in exile were restored to the home of their infancy, such as had been sold for slaves were redeemed, and in the days of Plutarch strangers were shown the shady groves in which the philosopher had walked, and the stone benches whereon he used to repose.§ The constitution under which the new citizens lived was said to be drawn up by him,* and long afterwards his memory was celebrated by the Stagirites in a solemn festival, and, it is said, one month of the year (perhaps the one in which he was born) called by his name.† There is every reason to believe that during the latter part of his connection with Alexander, when the more direct instruction had ceased, the newly built town furnished him with a quiet retreat, and that he then and there composed the treatises we have mentioned above, for the use of his absent pupil. While their personal communication lasted, Pella, the capital of Macedonia, was probably his residence,‡ as it is scarcely probable that Philip would have liked to trust the person of the heir apparent out of his dominions.

Aristotle.

Fellow pupils of Alexander.

We shall conclude the account of this portion of Aristotle's life by the mention of three other remarkable persons who probably all shared with Alexander in the benefit of his instructions, although this is only positively stated of the last of them.§ The first of these was Callisthenes, a son of Aristotle's cousin, who afterwards attended Alexander in his Asiatic expedition, and to whom we shall have occasion to revert in the sequel. The second was Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor in the school of the Lyceum some years afterwards; and the third was one Marsyas, a native of Pella, brother to the Antigonus who, after the death of Alexander, when the generals of the monarch divided their master's conquests among them, became King of Lycia and Pamphylia. He was a soldier and a man of letters; and one work of his *On the Education of Alexander* is perhaps as great a loss to us as any composition of antiquity which could be named.

Aristotle returns to Athens. B. C. 335–4

On Alexander commencing his eastern expedition, Aristotle, leaving his relation and pupil Callisthenes to supply his own place as a friendly adviser to the youthful monarch, whom he accompanied in the ostensible character of historiographer,‖ returned to Athens. Whe-

---

* Paley, *Moral and Political Philosophy*, ch. v. p. 12.

† See p. 1255, col. 1, line 5, *et seq.*, and col. 2, line 4, *et seq.*, also p. 1259, col. 2, line 21, *et seq.*

‡ From this point of view too, the assertion of Plutarch quoted above (p. 102*) acquires a plausibility, which otherwise we could never allow it.

§ Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* sec. 7. In this matter the accounts are confused. Ælian, (*Var. Hist.* iii. 17. xii. 54.) Diogenes, (v. 4.) and Pliny (vii. 29.) attribute the restoration to Alexander. If it took place at the commencement of the regency these may be reconciled with Plutarch. But the testimony of Valerius Maximus (v. 6.) would refer both the destruction and rebuilding of Stagirus to Alexander, and that too at a time when Aristotle was very old and residing in Athens. The gentlest mode of reconciling this inaccurate epitomizer with possibilities, is to suppose that he has confounded Stagirus with Eresus, the birthplace of Theophrastus, of whom Diogenes and Pseudo-Ammonius relate a somewhat similar story.

* Plutarch *adv. Colot. extr.*

† Pseudo-Ammon. and *Vit. Lat.* The name "Stagirites" shows the very late rise of this feature of the story. It may be built, however, on a true foundation.

‡ This has been by Stahr, *Aristotelia*, i. p. 104, inferred from the expression *βορβόρου ἐν τραχεῖαις* in Theocritus's Epigram quoted above p. 9. note. The Macedonians, he says, called the river, on whose banks Pella stood, by the name *Βόρβορος*. We cannot find any authority except Plutarch for this assertion; and should be inclined to recognise in the expression in question a moral rather than a physical allusion.

§ Suidas, *v. Marsyas*. That Callisthenes and Theophrastus were together pupils of Aristotle appears from Diogenes, *Vit. Theoph.* sec. 39. And the Macedonian connections of both would incline us to believe that it was in that country that this relation existed. Theophrastus was personally known to Philip and treated with distinction by him. (Ælian, *Var. Hist.* iv. 19.) And if Callisthenes had been Aristotle's pupil at Athens, his character would surely have been sufficiently developed eleven years afterwards to exhibit his unfitness as an adviser of Alexander to any eye, certainly to the sharp-sighted one of Aristotle. Besides, it is not likely that Alexander would have chosen one whom he was not already acquainted with, to attend him in such a capacity as Callisthenes did.

‖ Arrhian, iv. 10.

ther this step was the consequence of any specific invitation or not, it is difficult to say. Some accounts state that he received a public request from the Athenians to come, and conjointly with Xenocrates to succeed Speusippus.* But these views appear to proceed upon the essentially false opinion that the position of teacher was already a publicly recognised one, and besides to imply the belief that Xenocrates and Aristotle were at the time on their travels together; whereas we know that the latter was in Macedonia till B. C. 335, and that the former had four years before this time succeeded Speusippus, not by virtue of any public appointment, but in consequence of his private wish.† If any more precise reason be required for the philosopher's change of residence than the one which probably determined him at first to visit Athens, namely the superior attractions which that city possessed for cultivated and refined minds, we should incline to believe that the greater mildness of climate was the influencing cause.‡ His health was unquestionably delicate; and perhaps it was a regard for this, combined with the wish to economize time, that induced him to deliver his instructions (or at least a part of them) not sitting or standing, but walking backwards and forwards in the open air. The extent to which he carried this practice, although the example of Protagoras § in Plato's Dialogue is enough to show that he did not originate it, procured for his scholars, who of course were obliged to conform to this habit, the soubriquet of *Peripatetics*, or *Walkers backwards and forwards.*‖ From a neighbouring temple of Apollo Lyceus, his school was commonly known by the name of the Lyceum; ¶ and here every morning and evening he delivered lectures to a numerous body of scholars. Among these he appears to have made a division. The morning course, or, as he called it from the place where it was delivered, the morning walk, (ἑωθινὸς περίπατος,) was attended only by the more highly disciplined part of his auditory, the subjects of it belonging to the higher branches of philosophy, and requiring a systematic attention as well as a previously cultivated understanding on the part of the scholar. In the evening course (δειλινὸς περίπατος) the subjects as well as the manner of treating them were of a more popular cast, and more appreciable by a mixed assembly. Aulus Gellius,** who is our sole authority on this matter, affirms that the expressions *acroatic discourses* and *exoteric discourses* (λόγοι ἀκροατικοὶ and λόγοι ἐξωτερικοὶ) were the appropriate technical terms for these instructions; and he further says that the former comprised theological, physical, and dialectic investigations, the latter rhetoric, *sophistic*, (or the art of disputing,) and politics. We shall in another place examine thoroughly into the precise meaning of these celebrated phrases, a task which would in this place too much break the thread of the narrative. We may, however, remark that the morning discourses were called *acroatic* or *subjects of lectures*, not *because* they belonged to this or that branch, but because they were treated in a *technical and systematic* manner; and so the evening discourses obtained the name of *exoteric* or *separate*, because each of them was insulated, and not forming an integral part of a system. It is obvious that some subjects are more suitable to the one of these methods, and others to the other; and the division which Gellius makes is, generally speaking, a good one. But that it does not hold universally is plain, not to mention other arguments, from the fact that the work on *Rhetoric* which has come down to us is an *acroatic* work, and that on *Politics* the unfinished draught of one; while on the contrary, a fragment of an *exoteric* work preserved by Cicero in a Latin dress is upon a theological subject.

Why.

Peripatetics.

Division of his scholars.

The more select circle of his scholars Aristotle used to assemble at stated times on a footing, which without any straining of analogy we may compare to the periodical dinners held by some of the literary clubs of modern times. Their object obviously was to combine the advantages of high intellectual cultivation with the charms of social intercourse; to make men feel that philosophy was not a thing separate from the daily uses of life, but entered into all its charities and was mixed up with its real pleasures. These reunions were conducted according to regular rules,* of which we know enough to see that the cynicism or pedantry, which frequently induces such as would be accounted deep thinkers to despise the elegancies or even the decencies of life, was strongly discountenanced.† In these days, especially in England, where so many different elements combine to produce social intercourse in its highest perfection, it is difficult to estimate the important effect which must have been brought about by a custom such as that just mentioned. "To enjoy leisure gracefully and creditably,"‡ is not easy for any one at any time, but for the Athenian in the days of Aristotle was a task of the greatest difficulty. Deprived of that kind of female intercourse which in modern social life is the great instrument for humanizing the other sex, softening, as it does, through the affections, the disposition to ferocity and rudeness, and checking the licentious passions by the dignity of matronly or maidenly purity, the youth of ancient Greece almost universally fell either into a ruffianly asceticism, or a low and vulgar profligacy. Some affected the austere manner and sordid garb of the Lacedæmonians,§ regarding as effeminate all geniality of disposition, all taste for the refinements of life, every thing in short which did not directly tend to the production of mere energy: while others entirely quenched the moral will and the higher mental faculties in a

Their convivial meetings.

Athenian social intercourse.

---

* Pseudo-Ammon. *Vit. Lat.*

† Diog. Laert. iv. 3.

‡ This seems to be the true interpretation of the expression of Aristotle cited by Demetrius, *De Elocut.* sec. 29, 155: ἐγὼ μὲν Ἀθηνῶν εἰς Σκάγιρα ἦλθον διὰ τὸν βασιλέα τὸν μέγαν, ἐκ δὲ Σκαγίρων εἰς Ἀθήνας διὰ τὸν χειμῶνα τὸν μέγαν.

§ P. 314 E. 315. C.

‖ Cicero, *Academ. Post.* i. 4. Cicero translates the word περιπατεῖν by *inambulare*. Hermippus explained it by ἀναπάρεσθαι. Diogenes Laertius (v. 2.) attributes the origin of this practice with Aristotle to a regard not for his own health but for that of Alexander.

¶ Before the Peloponnesian War it had been used as a gymnasium, and was said to have been built by Pisistratus. See Aristoph. *Pax.* 355, and the Scholiast.

** *Noct. Att.* xx. 5.

* Athenæus, p. 186.

† Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἔλεγεν καὶ κοσμητὴν ἥλιον εἶναι δεῖ τὸ συμπόσιον ἀκριτὸν ἴδιον φησίν. Athenæus, p. 186. E.

‡ σχολάζειν καλῶς. *Polit.* viii. p. 1337, col. 2, line 34. Compare also Nicom. *Ethic.* p. 1177, col. 2, line 4, and *Polit.* vii. p. 1334, col. 1, line 18—34.

§ That the Λακωνομανία so admirably hit off by Aristophanes (*Av.* 1729, *et seq.*) lasted long after his time, is clear, not to mention other arguments, from the evident prevalence of the views which Aristotle (*Politic.* vii. p. 1324, col. 1, line 23, *et seq.*, also p. 1332, col. 2, line 20, p. 1334, col. 2, line 28) takes so much pains to controvert.

Biography.

debauchery of the coarsest kind.* To open a new region of enjoyment to the choicer spirits of the time, and thus save them from the distortion or corruption to which they otherwise seemed doomed, was a highly important service to the cause of civilization. The pleasure and utility resulting from the institution was very generally recognised. Xenocrates, the friend of Aristotle, adopted it. Theophrastus, his successor, left a sum of money in his will to be applied to defraying the expenses of these meetings; and there were in after times similar periodical gatherings of the followers of the Stoic philosophers, Diogenes, Antipater, and Panætius.† If some of these, or others of similar nature, in the course of time degenerated into mere excuses for sensual indulgence, as Athenæus seems to hint, no argument can be thence derived against their great utility while the spirit of the institution was preserved.

Their public exercises.

Another arrangement made by Aristotle in the management of his instructions appears particularly worthy of notice. In imitation, as some say, of a practice of Xenocrates, he appointed one of his scholars to play the part of a sort of president in his school, holding the office for the space of ten days, after which another took his place.‡ This peculiarity seems to derive illustration from the practice of the universities of Europe in the middle ages, in which, as is well known, it was the custom for individuals on various occasions to maintain certain theses against all who chose to controvert them. A remnant of this practice remains to this day in the *Acts* (as they are termed) which are kept in the University of Cambridge by candidates for a degree in either of the Faculties. It is an arrangement which results necessarily from the scarcity of books of instruction, and is dropped or degenerates into a mere form when this deficiency is removed. While information on any given subject must be derived entirely or mainly from the mouth of the teacher,—as was the case in the time of Aristotle no less than that of Scotus and Aquinas,—the most satisfactory test of the learner's proficiency is his ability to maintain the theory which he has received against all arguments which may be brought against it. We shall probably be right in supposing that this was the duty of the president (ἄρχων) spoken of by Diogenes. He was, in the language of the XVIth Century, *keeping an act.* He had for the space of ten days to defend his own theory and to refute the objections (ἀπόριαι) which his brother disciples might either entertain or invent, the master in the mean time taking the place of a *moderator*, occasionally interposing to show where issue must be joined, to prevent either party from drawing illogical conclusions from acknowledged premises, and, probably, after the discussion had been continued for a sufficient time, to point out the ground of the fallacy. This explanation will also serve to account for a phenomenon, which cannot fail to strike a reader on the perusal of any one of Aristotle's writings that have come down to us. The systematic treatment of a subject is continually broken by an apparently needless discussion of objections which may be brought against some particular part. These are stated more or less fully, and are likewise taken off; or it sometimes happens that merely the principle on which the solution must proceed is indicated, and it is left to the ingenuity of the reader to fill up the details. To return to our subject, it is quite obvious that such a discipline as we have described must have had a wonderful effect in sharpening the dialectical talent of the student, and in producing—perhaps at the expense of the more valuable faculty of deep and systematic thought—extraordinary astuteness and agility in argumentation. Indeed, if we make abstraction of the subject-matter of the discussions, we may very well regard the exercise as simply a practical instruction in the art of Disputation,—that which formed *the staple* of the education of the Sophists. And now we may understand how Gellius,* writing in the IId Century after Christ, should place this art among the branches which Aristotle's evening course embraced, although in the sense in which the Sophists taught it, he would have scorned to make any such profession.† In what other light could this compiler have viewed the fact, that *insulated* topics arising out of a subject which they had heard *systematically* treated by their master in his lectures (ἀκροάσεις) of the morning, were debated by Aristotle's more advanced scholars, in the presence of the whole body, in the evening, the master being himself present and regulating the whole discussion.

Aristotle.

Gellius's account explained.

It is evident that in this species of exercise it is not the faculty of comprehending philosophic truth that plays the most prominent part. As regards the subject-matter of such debates, nothing which is at all incomplete, nothing unsusceptible of rigid definition is available. Consequently the whole of that extensive region, where knowledge exists in a state of growth and gradual consolidation,—the domain of half-evolved truths, of observations and theories blended together in varying proportions, of approximately ascertained laws, in the main true, but still apparently irreconcilable with some phenomena,—all this fertile soil, out of which every particle of real knowledge has sprung and must spring, will be neglected as barren and unprofitable. Where public discussion is the only test to be applied, an impregnable paradox will be more valued than an imperfectly established truth‡. And it is not only by diverting

Effect of this discipline on the subject-matter of philosophy.

---

* ——————— *πῶς γὰρ οὐχὶ γυνάδας*
ἔστιν γε πίνειν οἴδε καὶ βινεῖν μόνον; Aristoph. *Ran.* 751.
The manners of the latter comedy, as preserved in Terence's plays, are a sufficient evidence that this sarcasm was little less applicable at Athens throughout the IVth Century before the Christian era.

† Athenæus, p. 186.

‡ *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ σχολῇ τοιαῦτα, μιμούμενοι Μενεδήμειον ὄντες κατὰ δίκα ἡμέρας ἄρχοντα ποιοῦν.* Diog. Laert. *Vit.* sec. 4. *Itaque mihi semper Peripateticorum Academicæque consuetudo de omnibus rebus in contrarias partes disserendi non ob eam causam solum placuit, quod aliter non posset, quid in quâque re veri simile esset, inveniri;* sed etiam quod esset ea maxima dicendi exercitatio: *quâ princeps usus est Aristoteles, deinde, eum qui secuti sunt.*—Cicero, *Tusc. Qu.* ii. 3.
Sin aliquis extiterit aliquando, qui Aristoteleo more de omnibus rebus in utramque partem possit dicere, et in omni causâ duas contrarias orationes, præceptis illius cognitis, explicare; aut hoc Arcesilæ modo et Carneadi, contra omne quod propositum sit disserat; *quique ad eam rationem* adjungat hunc rhetoricum usum moremque dicendi, *—is sit verus, is perfectus, is solus orator.*—Cicero, *De Orat.* iii. 21.
The passage from Quintilian, (i. 2. 23.) quoted by Menage in his note on Diogenes, (*loc. cit.*) refers to an essentially different kind of discipline, arising out of other grounds and directed to other ends.

* *Noct. Att.* xx. 5. See above, p. 105*.

† See, for instance, the contempt with which he speaks of the Sophistical principle,—the one on which Isocrates taught rhetoric. *Rhetoric.* i. *init.*

‡ *Sapientis hanc censet Arcesilas vim esse maximam, Zenoni assentiens, cavere ne capiatur; ne fallatur, videre.* Cicero, *Academ. prior.* ii. 21. Who can fail to recognise the disputatious habit of mind which gave birth to this principle? Compare sec. 21. *Si ulli rei sapiens assentietur unquam,* aliquando etiam opinabitur: nunquam autem opinabitur; *nulli igitur rei assentietur.*

the attention of the student away from the profitable fields of knowledge, that a pernicious effect will be produced. He will further be tempted to give, perhaps unconsciously, an artificial roundness to established facts by means of arbitrary definitions. In Nature every thing is shaded off by imperceptible gradations into something entirely different. Who can define the exact line which separates the animal from the vegetable kingdom, or the family of birds from that of animals? Who can say exactly where disinterestedness in the individual character joins on to a well-regulated self-love?—or where fanaticism ends and hypocrisy begins? But the intellect refuses to apprehend what is not clear and distinct. Hence a continual tendency to stretch Nature on the Procrustes-bed of logical definition, where, with more or less gentle truncation or extension, a plausible theory will be formed. If one weak point after another be discovered in this, a new bulwark of hypothesis will be thrown up to protect it, and at last the fort be made impregnable,—but, alas! in the mean time it has become a castle in the air. Should, however, the genius of the disputant lie less in the power of distinguishing and refining, than in that of presenting his views in a broad and striking manner, should his fancy be rich and his feelings strong,—above all, should he be one of a nation where eloquence is at once the most common gift and the most envied attainment,—he will call in rhetoric to the aid of his cause; and, in this event, as the accessory gradually encroaches and elbows out that interest in whose aid it was originally introduced,—as the handling of the question becomes more important, and the question itself less so,—there will result, not, as in the former case, a scholastic philosophy, but an arena for closet orators, who will* *abandon the systematic study of philosophy, and varnish up declamations on set subjects.* Such results doubtless did not follow in the time of Aristotle and Xenocrates. Under them, unquestionably, the original purpose of this discipline was kept steadily in sight; and it was not suffered to pass from being the test of clear and systematic thought to a mere substitute for it. But the transition must have been to a considerable extent effected when an Arcesilaus or a Carneades could deliver formal dissertations in opposition to any question indifferently, and when Cicero could regard the rhetorical practice as co-ordinate in importance with the other advantages resulting to the student.† In the very excellence and reputation then of this peculiar *discipline* of the founder of the Peripatetic school, we have a germ adequate to produce a rapid decay of his *philosophy*, and we have no occasion to look either to external accidents or to the internal nature of his doctrines for a reason of the degeneracy of the Peripatetics after Theophrastus. The importance of this remark will be seen in the sequel.

On the philosopher.

Reason of the degeneracy of the later Peripatetics.

Aristotle's prosperity.

It was probably in the course of this sojourn at Athens, which lasted for the space of thirteen years, that the greater number of Aristotle's works were produced. His external circumstances were at this time most favourable. The Macedonian party was the prevalent one at Athens, so that he needed be under no fears for his personal quiet; and the countenance and assistance he received from Alexander enabled him to prosecute his investigations without any interruption from the scantiness of pecuniary means. The Conqueror is said in Athenæus to have presented his master with the sum of eight hundred talents (about two hundred thousand pounds sterling) towards the expenses of his *History of Animals*,* and enormous as this sum is, it is only in proportion to the accounts we have of the vast wealth acquired by the plunder of the Persian treasures.† Pliny also relates that some thousands of men were placed at his disposal for the purpose of procuring zoological specimens, which served as materials for this celebrated treatise. The undertaking, he says, originated in the express desire of Alexander, who took a singular interest in the study of Natural History.‡ For this particular object, indeed, he is said to have received a considerable sum from Philip, so that we must probably regard the assistance afforded him by Alexander (no doubt after conquest had enlarged his means) as having effected the extension and completion of a work begun at an earlier period, previous to his second visit to Athens.§ Independently too of this princely liberality, the profits of his occupation may have been very great,‖ and we have before seen reason to suppose that his private fortune was not inconsiderable. It is likely, therefore, that not only all the means and appliances of knowledge, but the luxuries and refinements of private life, were within his reach, and having as little of the cynic as of the sensualist in his character, there is every probability that he availed himself of them. Indeed, the charges of luxury which his enemies brought against him after his death, absurd as they are in the form in which they were put, appear to indicate a man that could enjoy riches when possessing them, as well as in case of necessity he could endure poverty.

But fortune, proverbially inconstant, was even more fickle in the days of Aristotle than our own. At an earlier period of his life, we have seen the virulence of political partizanship rendering it desirable for him to quit Athens. The same spirit it was which again, in his old age, forced him to seek refuge in a less agreeable but safer spot. The death of Alexander had infused new courage into the anti-Macedonian party at Athens, and a persecution of such as entertained contrary views naturally followed. Against Aristotle, the intimate friend and correspondent of Antipater, (whom Alexander on leaving Greece had left regent,) a prosecution was either instituted or threatened for an alleged offence against religion.¶ The flimsiness of this pretext for

Aristotle retires to Chalcis in Eubœa. B. C. 322.

---

* μηδὲν ἦκιν φιλοσοφῶν πραγματικῶς, ἀλλὰ θέσις λημνίζων. Strabo, xiii. p. 124.

† See the passage cited above, p. 106, note ‡. Compare also *Acad. Prior.* ii. 18. *Quis enim ista* tam aperte perspicueque et perverse et falsa *secutus esset, nisi tanta in Arcesila, multo etiam major in Carneade, et copia rerum, et* dicendi vis *fuisset.* Yet the eloquent Arcesilaus and Carneades left *nothing* behind them written. Plutarch, *De Fort. Alex.* p. 323. ed. Paris.

‡ *Hist. Nat.* viii. 17.

§ Ælian, *Var. Hist.* iv. 19.

‖ See the beginning of the *Hippias Major* of Plato for the profits of the sophists, which there is no reason to suppose were greater than those of their more respectable successors. Hippias professes to have made during a short circuit in Sicily more than six hundred pounds, although the celebrated Protagoras was there as a competitor, (sec. 5.) Hyperbolus's instructions in oratory cost him a talent, or two hundred and fifty pounds. (Aristoph. *Nub.* 874.) But there is no means of deciding whether Aristotle's teaching was or was not gratuitous.

¶ Phavorinus, *ap.* Diog. Laert. *Vit.* sec. 5. Ælian, *Var. Hist.* iii. 36. Athenæus, p. 696. Origen *c. Celsum*, i. p. 51. ed. Spencer. Demochares, cited by Aristocles, (*ap.* Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* xv. 2.)

Biography.

crushing a political opponent—or rather a wise and inoffensive man, whose very impartiality was a tacit censure of the violent party spirit of his time—will appear at first sight of the particulars of the charge. Eurymedon the Hierophant, assisted by Demophilus, accused him of the blasphemy of paying divine honours to mortals. He had composed, it was said, a pæan and offered sacrifices to his father-in-law Hermias, and also honoured the memory of his deceased wife Pythias with libations such as were used in the worship of Ceres. This *pæan* is the Scolium Ἀρετὰ πολυμοχθὲ, &c., which we have described above, (p. 101,) and although we cannot tell what the circumstance was which gave rise to the latter half of the charge, we may reasonably presume that it as little justified the interpretation given to it as the ode does. That ignorance and bigotry, stimulated by party hatred, should find matter in his writings to confirm a charge of impiety founded on such a basis, was to be expected; and he is related to have said to his friends, in allusion to the fate of Socrates, "Let us leave Athens, and not give the Athenians a second opportunity of committing sacrilege against philosophy." He was too well acquainted with the character of "the many-headed monster" to consider the absurdity of a charge as a sufficient guarantee for security under such circumstances, and he retired with his property to Chalcis in Eubœa,* where at that time Macedonian influence prevailed. In a letter to Antipater he expresses his regret at leaving his old haunts, but applies a verse from Homer in a way to intimate that the disposition that prevailed there to vexatious and malignant calumnies was incorrigible.† It is not improbable that his new asylum had before this time afforded him an occasional retreat from the noise and bustle of Athens.‡ Now, however, he owed to it a greater obligation. He was out of the reach of his enemies, and enabled to justify himself in the opinion of all whose judgment was valuable by a written defence of his conduct,§ and an exposure of the absurdities which the accusation involved. "Was it likely," he asks, "that if he had contemplated Hermias in the light of a deity, he should have set up a cenotaph to his memory as to that of a dead man? Were funeral rites a natural step to apotheosis?" Arguments like these, reasonable as they are, were not likely to produce much effect upon the minds of his enemies. The person of their victim was beyond their reach; but such means of annoyance as still remained were not neglected. Some mark of honour at Delphi, probably a statue, had been on a former occasion (perhaps the embassy alluded to above) decreed him by a vote of the people. This vote seems to have been at this time rescinded, an insult the more mortifying, if, as appears likely, it was inflicted on the pretext that he had acted the part of a spy in the Macedonian interest.* In a letter to Antipater he speaks of this proceeding in a tone of real greatness, perfectly free from the least affectation of indifference. He alleges that it does not occasion him great uneasiness, but that he still feels hurt by it.† It is impossible to find expressions more characteristic of an unaffectedly magnanimous nature, or which better illustrate the description of that disposition given by himself in one of his works.‡

Frivolously accused of impiety.

His defence.

Insult passed upon him.

Aristotle.

A subject which it is likely occasioned him during the latter years of his life far greater pain than any thing which the fickle public of Athens could think or do, was the coolness which had arisen between himself and his illustrious pupil. It seems to have been closely connected with the conduct of Callisthenes, whom we have mentioned above, (p. 104,) who had accompanied Alexander into Asia by his particular recommendation. This individual possessed a cultivated mind, a vigorous understanding, and a bold and fearless integrity, combined with a strong attachment to the homely virtues and energetic character of the Macedonians, and a corresponding hatred and contempt for the Persian manners which had been adopted by Alexander after his successes. Unfortunately no less for those whom it was his desire to reform than for himself, the sterling qualities of his mind were obscured by a singular want of tact and discretion.§ He had no talent for seizing the proper moment to tell an unwelcome truth, and so far from being able to sweeten a reproof by an appearance of interest and affection for the party reproved, he often contrived to give his real zeal the colouring of offended vanity or personal malice. Aristotle is said to have dreaded from the very first that evil would follow from these defects in his character, and to have advised him to abstain from frequent interviews with the King, and when he did converse with him, to be careful that his conversation was agreeable and goodhumoured.‖ He probably judged that the character and conduct of Callisthenes would of itself work an effect with a generous disposition like Alexander's, and that its influence could not be increased, and would in all probability be much diminished, by the irritation of personal discussion, producing, almost of necessity, altercation and invective. Callisthenes, however, did not abide by the instructions of his master; and perhaps the ambition of martyrdom contributed almost as much as the love of truth to his neglect of them. The description of Kent, which Shakspeare puts into the mouth of Cornwall,¶ would certainly

Coolness towards him on the part of Alexander.

Callisthenes.

Aristotle's advice to him.

* Apollodorus, *ap.* Diog. *Vit.* sec. 10. Lycon the Pythagorean, cited by Aristocles, *ap.* Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* xv. 2. grounds a charge of luxury on the number of culinary utensils which were passed at the custom-house in Chalcis.

† Pseudo-Ammon. Ælian, *Var. Hist.* iii. 36; (compare xii. 52.) Phavorinus, (*ap.* Diog. *Vit.* sec. 9.)

‡ Diog. *Vit. Epicuri*, sec. 1. Strabo, x. p. 325, ed. Tauchnitz.

§ Athenæus (p. 697) quotes a passage from this work to which he gives the title of *διαλογία διαβολίας*, but at the same time mentions a suspicion that it was not genuine. It might very well be written by one of his scholars in his name, and embody his sentiments, just as the *Apology* of Plato does those of Socrates. This is the more likely, as Aristotle at this time appears to have been in a very weak state of health. It seems to be identical with the λόγος ἐπιτιμητικὸς mentioned by Phavorinus, (*ap.* Diog. *Vit.* sec. 9.) and to be so called because written in that form, although probably never intended to be recited in court.

* Demochares cited by Aristocles. (Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* xv. 2.)

† Ælian, *Var. Hist.* xiv. 1. οὕτως ἔχω, ὡς μήτε μοι σφόδρα μέλειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, μήτε μηδὲν μέλειν. Pausanias (vi. 4. 8.) speaks of a statue at Olympia said to be his: but it had no name, nor was it known who had placed it there.

‡ Nicom. *Ethic.* iv. p. 1123, col. 1, line 34.

§ Aristotle himself said of him, on hearing of his behaviour at court, that he was λόγῳ μὲν δυνατὸς καὶ μέγας, νοῦν δ' οὐκ ἔχειν. Hermippus *ap.* Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* sec. 54.

‖ Valerius Max. vii. 2.

¶ ——————— This is some fellow,
Who, having been praised for bluntness, doth affect
A saucy roughness, and constrains the garb
Quite from his nature: He cannot flatter, he!
An honest mind and plain!—he must speak truth:
An they will take it, so: if not, he's plain.
These kind of knaves I know, which in this plainness
Harbour more craft, and more corrupter ends,
Than twenty silly ducking observants
That stretch their duties nicely!

King Lear, act ii. sc. 2.

not do him justice; but it is impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that he made it "his occupation to be plain." Disgusted at the ceremony of the salaam, and the other oriental customs, which in the eyes of many were a degradation to the dignity of freeborn Greeks, he did not take the proper course, namely, to withdraw himself from the royal banquets, and thus by his absence enter a practical protest against their adoption; but, while he did not cease to attend these, he took every opportunity of testifying his disapprobation of what he saw, and his contempt of the favours which were bestowed on such as were less scrupulous than himself. One of these who appears to have particularly excited his dislike was the sophist Anaxarchus, an unprincipled flatterer, who vindicated the worst actions and encouraged the most evil tendencies of his master;* and perhaps a jealousy of this miscreant, and an unwillingness to leave him the undivided empire over Alexander's mind, was one reason which prevented him from adopting what would have been probably the most effectual as well as the most dignified line of conduct. Some anecdotes are related by Plutarch, which exhibit in a very striking manner both the mutual hatred of the philosophers breaking out in defiance of all the decencies of a court, and the rude bluntness of Callisthenes's manners. On one occasion, a discussion arose at supper time, as to the comparative severity of the winters in Macedonia and in the part of the country where they then were. Anaxarchus, in opposition to his rival, strongly maintained the former to be the colder. Callisthenes could not resist the temptation of a sneer at his enemy. "You at least," said he, "should hardly be of that opinion. In Greece you used to get through the cold weather in a scrubby jacket; (ἐν τριβωνι;) here, I observe, that you cannot sit down to table with less than three thick mantles (δάπιδας) on your back."† Anaxarchus, whose vulgar ostentation of the wealth which his low servilities had procured him was observed and ridiculed by all, could not turn off this sarcasm; but the meanest animal has its sting, and he took care not to miss any opportunity for lowering the credit of Callisthenes with Alexander, a task which the unfortunate wrong-headedness‡ of the other rendered only too easy. On the occasion of another royal banquet, each of the guests, as the cup passed round, drank to the monarch from it, and then, after performing the salaam, received a salute from him,—a ceremony which was considered as an especial mark of royal favour. Callisthenes, when his turn arrived, omitted the salaam, but advanced towards Alexander, who, being busy in conversation with Hephæstion, did not observe that the expected act of homage had been omitted. A courtier of Anaxarchus's party, however, Demetrius, the son of Pythonax, determined that their enemy should not benefit by this casualty, and accordingly called out, "Do not salute that fellow, Sire, for he alone has refused to salaam you." The King on hearing this, refused Callisthenes the customary compliment; but the latter, far from being mortified, exclaimed contemptuously as he returned to his seat, "Very well, then I am a kiss the poorer!"* Such gratuitous discourtesy as this could hardly fail to alienate the kindness of a young prince, whose mere taste for refinement—leaving entirely out of consideration the intoxication produced by unparalleled success and the flatteries which follow it—must have been revolted by it.† It, however, gained him great credit with the Macedonian party, who were no less jealous of the favour which the Persian nobles found with the Conqueror than disgusted with the adoption of the Persian customs. He was considered as the mouth-piece of the body, and as the representative and vindicator of that manly and plain-speaking spirit of liberty which they regarded as their birthright;‡ and the satisfaction which his vanity received from this importance, combined with a despair of reconquering the first place in Alexander's favour from the hated and despised Anaxarchus, probably determined him to relinquish all attempts at pleasing the monarch, and to adopt a line which might annoy and injure himself but could hardly benefit any one. When an account was brought to Aristotle in Greece of the course pursued by his relation, his sharpsightedness led him at once to divine the result. In a line from the Iliad,§

Ah me! such words, my son, bode speedy death!

he prophetically hinted the fate which awaited him. Indeed the latter himself appears not to have been blind to the ruin preparing for him; but this conviction did not produce any alteration in his conduct, or, if any thing, it perhaps induced him to give way to his temper even more than before. At another banquet, the not unusual request was made to him, that he would exhibit his talents by delivering an extemporaneous oration, and the subject chosen was a panegyric upon the Macedonians. He complied, and performed his task so well as to excite universal admiration and enthusiastic applause on the part of the guests. This circumstance appears to have nettled Alexander, whose affection for his old fellow-pupil had probably quite vanished, and he remarked in disparagement of the feat, in a quotation from Euripides, that on such a subject it was no great matter to be eloquent. "If Callisthenes wished really to give a proof of his abilities," said he, "let him take up the other side of the question, and try what he can do in an invective against the Macedonians, that they may learn their faults and reform them." The orator did not decline the challenge:—his mettle was roused,

His dislike of the Persian party.

His popularity with the Greek party.

His indiscretion.

* When Alexander, after having slain his friend Clitus in a fit of drunken passion, threw himself upon the earth, overwhelmed with remorse, deaf to the solicitations of his friends, and obstinately refusing to touch food, Callisthenes and Anaxarchus, the philosophers of that day standing in the place of the priests of this, were sent to offer him spiritual consolations. The latter, wise in his generation, determined to sear the conscience which he could not heal, and entered the tent with an expression of indignation and surprise. "What," he cried, "is this Alexander on whom the eyes of the whole world are bent? is this he lying weeping like a slave, in fear of the reproaches and the conventional laws of men, when he ought to be himself the law and the standard of right and wrong to them?—Why did he conquer the world but to rule and command it; surely not to be in bondage to it and its foolish opinions?" "Dost thou not know," he continued, addressing the unhappy prince, "that Justice and Law (Δίκαι καὶ Θέμις) are represented the assessors of Jupiter, as a sign to all that whatever the mighty do is lawful and just?"—Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* sec. 52.

† Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* sec. 52.

‡ σκαιότης and ὑπέρογκος ἀβλαστεία are terms in which Arrhian, who perfectly appreciates the manly spirit of Callisthenes and is no idolater of Alexander, characterises his manners.—*De Exped. Alex.* iv. c. 12.

* Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 54. Arrhian, iv. 12.

† "Do not the Greeks seem to you," said he, on the occasion of Clitus's outrageous behaviour, to two of his friends, "compared with the Macedonians, like demigods among brute beasts?"—Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 51.

‡ Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 53. Arrhian, iv. 12.

§ ἀνίμερος δὴ μοι, τέκνε, θάνατος, ὃς ἐγγεγάασιν.

Diog. Laert. *Vit.* sec. 5.

Biography. and he surpassed his former performance. The Macedonian nation was held up to utter scorn, and especial contempt heaped upon the warlike exploits and consummate diplomacy of Alexander's father Philip. His successes were attributed to accident or low intrigue availing itself of the dissensions which existed at that time in Greece; and the whole was wound up by the Homeric line—

> Ἐν δὲ διχοστασίῃ καὶ ὁ πάγκακος ἔλλαχε τιμῆς.
> When civil broils prevail, the vilest soar to fame!

The effect of this course was such as might have been expected. Alexander fell into a furious passion, telling the performer, what was not far from the truth, that his speech was an evidence not of skill, but of malevolence, and the latter, perhaps conscious that he had now struck a blow which would never be forgiven, left the room, repeating as he went out a verse from the Iliad, which seems to be an allusion to the death of Clitus, and an intimation that he expected to be made the second victim to his sovereign's temper.*

His ruin. A victim he was destined to be, although not in the way in which he appears to have expected. A practice had been introduced by Philip, similar to that which prevailed in the courts of the feudal sovereigns in the Middle Ages, that the sons of the principal nobles should be brought up at court in attendance on the person of the

Conspiracy of the pages. King. Of these pages, esquires, or grooms of the bedchamber, (for their office appears to have included all these duties,†) who attended on Alexander, there was one named Hermolaus, a youth of high spirit and generous disposition, who was much attached to Callisthenes, and took great pleasure in his society and conversation.

Hermolaus a friend of Callisthenes. The philosopher appears to have considered his mind as a fit depositary for the manly principles of Grecian liberty, which the tenets of Anaxarchus and the corrupt example of the monarch threatened utterly to extinguish, and, in the inculcation of these, to have made use of language and of illustrations, which, considering the circumstances of the case, were certainly dangerous, although in reference to the then prevailing tone of morality we shall scarcely be justified in censuring them. Harmodius and Aristogiton having with the sacrifice of their own lives been fortunate enough to bring about the freedom of their country, had been canonized as political saints, and were held up to all the youth of the free States of Greece for admiration and imitation; and Callisthenes can hardly deserve especial blame for participating in this general idolatry, or for regarding the glory of a tyrannicide as surpassing that of a tyrant, however brilliant the fortunes of the latter might be. Neither can we at all wonder that he should delight in depreciating the "pride, pomp, and circumstance" of greatness in comparison with dignity of character and manly energy, and in exposing the impotence of externals to avert any of "the ills to which flesh is heir." Such topics have been in all ages and ever will be the staple both of philosophy and of the sciolism which is its counterfeit, and the necessity for dwelling upon them must to Callisthenes have appeared the greater in order to counterbalance the habits of feeling which Persian manners and sophistry like that of Anaxarchus were calculated to spread among the Macedonian youth. He is said indeed to have continually professed that the only motive which induced him to accompany Alexander into Asia was that he might be the means of restoring his countrymen to their fatherland, as true Greeks as they went out, uncorrupted by the manners or the luxury of the barbarians;* and he seems unquestionably to have succeeded in putting a stop, at least for a time, to the ceremony of the salaam, of all Eastern customs the most galling to Macedonian pride.† In an evil day, however, to Callisthenes, it happened that Hermolaus was out boar-hunting with Alexander, when the animal charged directly towards the King. The page, influenced probably more by the ardour of the chase, and his own youthful spirits, than by any just apprehension for his sovereign's safety, struck the creature a mortal wound before it came up to him. Alexander, the keenest of huntsmen, balked of his expected sport, in the passion of the moment, ordered Hermolaus to be flogged in the presence of his brother pages, and deprived him of his horse, (apparently the sign of summarily degrading him from his employment.) Such an insult to a Greek could only be washed out in the blood of the aggressor, and Hermolaus found ready sympathy among his compeers. It was agreed among them to assassinate Alexander while asleep, and the execution of the design was fixed for a night on which Antipater, the son of Asclepiodorus, (whom Alexander had made lord-lieutenant of Syria,) was to be the groom in waiting. It so happened that on that night Alexander did not retire to bed at all, but sat at table carousing until the very morning, whether by accident, or in consequence of the advice of a Syrian female, to whom in the character of a soothsayer he paid great respect, is not agreed by the contemporary historians. But this circumstance, whatever was the cause of it, saved the King and led to the detection of the plot. The next day, Epimenes, one of the conspirators, mentioned the matter to an individual who was strongly attached to him. This person spoke of it to Eurylochus, the brother of Epimenes, perhaps considering that his relationship was a sufficient guarantee for secrecy. Eurylochus, however, at once laid an information before Ptolemy Lagides, subsequently the first of the Greek dynasty in Egypt, and then one of the guard of honour in attendance on Alexander. He reported to the King the names of those who he had been told were concerned in the affair: they were arrested, and on being put to the torture confessed their crime and gave up the names of others who were participators.‡ So far all accounts agree as to the substantial facts of this story, but here a great discrepancy commences. Ptolemy and Aristobulus § both asserted that the pages named

Aristotle

Insulted b Alexander

Plots his death.

Is detected

Inculpati of Callisthenes.

* πάντων καὶ Πάτροκλος, ὅπερ εἰς πολλὴν ἀμύνων. Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 54.

† Arrhian, iv. c. 13.

* Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 53.

† Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 54. Compare Arrhian, iv. 14, where Hermolaus is said to have complained of τὴν προσκύνησιν τὴν βασιλητὸν καὶ οὕτω πεπαυμένην.

‡ Arrhian, iv. 13, 14.

§ Aristobulus was one of Alexander's generals, and wrote an account of his campaigns. He did not, however, commence this work till his eighty-fourth year, (Lucian, *De Macrob.*) long enough therefore after the transaction in question, to allow us to suppose that by a slip of the memory he may have confused circumstantial with direct evidence. Moreover as there was nothing which made Alexander so unpopular as the execution of Callisthenes, (Quintus Curtius, *De rebus gestis Alex.* viii. c. 3) so there was nothing which his biographers took so much pains to extenuate. See Ste. Croix, p. 360, *et seq.* Arrhian, (iv. 14. *fin.* at the same time that he speaks of the opportunities of knowledge possessed by Ptolemy and Aristobulus, and of their general fidelity, yet remarks that their accounts of the details of this affair differ from one another.

Biography. Callisthenes as the instigator of their design. This, however, was denied by the majority of contemporary writers on the subject, who related that the ill-will towards Callisthenes previously existing in the mind of Alexander, united with the intimacy between Hermolaus and the former, furnished ample means to his enemies to raise a strong suspicion against him.* They alleged, that to a question from Hermolaus, "*How a man might make himself the most illustrious of his species?*" he replied, "*By slaying him that is most illustrious;*" and that to incite the youth to the rash act he bad him "*not be in awe of the couch of gold, but remember that such a one often holds a sick or a wounded man;*" also, that when Philotas had asked him whom the Athenians honoured most of all men, he replied "*Harmodius and Aristogiton, the tyrannicides;*" and when the querist expressed a doubt whether such a person would at the existing time find countenance and protection anywhere in Greece, he replied, "*That if every other city shut its gates against him, he would certainly find a refuge in Athens;*" and in support of this opinion quoted the instance of the Heraclidæ who there found protection against the tyrant Eurystheus.† It requires but little penetration to see how, under circumstances of such peculiar irritation, the words of Callisthenes might, with very little violence and with the greatest plausibility, be interpreted in a treasonable sense, although they were nothing more than Macedonian principles expressed in a strong and antithetical manner. Indeed, the very admixture of legendary history in the instance of the ass of Hercules seems to betray the common-places of the rhetorician. And that this account of the matter, to which Arrhian, following the majority of contemporary accounts, inclines, is the true one, seems proved beyond all doubt by two letters of Alexander himself, which are cited by Plutarch. In the former of these, written immediately after the event to his general, Craterus, he states "that the pages on being put to the torture confessed their own treason, but denied that any one else was privy to the attempt." He wrote to Attalus and Alcetas to the same effect. But *afterwards* in a letter to Antipater, he says, "the pages have been stoned to death by the Macedonians; *but as for the sophist, I intend to punish him, and those too who sent him out, and also the cities which harbour conspirators against me.*" In the latter part of this phrase, according to Plutarch, he alludes to Aristotle, as being the great uncle of Callisthenes, and him by whose advice he had joined the court. It seems plain that in the interval between the writing of these letters, Alexander's mind had been worked upon by those whose interest it was to identify the cause of manliness and virtue with that of disloyalty and treason, by Anaxarchus and the crew of court sycophants whose practice he sanctioned by his example and attempted to justify by his philosophy. The tide of hatred, however, was setting too strong against Callisthenes for him to stem it. He was placed under confinement, and, according to accounts which there is too much reason to fear are true, cruelly mutilated. It is said to have been Alexander's intention to bring him to a trial in the presence of Aristotle on his return to Greece; but the unfortunate man, after remaining in his deplorable situation for a considerable time, died from the effects of ill treatment. Aristotle.

Whatever prejudices against his old master may have been raised in the mind of Alexander on the score of Callisthenes, and whatever ill consequences might perhaps have followed if the Conqueror had lived to revisit Europe, intoxicated with his military successes, and hardened by the influence of those flatterers who, after Callisthenes's death, reigned supreme at court, it is explicitly stated by Plutarch that while he lived his estrangement never led him to injure Aristotle in the slightest degree. Mortification, therefore, at the degeneracy of his pupil, and sorrow at the loss of an affection in which he doubtless took both pride and pleasure, were the only evils which the latter during his remaining days had to endure. But a few years after the death of both, a story began to be circulated which at last grew into a form in the highest degree detrimental to his character. It is impossible to doubt that Alexander died from the fever of the country, caught immediately after indulgence in the most extravagant excesses. At the time no suspicion to the contrary was entertained.* But some time afterwards, the ambitious and intriguing Olympias, who had long indulged a bitter hostility towards Antipater, (a hostility which the successful establishment of the latter in the government of Macedonia after her son's death had inflamed into a fiendish hatred,) seized the opportunity which Alexander's rapid illness afforded to throw the suspicion of poisoning him upon her enemy, whose younger son Iolaus had been his cupbearer. It was not till the sixth year after the fatal event that this story was set on foot; and it seems to have originated in nothing but Olympias's desire of vengeance, which then first found a favourable vent. The bones of Iolaus, who had died in the interim, were torn from their grave, and a hundred Macedonians, selected from among the most distinguished of Antipater's friends, barbarously butchered.† The accusation of poisoning the King seems at first to have been vaguely set on foot, the only circumstantial part of the story being the point necessary to justify Olympias's malignity,—namely, that Iolaus was the agent in administering the poison. But in process of time the minutest details of the transaction were supplied. We give them in the last form which they assumed. The fears of Antipater, it was said, arising from the growing irritation of Alexander incessantly stimulated by Olympias, induced him, on hearing that he was superseded by Craterus and ordered into Asia with new levies, to plot against his master's life. A fit means for this purpose was pointed out to him by his friend Aristotle, who dreaded the personal consequences to himself which seemed likely to follow from Alexander's anger against Callisthenes.‡ The nature of this is quite in keeping with the other features of the narrative. It was no other than the water of the river Styx, which fell from a rock near the town of Nonacris in Arcadia, and which, according to a local superstition which is not extinct to this day,§ possessed not only the property of destroying

Ineffective during the life of Alexander

Report which arose after the death of both;

Insinuation of Aristotle.

at first vague;

afterwards detailed.

* Arrhian. *loc. cit.*

† Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 55. Arrhian, iv. 10. This Philotas is not the son of Parmenio, put to death together with his father on a former occasion, but a page, the son of Carsis, a Thracian. See Arrhian, iv. 13.

* Plutarch, *Vit.* sec. 77.

† Diodorus, xix. 11. Plutarch, *loc. cit*

‡ Although Callisthenes had been put to death five years before, *i. e.* in B. C. 328! See Clinton, *Fast. Hel.* ii. p. 376.

§ See Col. Leake's *Travels in the Morea*, vol. iii. p. 165—9. The natives say that the water, which they call τὰ Μαυρα-νέρια (the black waters) and τὰ Δρακο-νέρια (the terrible waters), is unwholesome, and also that no vessel will hold it. It is a slender

Biography.

animal life by its cold and petrifying qualities, (ψυχρὸν καὶ παγετῶδες,) but also that of dissolving the hardest metals, and even precious stones. One substance alone was proof against its destructive influences,—the hoof of a Scythian ass! In a vessel made out of this, a small portion of the fluid was conveyed by Cassander, Iolaus's elder brother, into Asia, and, on the occasion of the debauch at which Alexander was taken ill, administered to him by the latter. Iolaus was stimulated to the act by the desire of revenging an outrage upon himself committed by the King, and attachment to him induced Medius, a Thessalian, at whose palace the debauch took place, to be an accomplice in the treason. The assassin, according to the author of the *Lives of the Ten Orators*, falsely attributed to Plutarch,* was rewarded by a proposition of the demagogue Hyperides at Athens, to confer public honours upon him as a tyrannicide, and the horn cup in which the fatal draught had been conveyed from Greece deposited in the temple of Delphi.†

Its refutation.

The absurdity of this account is glaringly manifest to readers of the present day, of whom nine out of every ten are probably better acquainted with the nature and operation of petrifying springs than the best informed of the Greek naturalists were. The ancients were not in possession of the touchstone for the discovery of falsehood which modern science affords; but even they were long before they attached any credence to the calumny. "The greater part of the writers on the subject," says Plutarch,‡ "consider the whole matter of the alleged poisoning a mere fiction; and in confirmation of this view they quote the fact, that although the royal remains lay for several days unembalmed in consequence of the disputes of the generals,—and that too in a hot and close place,—they exhibited no marks of corruption, but remained fresh and unchanged." Arrhian§ too, who as well as Plutarch derives his account of the King's illness and death from the court gazettes, (ἐφημερίδες,) and confirms the statements of these by the narratives of Ptolemy and Aristobulus, says of the charge of poisoning, which he afterwards mentions, that he has alluded to it merely to show that he has heard of it, not that he considers it to deserve any credit. In fact, the sole source of the story in its details appears to have been one Hagnothemis, (an individual of whom nothing else is known,) who is reported to have said that he had heard it told by King Antigonus.‖ But its piquancy was a strong recommendation to later writers, and it is instructive and amusing to observe how their statements of it increase in positiveness, about in proportion as they recede from the time in which the facts of the case could be known. Diodorus Siculus and Vitruvius, living in the time of the two first Cæsars, merely mention the rumour that Alexander's death was occasioned by poison through the agency of Antipater, but do not pretend to assert its credibility. Quintus Curtius, writing under Vespasian, considers the authorities on that side to preponderate. The epitomizer of a degenerate age, Justin, flourishing in the reign of Antoninus Pius, slightly alludes to the intemperance which he allows had been assigned as the cause of Alexander's death, but adds that in fact he died from treason, and that the disgraceful truth was suppressed by the influence of his successors. And finally Orosius, in the Vth Century, states broadly and briefly that he died from poison administered by an attendant, without so much as hinting that any different belief had ever even partially obtained.* But it is remarkable that, of all these writers, not one mixes up Aristotle's name with the story; and it is probable that the foolish charge against him, mentioned (and discountenanced) by Plutarch and Arrhian, fell into discredit very soon after it arose, and perhaps was only remembered as a curious piece of scandalous history, until the half-lunatic Caracalla thought proper to revive it in order to gratify at once the tyrant's natural hatred for wisdom and virtue, and his own morbid passion for idolizing the memory of Alexander. It is recorded of him that he persecuted the Aristotelian sect of philosophers with singular hatred, abolishing the social meetings of their body, which appear to have taken place in Alexandria, confiscating certain funds which they possessed, and even entertaining the design of destroying their master's works, on no other ground than that Aristotle *was thought* to have aided Antipater in destroying Alexander.†

Aristotle.

Its gradual growth.

Its possible origin.

To attempt to account for the origin of so absurd a charge as that we have been discussing may perhaps appear rash. We cannot, however, resist the temptation to hazard a conjecture that while the intimacy of Aristotle with Antipater undoubtedly furnished a favourable soil for the growth of the story, the actual germ of it is to be looked for at Delphi. The cup in the treasure house there, which the Epigram we have quoted above represents as presented by Alexander, was probably of onyx, a stone of which the coloured layers, resembling as they do the outer coats of a hoof, pro-

perennial stream falling over a very high precipice, and entering the rock at the bottom, which is said to be inaccessible from the nature of the ground. Col. Leake quotes the phrases of Homer, κατιβάμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ and Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα, as exact descriptions of it. See also Herod. vi. 74. Hesiod, *Theog.* 785. 806.

* P. 849. The same is stated by Photius, *Biblioth.* p. 496.

† *Epigr. ap.* Ælian, *De Nat. Animal.* x. 40. That it should have been deposited there, as the Epigram states, *by Alexander himself* is a circumstance which will not add much, in the opinion of modern critics, to the incredibility of the story.

‡ *Vit. Alex. ult.*

§ vii. 27.

‖ Plutarch, *Vit. Alex. loc. cit.*

* Diodorus, xvii. 117. Vitruvius, viii. 3. Q. Curtius, x. 10. Justin. xii. 14. Orosius, iii. 20. It is possible that some readers may quote Tacitus (*Annal.* ii. 73.) as opposing the view we have given in the text of the gradual progression of credulity. But the exception is only apparent. Tacitus does not give his own view, but merely that of those who chose to draw a parallel between the circumstances of Germanicus's life and those of Alexander: for which purpose this version of the death of the latter was necessary, and perhaps to this it owed much of its subsequent popularity. With respect too to the silence respecting Aristotle, it is to be remarked that the expressions of Pliny, (*magnâ Aristotelis infamiâ exogitatum, Hist. Nat.* xxx. *ult.*) if they are genuine, do not imply a belief, either on his own part or that of people in general, that the philosopher was guilty of abetting Antipater. But they seem more likely to be a marginal note, implying that "the story of the poisoning by such water was a figment that had done Aristotle's character much harm."

† Xiphilinus, *Epitom. Dionis.* p. 329, 330. Caracalla wore arms and used drinking cups which had belonged to Alexander, erected a great number of statues to him both in Rome and at the several military stations, and raised a phalanx of Macedonians, armed all after the manner of five centuries back, which he named after the Conqueror of the East. In his wish to destroy the philosopher's works, (καὶ τὰ βιβλία αὐτοῦ κατασπάσαι ἐθελῆσαι,) he had the precedent of Caligula, who threatened to do the same with the works of the jurists and of Livy, and in the case of the latter carried his threat out to a considerable extent.—Suetonius, *Vit. Calig.* 34.

Egypt. cured it the name by which it goes. Now it is obvious that in the time of which we are speaking, when the merchant who sold the wares was for the most part himself a traveller in distant countries, marvellous tales would be related respecting the strange commodities which he imported. The onyx might to the admiring Greek be represented as the solid hoof of some strange animal, with no less plausibility than in the XIVth Century a cocoa-nut could be sold as a griffin's egg,—a long univalve shell represented as the horn of a land animal,—or the ammonites of Malta regarded as serpents changed into stone by St. Paul.* And although the more extensive communication with the East, which commenced after Alexander's expedition, would in process of time spread more correct views on the subject of natural productions, the old legends would linger in the temples, handed down traditionally by the attendants, who showed the curiosities to strangers, and were expected to be provided with a story for every relic.† If any one of these Ciceroni, (ἐξηγηταί,) aware of the intimate friendship which subsisted between Aristotle and Antipater, and also of the rumour that Alexander had been poisoned through the agency of the latter, had either chanced to stumble himself, or to be directed by a more learned visitor to a passage in a work of Theophrastus, (Aristotle's favourite scholar and successor,) at that time extant, which stated "that in Arcadia there was a streamlet of water dropping from a rock, called *the water of Styx*, which those who wished for, collected by means of sponges fastened to the end of poles; and that not only was it a mortal poison to whoever drank it, but it possessed the property of dissolving all vessels into which it was put, *except they were of horn*,"‡ he must have possessed much less fancy, and a much greater regard for historical accuracy than the rest of his countrymen, if he did not, when the next pilgrim visited the temple, add at least a conjecture or two as to the connection which the relic in question had with a story possessing so much interest to all. It should not be forgotten, in reference to that part of the account which represents Aristotle as the *discoverer* of this peculiar property of the "Stygian water,"—that Theophrastus is the earliest authority for its possessing it, and that if Aristotle had been aware that such a belief existed, we should hardly fail to find it in the book περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμάτων, in the 121st chapter of which there is an account of a pestilential fountain in Thrace, the water of which was said to be clear and sparkling, and to the eye like any other, but fatal to all who drank of it. Aristotle.

We must now return from the discussion of the imputed share of Aristotle in the death of his illustrious pupil, to the narrative of his own. He did not long survive his departure from the city in which he had spent so large a portion of his life. He retired to Chalcis in the year of Cephisodorus's archonship, (B. C. 323—322,) and early in that of his successor Philocles died, (as we are justified by Apollodorus's authority in stating positively,*) from disease. At nearly the same time the greatest orator that the world ever saw, the leader of that party whose influence had expelled Aristotle from Athens, was driven to have recourse to poison to escape a worse fate. There are not wanting accounts that the philosopher also met a violent death. That he poisoned himself to avoid falling into the hands of his accusers is the view of Suidas and the anonymous author of his Life.† But independently of the superior authority of Apollodorus, and the evidence which Aristotle's own opinions, expressed in more than one place, on the subject of suicide, afford in contradiction of this story, the fact of Chalcis being then under Macedonian influence, and consequently a perfectly secure refuge for any one persecuted for real or supposed participation in Macedonian politics, is quite enough to induce us to reject this story. A yet more absurd one is repeated by some of the early Christian writers. Mortification, according to them, at being unable to discover the cause of the Euripus ebbing and flowing seven times every day, induced him to throw himself headlong into the current.‡ Of this story it is scarcely necessary to say more than that the phenomenon which produced such fatal consequences to the philosopher does not really exist. The stream constantly sets through the narrow channel between Eubœa and the mainland from north to south, except when winds blowing very strongly in an opposite direction produce for a time the appearance of a current from south to north.§ But instead of wasting time upon the refutation of these foolish accounts, we shall perhaps please our readers better by bringing together a few circumstances which appear to confirm the statement of Apollodorus, to which independently of them we should not be justified in refusing belief. Death of Aristotle. Various accounts.

Aulus Gellius‖ relates that Aristotle's scholars, when their master had passed his sixty-second year, and Confirmation of Apollodorus's statement,

* Compare for instance the stories related by Herodotus, iii. 102—111, of the way in which gold dust and the various spices brought from the East were procured. The account which he gives of cinnamon is confirmed with a little variation in the details by Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* ix. 13. p. 616, col. 1, Bekk. Theophrastus (*Hist. Pl.* iv. 7, 8.) represents various corals as plants growing in the Indian Ocean. The *Madrepora muricata* is termed by him "stone thyme." The informant of Herodotus was no doubt some one of the travelling merchants which came by the caravans to Egypt.

† It has been remarked by Heeren that Herodotus's account of the History of Egypt is derived entirely from local narrations connected with public monuments. (*Manual of Ancient History*, pp. 52, 53. Eng. transl.) This remark admits of far wider application. It would not be difficult to show that almost all the early events recorded by that author rest on the same basis. For instance, the history of the Lydian kings in the first book is obviously entirely made up of stories connected with offerings in the temples of Apollo at Delphi and Miletus. This is plain from the fact that every narrative at all circumstantial of any of these monarchs terminated with a reference to one of these temples. The historians before him, with perhaps the exception of Hellanicus, made use even of the topographical form of composition.

‡ Theophrastus, *ap.* Antigonum Carystium, *Hist. Mirab.* sec. 174. Pausanias, where he describes the water and its singular effects, speaks of the story of Alexander having been destroyed by it as one which he had heard, but not as if it had been told him at the place. Beckmann (*ap.* Antig. Caryst. *loc. cit.*) supposes that a part of the legend is due to the fact that the water contained a volatile acid which exercised a corrosive effect upon metallic cups.

* *Ap.* Diog. *Vit.* sec. 10, and Dionys. Hal. *Ep. Amm.* p. 728.

† They appear to follow one Eumelus, whom Diogenes (*Vit. Arist.* sec. 6.) cites and contradicts. He related that Aristotle died by drinking hemlock at the age of seventy, and had become a pupil of Plato at that of thirty. See above, p. 95*.

‡ Pseudo Justin Martyr, *Paranet. ad Græcos*, p. 34. Διὰ πολλὴν ἀδοξίαν καὶ αἰσχύνην λυπηθείς, μετέσχεν τοῦ βίου. Gregor. Nazienz. *Orat.* i. in Julian, p. 123. Later writers go so far as to put various sentiments into his mouth immediately before the perpetration of this rash act. Elias Cretensis (*Comm. in S. Greg. Orat.* iv.) attributes to him the words *Quoniam Aristoteles Euripum non cepit, Aristotelem Euripus habeat.*

§ Tanaquil Faber, *Epp. Critic.* i. 14

‖ *Noct. Att.* xiii. 5.

Biography.

being in a state of extremely bad health gave them but little hopes that he would survive for any length of time, entreated him to appoint some one of their body as his successor, to keep their party together and preserve the philosophical views which he had promulgated. There were at that time, says Gellius, many distinguished men among his disciples, but two pre-eminently superior to the rest. Menedemus, (or, as some suppose it should be written, Eudemus,) a Rhodian, and Theophrastus, a native of Eresus, a town in the island of Lesbos. Aristotle's appointment of a successor. Aristotle, perhaps unwilling that his last moments should be disturbed by the heartburnings which a selection, however judicious, might produce, contrived to avoid the invidious task, and at the same time to convey his own sentiments on the subject. He replied that at the proper time he would satisfy their wishes, and shortly afterwards, when the same persons who had made the request happened to be present, he took occasion to complain that the wine which he usually drank did not agree with him, and to beg that they would look out for some sort which might suit him better,—for instance, said he, some Lesbian or Rhodian;; two wines which, as is notorious, were beyond almost any others celebrated in antiquity. When a sample of each had been brought to him, he first tasted the latter and praised it for its soundness and agreeable flavour. Then trying the Lesbian, he seemed for a time to doubt which he should choose, but at last said, "Both are admirable wines, *but the Lesbian is the pleasanter of the two.*" He never made any further allusion to the matter of a successor, and the disciples universally concluded that this observation relative to the Rhodian and Lesbian vintages was meant as an answer to their question, Theophrastus the Lesbian being a man singularly distinguished for suavity both of language and manners; and accordingly on the death of Aristotle they unanimously acknowledged him as the chosen successor. That this anecdote implies the belief that a disease of some duration was the cause of the philosopher's death is quite obvious; and there is some ground for supposing that this disease was an affection of the intestines, from which he had long suffered. This affection, His probable complaint. says another ancient author,* which he bore with the greatest fortitude, was of such a nature that the wonder is that he contrived to prolong his life to the extent of sixty-three years, not that he died when he did. For complaints of this kind warm fomentations of oil applied to the stomach were recommended in the medical practice of antiquity.† Now Lycon the Pythagorean,‡ a bitter calumniator of Aristotle, grounded a charge of inordinate luxury against him upon the assertion that he indulged himself in the habit of taking baths of warm oil:—an assertion which, if we should fail at once to recognise it as a misrepresentation of the medical treatment alluded to, will be unequivocally explained by the more accurate description of another writer,§ who obviously alludes to the same circumstance.

His will.

Diogenes Laertius, as we have mentioned in an earlier part of this essay, speaks of having seen Aristotle's will and proceeds to give the substance of it.* That this is not an abstract of the authentic document is obvious from the circumstance that no mention whatever is made in it of his literary property, which was very considerable, and which we know from other sources came to Theophrastus.† Neither, however, does there seem to us any well-grounded suspicion that the account of Diogenes is either a forgery, or the copy of a forgery. The whole document bears the stamp, in our judgment, of a codicil to a previously existing will, drawn up at a time when the testator was dangerously ill, and had but little expectation of recovery. Thus, at the very commencement, Antipater, the regent of Macedonia, is appointed the supreme arbiter and referee, and four other persons besides Theophrastus, "if he be willing *and able,*" are directed to administer, until Nicanor the son of Proxenus—to whom he gives his orphan daughter in marriage and the guardianship of his orphan son Nicomachus, together with the whole management of his property—shall take possession, (ἕως ἂν καταλάβῃ.) Nicanor was apparently abroad on some service of danger. If he escapes, he is directed by the codicil to erect certain statues of four cubits in height in Stagira to Jupiter and Athene the Preservers, (Διΐ Σωτῆρι καὶ Ἀθήνᾳ σωτείρῃ.) in pursuance of a vow which the testator had made on his account. If any thing should happen to Nicanor before his marriage, or after his marriage before the birth of children, and he should fail to leave instructions, Theophrastus is to take the daughter, and stand for all purposes of administration in the place of Nicanor. Should he decline to do so, the four provisional trustees are to act at their own discretion, guided by the advice of Antipater. Besides these arrangements, all which seem adapted to meet a sudden emergency, such as that of a man dying away from the person in whom he put the most confidence, and in doubt whether the one whom he next trusted would be able to act, we find legacies to more than one individual which apparently imply a former bequest,‡ and a trifling want of arrangement in the latter part, quite characteristic of a document drawn up under the circumstances we have supposed. Thus he orders statues to be erected to Nicanor, and Nicanor's father and mother; also to Arimnestus, (his own brother,) "that there might be a memorial of him, he having died childless." A statue of Ceres, vowed by his mother, is to be set up at Nemea or elsewhere. Then, as if the mention of one domestic relation had suggested another, he commands that wherever he should be buried, the bones of his deceased wife should be taken up and laid by his side according to her desire; and after this he again reverts to the subject of statues to be set up, and gives directions for the

Aristotl

* Censorinus, cited above, p. 6.

† Celsus, ii. 17. iii. *ult.*

‡ Cited by Aristocles, *ap.* Euseb. *loc. cit.* He adds, that his avarice induced him to sell the oil after this use had been made of it.

§ Diog. Laert. *Vit.* sec. 16. He adds to Lycon's account, ἵνα καὶ ἀτιμίαν θεμοῦ ἐλαίου ἐπενεγκεῖν αὐτὸν τῷ στομάχῳ.

* *Vit. Arist.* sec. 12—16.

† Strabo, xiii. p. 124.

‡ A legacy is left to Herpyllis, πρὸς τοῖς πρέπουσιν ἀναλίσκειν, (sec. 13,) and one Simus is to have χωρὶς τοῦ πρέποντος ἐργαστήριον, another slave, or money to buy one, (sec. 15.) The battle of Cranon took place in August, B.C. 322; but it is very probable that it could not be safely conjectured till some time after what course Greek politics would take. If now Theophrastus was in Athens, and not with Aristotle at Chalcis, as seems far from improbable, (see Diog. Laert. *Vit. Theophrasti*, sec. 36.) Aristotle might reasonably fear that he perhaps would not be able to act as his executor. Thus, too, when he directs a house and furniture to be provided for Herpyllis, he selects Chalcis and Stagira, both places where she would be safe from Athenian hatred, for her to choose between as a residence, (sec. 14.)

fulfilment of the vow which he had made for the safety of Nicanor.

Aristotle's descendants.

Aristotle left behind him a daughter named after her mother, Pythias. She is said to have been three times married: first, to Nicanor, the son of Aristotle's guardian Proxenus, and his own adopted child; secondly, to Procles, a descendant—apparently son or grandson—of Demaratus, King of Lacedæmon, by whom she had two sons named Procles and Demaratus, scholars of Theophrastus; and, thirdly, to Metrodorus, an eminent physician, to whom she bore a son named after his maternal grandfather.* He also left behind him an infant son, named after his paternal grandfather, Nicomachus,

Herpyllis.

by a female of the name of Herpyllis, of whom it is very difficult exactly to say in what relation she stood to him. To call her his mistress would imply a licentious description of intercourse which the name by which she is described (παλλακή) by no means warrants us in supposing, and which the character of Aristotle, the absence of any allusion to such a circumstance in the numerous calumnies which were heaped upon him, and the terms of respect in which she is spoken of in his will,† would equally incline us to disbelieve. It seems most probable that he was married to her by that kind of left-handed marriage which alone the laws of Greece and Rome permitted between persons who were not both citizens of the same State. The Latin technical term for the female in this relation was *concubina*. She was recognised by the law, and her children could inherit the sixth part of their father's property. Mark Antony lived in this kind of concubinage with Cleopatra, and Titus with Berenice. The two Antonines, men of characters the most opposite to licentiousness, were also instances of this practice, which indeed remained for some time after Christianity became the religion of the State, and was regulated by two Christian emperors, Constantine and Justinian.‡ The Greek term is not used so strictly in a technical sense, and may he said to answer with equal propriety to either of the Latin words *pellex* and *concubina*. Where, however, the legal relation was denoted, there was no other word selected in preference;§ and we may safely say that this, in the case before us, is the probable interpretation, although there is no positive authority that it is the true one. The son Nicomachus was brought up by Theophrastus, and if we are to credit Cicero's assertion, that the Nicomachean Ethics which are found among Aristotle's works, were by some attributed to him, must have profited much by his master's instructions. It seems, however, more likely that Aristocles's account of him is the correct one, who relates that he was killed in battle at a very early age.*

Fate of Aristotle's works.

The works of Aristotle are said to have met with a most singular mischance. They are related to have been buried some time after his death, and not to have been recovered till two hundred years afterwards. This story is so curious in itself, and of such vital importance in the history of philosophy, that we shall make no apology for investigating it thoroughly, in spite of the length to which this article has already been extended.

Strabo's account.

The main authority for the opinion is Strabo, in a passage of his geographical work,† where having occasion to speak of Scepsis, a town in the Troad, he mentions two or three persons of eminence who were born there. One of these is Neleus, the son of Coriscus, a person who was a scholar both of Aristotle and Theophrastus, and who succeeded to the library of the latter, in which too was contained that of the former. "For Aristotle," Strabo goes on to say, "made over his own library to Theophrastus, (to whom he also left his school,) and was the first that I know of who collected books and taught the kings in Egypt to form a library. Theophrastus made them over to Neleus; he took them over to Scepsis, and made them over to his heirs (τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν)—uneducated men, who let the books remain locked up without any care. When, however, they observed the pains which the kings of the Attalic dynasty (in whose dominions the town was) were at to get books to furnish the library at Pergamus, they buried them under ground in a sort of cellar, and a long time after, when they had received much injury from damp and worms, the representatives of the family sold them to Apellicon of Teos—the books both of Aristotle and of Theophrastus—for a very large sum. Apellicon was more of a book-collector than a philosopher; and the result was that in an attempt to supply the gaps on the transcription of the text in new copies, he filled them up the reverse of well, and sent the books abroad full of mistakes. And of the Peripatetic philosophers,

* Stahr, *Aristotelia*, p. 164.

† He provides amply for her, and enjoins his executors, if she should desire to marry, to take care that she is not disposed of in a way unworthy of him, reminding them that she has deserved well of him, (ὅτι σπουδαία περὶ ἐμὲ ἐγένετο.) Diog. Laert, sec. 13.

‡ Taylor, *Elements of the Civil Law*, p. 273. The terms *semi-matrimonium* and *conjugium inæquale*, were applied to this connection, which was entered into before witnesses (*testatione interposità*) and with the consent of the father of the woman. Both contracting parties, too, were obliged to be single. See Gibbon, vol. v. ch. xliv. pp. 368—370.

§ The author of the oration against Neæra thus uses it in the distinction which he draws, (p. 1386.) τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἑταίρας ἡδονῆς ἕνεκα ἔχομεν, τὰς δὲ παλλακὰς τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν θεραπείας τοῦ σώματος, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίους καὶ τῶν ἔνδον φύλακα πιστὴν ἔχειν. It must not be concealed that Athenæus, p. 589, (and perhaps Hermippus, whom he quotes,) called Herpyllis by the term ἑταίρα. But possibly the word ἑταίρα was used by him in that sense which Athenæus (p. 571, c.) speaks of. And even if Herpyllis had been originally an adventurer of the same description as Aspasia, we shall not necessarily think the worse of Pericles for marrying the latter, or Aristotle the former, when we consider that every thing which elevates marriage above a faithful intercourse of this kind is due to the religious sanction and the religious meaning which it derives from Christianity. In Paganism the superiority of the one to the other was purely legal and conventional. The wife was the housekeeper and the breeder of citizens, and nothing whatever more.

* Aristocles, *ap.* Euseb. *loc. cit.* Cicero, *De Fin.* v. 5.

† *Geogr.* xiii. p. 124. ed. Tauchnitz. We have translated the whole of this celebrated passage as it stands in the text of all the printed editions. But besides the words τὰ τε Ἀμμωνείλου καὶ τὰ Θεοφράστου βιβλία, which we look upon as a marginal note that has crept into the text, there appears to us to be unquestionably a corruption in the latter part. In default of the authority of MSS., a conjecture can only be received with great caution; but still we should be inclined to think, that immediately after the word πρωτιλάβετο should come καὶ βιβλιοπῶλαί τινες..... Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, and that after βιβλιοθήκης probably followed something like καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ ὁ Ῥόδιος Ἀπελλίκωνος ὠνησάμενος τῶν ἀντιγράφων εἰς μέσον ἤγαγε, καὶ ἀνίγραψε τοὺς νῦν φερομένους πίνακας. Plutarch, *Vit. Syll.* c. 26. from whom we have taken these words, unquestionably follows Strabo in the account which he gives of this affair. He cites him by name almost immediately afterwards, as is remarked by Schneider. (*Præf. ad Aristot. H. A.* p. lxxx.) It was, however, scarcely the *Geography*, but the *Historical Memoirs* of Strabo, which was his authority through the life of Sylla. Hence the slight divarication of the two narratives; in the topographical work the circumstances of the story which are most connected with Scepsis are principally dwelt upon; in the other those connected with Sylla.

the more ancient who immediately succeeded Theophrastus, as in fact they had no books at all, except a very few, and those chiefly of the *exoteric* class, were unable to philosophize systematically, but were obliged to elaborate rhetorical disquisitions, (*μηδὲν ἔχειν φιλοσοφεῖν πραγματικῶς ἀλλὰ θέσεις ληκυθίζειν,*) while their successors after the time when these books came out, speculated better and more in Aristotle's spirit than they, although they too were forced to explain most of his views by guess work (*τὰ πολλὰ εἰκότα λέγειν*) from the multitude of errors. And to this inconvenience Rome contributed a large share. For immediately after the death of Apellicon, Sylla, having taken Athens, seized upon the library of Apellicon; and after it had been brought here, Tyrannio the grammarian, who was an admirer of Aristotle, had the handling of it (*διεχειρίσατο**) by the favour of the superintendent of the library; and [so had] some booksellers, who employed wretched transcribers, and neglected to verify the correctness of the copies, an evil which occurs in the case of all other authors too when copied for sale, both here and in Alexandria."

Plutarch's account.

Plutarch, in his biography of Sylla,† confirms a part of this account, and adds a feature or two which is wanting here. His authority is obviously Strabo himself in another work now lost, and he is, therefore, not to be reckoned as an additional witness, but as the representative of the one last summoned, again recalled to explain some parts of his own testimony. From him we learn that Sylla carried the library of Apellicon, containing the greater part of the books of Aristotle and Theophrastus, with which up to that time most people had no accurate acquaintance,‡ to Rome. "There," he continues, "it is said Tyrannio the grammarian arranged (*ἐνσκευάσασθαι*) the principal part of them, and Andronicus the Rhodian, obtaining copies from him, published them, and drew up the syllabuses (*πίνακας*) which are now current." He confirms the account of Strabo that the early Peripatetics had neither a wide nor an accurate acquaintance with the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus, from the circumstance of the property of Neleus, to whom Theophrastus bequeathed his books, falling into the hands of illiterate and indifferent persons; but of the story of burying the books he says nothing, nor yet of the endeavours of Apellicon to repair the damaged manuscripts.

General belief of the story.

Our readers have here the whole authority§ which is to be found in the writers of antiquity for this celebrated story, which has been transmitted from one mouth to another in modern times without the least question of its truth until very lately. And not only has it been accepted as a satisfactory reason for an extraordinary and most important fact, the decay of philosophy for the two centuries preceding the time of Cicero, but editors and commentators of the works of Aristotle have resorted to it without scruple for a solution of all the difficulties which they might encounter. They have allowed themselves the most arbitrary transpositions of the several parts of the same work, and acknowledged no limit to the number or magnitude of gaps which might be assumed as due to the damp or worms of the cellar at Scepsis.* Of late years, however, as the critical study of the Greek language has increased, and the attention of scholars been more drawn towards the philosophical department of antiquity, the inadequacy of this story to account for the state in which Aristotle's writings have come down to us has become more and more apparent; notices have been found which are quite incompatible with it; and at the present time it may safely be said that the falsity of the account in the main is completely proved. We will endeavour to give our readers some idea of the laborious researches which have led to this result. They have been carried on chiefly, if not entirely, by German philologers, the pioneers in this as in almost every other uncleared region of antiquity.† But we must first call their attention to some other circumstances which would, antecedently to the investigations of which we speak, dispose us to look with some suspicion on the tale, unless very considerably qualified.

Unwarranted.

The work of Athenæus, to which we are indebted for so much fragmentary information on matters of antiquity, is cast in a form which had particular attractions for the readers of the time in which the author lived—the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. A wealthy Roman is represented as hospitably entertaining several persons eminent for their acquaintance with literature and philosophy, and the most curious notices imaginable from a multitude of writers, and upon all subjects, are woven ingeniously into the conversation of the guests. Nearly in the beginning of the work, the author, who himself is one of them, enlarges on the splendid munificence, the literary taste, and the accomplishments of the host. Among other things he praises the extent and value of his library. "It was of such a size," he says, "as to exceed those of all who had gained a reputation as book-collectors,—Polycrates the Samian, Pisistratus the tyrant of Athens, Euclid, (also an Athenian,) Nicocrates of Cyprus, aye, the kings of Pergamus too, and Euripides the poet, and Aristotle the philosopher, [and Theophrastus,] and him who had (*διατηρήσαντα*) the books of these, from whom king Ptolemy my countryman, surnamed Philadelphus, *bought the whole*, and carried them away, together with those he got from Athens and those from Rhodes, to the fair city of Alexandria." It is obvious that the author here follows an account very different from Strabo's, one which represented Neleus's library including the costly collections of Aristotle and Theophrastus as forming, together with some others, the basis of the famous collection at Alexandria. Now it is utterly inconceivable that if Ptolemy bought the *whole library* of Neleus, he should have been satisfied

Athenæus's statement.

Incompatible with Strabo's.

* In the parallel narrative of Plutarch the term *ἐνσκευάσασθαι* is used.

† *Vit. Syll.* sec. 26.

‡ *οὔπω τότε σαφῶς γνωριζόμενα τοῖς πολλοῖς.*

§ The account of Suidas (*v.* Ἀπέλλικος) is obviously extracted from the passage in Plutarch.

* Thus Antonius Scainus interpolated the seventh and eighth books of the *Politics* between the third and fourth. Conringe, who followed him, made up for a scrupulous abstinence from this course by indulging himself freely in hypothesized *lacunæ*, to such an extent that Goettling somewhat facetiously observes, *Asteriscis suis interpositis noctem Aristoteliam quasi stellis illustrare sategit.*—*Pref. ad* Arist. *Polit.* p. 6.

† Brandis, *Ueber die Schicksale der Aristotelischen Bucher, und einige Kriterien ihrer Aechtheit*, in Niebuhr's *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. i. Kopp, *Nachtrag zur Brandisischen Untersuchung*, &c. in the same work, vol. iii. Fabricius (*Biblioth. Græca*, iii. c. 5.) mentions a French author who, in a work entitled *Les Aménités de la Critique*, published at Paris in 1717, impugns the story of Strabo. Of the two German writers the former has contributed by far the more important investigations of this subject. Stahr, *Aristotelia, Zweiter Theil*, has availed himself of both, but has added little of his own.

Biography. to leave the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus only behind in the hands of men so ignorant of their value and careless of what became of them as Neleus's heirs are represented to have been, if no other copies of these works existed; and even supposing it possible that he should have done so, would not so singular an incident of literary history have been mentioned by some author of antiquity? Should we not find some record of it in Cicero, from whom we learn so much of the history of Greek philosophy? He even mentions the degeneracy of the Peripatetic school after Theophrastus in strong terms:* is it conceivable that if it had been attributable to the want of their founders' works, he should either have not heard of this, or should not think it worth mentioning? Could such a story have escaped the anecdote collectors under the empire, Ælian, Phavorinus, and a host of others? Would Diogenes Laertius, who relates how many cooking utensils Aristotle passed at the Eubœan custom-house, have neglected so interesting an anecdote as this? Such considerations, combined with the notice in Athenæus, must prevent an impartial judge from attaching more than a very small degree of credit to that part of Strabo's narrative, which denies the publication of the works of Aristotle to any considerable extent before the time of Sylla. And this scepticism will not be diminished when we consider, that the greater part of Aristotle's works are so closely connected with each other that if any were published all or nearly all must have been so. He continually refers from the one to the other for investigations which are necessary to the argument which he has in hand. And although these references may be, and probably often are, due to a later hand, still this objection cannot be made in all cases,—in those, for instance, where the special work referred to is not named, but described in such a way that it is impossible not to identify it.†

Silence of Cicero.

Connection of Aristotle's works.

But after all, these arguments are little else than negative, and although they lead to a probability of a very high order against the truth of Strabo's narrative, they are not absolutely conclusive. In fact, the work of disproof is a most difficult one, from the circumstance of the whole of the literature of the two centuries after Theophrastus, enormous as its extent was, having been swept away, except such scanty fragments as are found here and there imbedded in the work of some grammarian or compiler. This will be strikingly evident from the consideration, that if the works of Aristotle, which have come down to us, had been lost, and a similar story had been related of Plato's works to that which we read in Strabo respecting those of Aristotle and Theophrastus, its refutation would be quite as difficult as that of the one about which we are at present concerned. But the difficulty of the problem did not damp the ardour of the German scholars we have spoken of above. They have searched through the works of the voluminous commentators upon Aristotle, which the learned eclecticism of the IIId, IVth, and Vth Centuries of the Christian era produced, some of them still only existing in manuscripts,* with an untiring diligence, and have detected in the works of much more modern scholiasts extracts from their predecessors, which prove to demonstration that the notice in Athenæus is in all probability true, and that certainly so much of Strabo's account as is incompatible with it is false.

Destruction of literature.

Aristotle.

We have seen that, according to the authorities on which the story rests, a very considerable impulse was given in the first century before the Christian era to the study of the Peripatetic philosophy. Andronicus the Rhodian is mentioned as the principal promoter of this revival, having rearranged the works of Aristotle in a way which was generally received in the time of Strabo, and which formed the basis of the present division. Contemporary with Andronicus, although younger than him, was Athenodorus of Tarsus; and in the next generation to Athenodorus, Boëthus of Sidon, both celebrated for their acquaintance with the doctrines of Aristotle, and for their investigations of the literary questions connected with them. Now, although the works of all these writers have perished,† they were not lost until they had furnished materials to Adrastus and Alexander of Aphrodisias in the IId century, and the Eclectic philosophers, Ammonius Saccas, Porphyry, Ammonius the son of Hermias, Simplicius, and David the Armenian, in the IIId, IVth, and Vth; and of most of these considerable remains have come down to the present time,‡ so that we are enabled, with very great precision, to ascertain the views of "the *ancient commentators*," (*οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐξηγηταί*,) as Andronicus and his contemporaries are called by their more modern followers, on several particulars, and among others, on some having a direct bearing upon the story of Strabo.

Ancient commentators on Aristotle.

We find, for instance, that a point which occupied much of the attention of the "ancients," was to determine between the claims of rival works, bearing the same name, and upon the same subject, to be reputed the genuine productions of Aristotle. Andronicus questioned the pretensions of the treatise *περὶ ἑρμηνείας*, and

Some of their views still known.

---

* *De Finibus*, v. 5. *Simus igitur contenti his* [*i. e. Aristotele et Theophrasto*] *namque horum posteri*, meliores illi quidem meâ sententiâ quam reliquarum philosophi disciplinarum; *sed ita degenerarunt, ut ipsi eis se nati esse videantur*. It is strange that the words in roman characters should not have opened the eyes of men to look for a general cause of a general deterioration. Could they suppose that *all* the schools had lost all their books?

† Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. iii. p. 35, gives a list of the passages in which the philosopher alludes to his own writings. Against many of these the objection we have noticed may be made. A more conclusive one is *Poetic.* p. 1454, col. 2, line 18, (quoted by Stahr, *Aristotelia*, ii. p. 296.) from which it is certain that an Ethics—not however necessarily the Nicomachean—was published at the time the passage was written. But, unfortunately, (supposing the work alluded to to be the Nicomachean Ethics,) there is perhaps no one of Aristotle's writings so independent of all the rest.

* The Royal Academy of Berlin were induced by the advice of Schleiermacher to publish a complete edition of Aristotle's works, based upon the collation of as many manuscripts as could be made available for the purpose. The execution of this work was placed under the superintendence of two most distinguished men, the one, Immanuel Bekker, the celebrated editor of Plato, Thucydides, and the Greek Orators, a scholar whose piercing intuition into the genius of the Greek language can only be compared to that of Newton into the laws of the universe, or that of Niebuhr into the institutions of antiquity; the other, Christian Brandis, the friend of Niebuhr, and guardian of his orphan children. The former fulfilled his portion of the task in 1831, by publishing the text of Aristotle's works from the collation of more than a hundred manuscripts, in two volumes, quarto. The latter, to whom the task of collecting and arranging the Greek commentators, and of elucidating the philosophy, devolved, published one volume of those (some from hitherto unedited manuscripts) in 1836, and promises in the preface a second, with prolegomena, as soon as the pressure of bad health will allow.

† The Paraphrase of the Nicomachean Ethics which has come down to us under the name of Andronicus's, is generally considered to be of a later date.

‡ Adrastus *περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους συγγραμμάτων*, is said still to exist in an Arabic version. Brandis, *loc. cit.* p. 253.

Biography.

those of the latter part of the *Categories*.* Adrastus found two editions (if we may use the expression) of the latter work, differing very considerably from each other. The same was stated by him of the seventh book of the *Physical Lectures*.† Cicero mentions it as a question which could not be decided, as to whether a work on Ethics (apparently that which has come down to us under the title of ἠθικὰ Νικομάχεια) was written by Aristotle, or by his son Nicomachus. And that the only evidences on the one side or the other were merely internal, is obvious from the remark in which he expresses his inclination towards the latter opinion, "that he does not see why the style of the son should not bear a close resemblance to that of the father."‡ Another question which occasioned considerable perplexity, was the arrangement of the several works which were held to be genuine. The present distribution is entirely based upon an arrangement which goes no further back than the time of Andronicus, and is entirely different from the one or more which appear to have prevailed before him. There are at this day three known catalogues of the writings, the first is the one given by Diogenes Laertius in his life, the second that of the anonymous Greek biographer published by Menage. These resemble one another very much, and bear every appearance of having been derived, probably however through secondary channels, from the same source, which has been conjectured with great plausibility to be Hermippus of Alexandria's work,§ of which we have spoken in the early part of this essay. But it is impossible to imagine a greater difference than is found between these lists and the works which have come down to us. The names are so completely unlike, and there are so many reciprocal omissions, that a scholar of the XVIth century was able, with the aid of a mortal antipathy to the Aristotelian philosophy, to succeed in persuading himself that every thing which has come down to us under the name of the great Stagirite, was, with very slight exceptions, spurious.‖ The third catalogue is found only in Arabic, and is said to much more nearly correspond with our own,¶ and, indeed, a great part of the difference between this and the two former is explicable from the fact that the same work is often referred to under more names than one, not merely by subsequent commentators on Aristotle, but also by the philosopher himself.** But such differences, independently of positive testimony, abundantly show that many pieces which now form the component parts of a larger treatise were not left by the author in such an order, or at least, that no authentic documents from which any given arrangement could be decidedly inferred, came to the knowledge of Andronicus and his brethren. If they had,—

Arrangement of the writings of Aristotle.

if, that is, the manuscripts of Apellicon had been, as they are represented, a genuine copy of all or most of Aristotle's works, never till then known, the task of these critics would have been a most easy one. There would have been no occasion for discussions of the internal evidence to determine between various readings of the text, different systems of arrangement, or contending claims as to authorship. A simple reference to a primitive copy would at once have settled all. And what shall we say to the letter of Alexander to Aristotle, complaining that he had published his *acroamatic* works, and thus put the world on a footing with his most highly instructed pupil? It is of no avail to urge that the letter is not genuine: it very likely may not be so, but it was extracted by Gellius from the book of the very Andronicus whom this tale represents as the first publisher of these, and therefore proves *his* belief at any rate that some of them had been published long before.*

Aristot

Androni possesse no authentic copy.

This evidence seems to prove incontrovertibly that the part of Strabo's and Plutarch's narrative which relates to the extraordinary treasure first made available by Andronicus, cannot be true. By another chain of testimony equally elaborate, Brandis has shown that many of the works of Aristotle, of the highest and most recondite character, that we now possess, were actually in the hands of the Peripatetic school, whose degeneracy has been attributed to the loss of them. It is well known that the successors of the great philosopher in several instances composed works on the same subject, (and sometimes identical in title also,) with existing treatises of their founder.† For indeed the spirit of dogmatism, which is often imputed to the Aristotelian philosophy by persons who are only acquainted with the schoolmen's modifications of it in the XVth and XVIth centuries, is really so alien to it, that it would be difficult to find in the history of civilization an example of a more vigorous and healthy independence of thought, and a greater ardour for investigation than is afforded by the earlier disciples of the Lyceum.‡ Although the works in question have long since been lost, Brandis has succeeded in eliciting from the notices which remain of them in the commentators we have referred to, very many particulars, which show in some instances that the author actually followed the course of the Aristotelian parallel work, and in more, that he made use of it. Under the first of these two classes are brought, by decisive arguments, the *Physical Lectures* and the first book of the *Former Analytics*; and there is a considerable probability that the second book of the *Former*

Aristotle writings known to the early Peripatetics.

* Brandis, p. 241.
† *Ibid. loc. cit.*
‡ *De Fin.* v. 5.
§ Brandis, p. 249, 262.
‖ Patritius, *Discussiones Peripateticæ*, i. p. 16, *et seq.* His only exceptions were the *Mechanics*, and the treatise on the doctrines of Xenophanes, Zeno, and Gorgias. Some years afterwards a yet more extravagant opinion was propounded, that the present Greek manuscripts of Aristotle were translations from the Arabic. Philippe Cattier (quoted by Harles on Fabricius, *Bib. Gr.* vol. iii. p. 207.) mentions it as the belief of some.
¶ Brandis, p. 262.
** Brandis, p. 261. Petiti (*Observatt. Miscell.* iv. 9.) and Buhle (*Commentationes Societatis Reg. Gottingensis*, vol. xv. p. 57,) quoted by Brandis, give several instances of this identity; as also Brandis himself, (*Diatribe de perditis Arist. libris De Ideis et De Bono*, p. 7.)

* Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* xx. 5.
† Ammonius, *Proœm. ad Categor.* εἰ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Εὔδημος καὶ Θαλῆς καὶ Θεόφραστος κατὰ ζῆλον τοῦ διδασκάλου γεγραφήκασι κατηγορίας καὶ περὶ ἑρμηνείας καὶ ἀναλυτικά.
‡ Aristotle himself is especially noticed for having modified some of his views, which had been attacked by other philosophers, with perfect readiness, and without attempting any vexatious resistance, or exhibiting any annoyance: ἵνα τῶν πρέπόντων αὐτοῖς, (besides Aristotle, Democritus and Chrysippus are spoken of,) ἀμεταπόητοι ἀληθείας καὶ ἀδόκητοι καὶ μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἀφῶσιν. Plutarch, *De virtute morali*, p. 448. This passage will serve to show how little Bacon's well-known representation of him as one who "bore, like the Turk, no brother near the throne," is founded on fact. But, in truth, the great father of modern science imputed to Aristotle all the positiveness and dogmatism of the modern Aristotelians: his disgust at the idolaters was extended to the object of their idolatry. Somewhat similarly, he confuses the practice of the later Peripatetics (οἱ ἔσχατοι λογοδίζοντες) with that of their founder. *Novum Organum*, lib. i. sec. 71.

Biography. *Analytics* and the fifth of the *Metaphysics* may be added to these.* Under the second we may number the *Latter Analytics*, the *Categories*, perhaps the treatise περὶ ἑρμηνείας, the *Topica*, the treatises *On the Heavens*, *On Growth and Corruption*, *On the Soul*, and the *Meteorologica*.† Further researches on the principle here indicated may very probably add to the lists, but a very small part of either would be sufficient to demonstrate —when we consider that almost every one of these treatises would involve the possession of some others in order to be itself intelligible—that it was not the want of acroamatic works that produced the decay of the Peripatetic school.

Also to the Stoics. To make an objection to the inference which these facts allow us to draw against the correctness of Strabo's story, on the ground that Theophrastus may possibly have chosen to keep the works of Aristotle, as well as his own, in his own possession, and communicate the use of them only to the more favoured of his scholars, would be a most arbitrary proceeding; as there is not the slightest historical ground for such an hypothesis. But Brandis has precluded even this step. He has shown that Chrysippus the Stoic, (who, in his dialectical work, quoted by Plutarch,‡ speaks in the highest terms of the cultivation of that branch of science by the Academics down to Polemo, and the Peripatetics down to Strato inclusive,) in several of his particular doctrines had an especial reference to the former treatment of the same by Aristotle, Eudemus, and Theophrastus.§ His discussion of the Idea of Time is entirely based upon that of Aristotle, and exhibits an unworthy endeavour to conceal the similarity.‖ Nay, the ancient commentators of highest reputation maintained that the whole of the Stoics' logical science, on which they prided themselves much, was nothing more than a following out of Aristotle's principles, and, in particular, that their doctrine of Contraries (τὰ ἐνάντια) was entirely derived from Aristotle's book *On Opposites* (περὶ ἀντικειμένων.)¶

Also to the Alexandrine scholars. But it was not only to philosophers either of his own or of rival sects that the works of Aristotle were known at the time when they are reported to have been lying in the cellar at Scepsis. Aristophanes of Byzantium, the celebrated grammarian of Alexandria in the early part of the IId Century before Christ, made an abridgement of his Zoological works,** and also wrote commentaries apparently on these, or some other of his works relating to Natural History.†† But before his time, Antigonus of Carystus, under Ptolemy Euergetes, (B.C. 247—222,) in his *Collection of Wonderful Stories*, quoted largely both from these and from the works of Theophrastus on similar subjects. Kopp says that he used not only these, but also the work on Foreign Customs, (βάρβαρα νόμιμα,) and that the same is probable both of Callimachus and Nicander,‡‡ and he acutely remarks, that the reason that the works on the Parts of Animals and the Generation of Animals are not so often cited as the History, is that the latter furnished far more materials for works that would possess a general interest, whereas the former necessarily implied a certain knowledge of physiology in the reader. But that they could not have remained unknown while the latter was published, is evident from the circumstance that in it the author frequently refers to them. Nor were the writings which related to physical phenomena the only ones which we are sure reached Alexandria. Andronicus related, that in the great library there were found forty books of *Analytics* and two of *Categories*, professedly the work of Aristotle. Of the former of these four only, of the latter one,—in both instances those which we have,—were decided upon by the ancient critics to be genuine.* Besides which, the Alexandrine writers, who formed Canons of Classical Poets, Historians, and Philosophers, included Aristotle among the last, surely not on the strength either of his mere reputation, or only of his exoteric works.

Aristotle.

Nature of the exoteric writings. But what, after all, was the nature of these *exoteric* writings; for we are now obviously come to a point at which the accurate determination of this question, which the continuity of the narrative has hitherto prevented, becomes necessary. We shall endeavour to be as brief as possible in our answer.

Aristotle's division. If we apply to Aristotle himself for information, we shall find nothing at all in his writings to confirm the popular opinion of a division of his doctrines into two classes, the one of which was communicated freely, while the other was carefully reserved for those disciples whose previously ascertained character and talents were a security for their right appreciation of them. Wherever the term *exoteric* occurs, it is with reference to a distinction, not of readers or hearers, but of questions treated on. It signifies little or nothing more than *extrinsic*, *separate*, or *insulated*. That facility of comprehension as regards the main subject-matter was not necessarily a characteristic of such works, appears from a passage in the *Metaphysics*,† in which the writer excuses himself from touching upon the doctrine of Ideas (or Constituent Forms) any more than the order of his work demanded, assigning as a reason, that his views on this particular "were for the most part familiar *from the exoteric discourses*." It is notorious that this was one of the deepest and most difficult questions of the ancient philosophy, being in fact the point where the schools of the Academy and the Lyceum diverged, and, consequently, if any part of Aristotle's views had been confined to a chosen few,—if there had been such a thing as an esoteric coterie,—here would have been proper matter to be reserved for them. Similarly, in the Nicomachean Ethics,‡ he refers his readers to "*the exoteric discourses*" for an analysis of the human mind. The law of subordination among the parts of a composite whole, as, for instance, the law of harmony in music, is another subject which he considers as "rather proper for an *exoteric* investigation. § In "the exoteric

* Brandis, pp. 266—269, 281, 282.
† *Ibid.* pp. 270, 272—275.
‡ *De Stoic. Repugn.* p. 1045, *fin.*
§ Brandis, pp. 246, 247.
‖ To the passages illustrative of this position collected by Baguet, *De Chrysippi vitâ, doctrinâ, et reliquiis*, pp. 170, 181, Brandis adds Aristol. *Phys. Ausc.* iv. 10—14.
¶ Simplicius *ap.* Brandis, p. 247, note 30.
** τὰ περὶ φύσεως ζώων. Hierocles cited by Schneider, *Præf. ad Hist. Arist.* p. xviii.
†† Artemidorus, *Oneirocr.* ii. c. 14, on which see Schneider, p. xix.
‡‡ *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. iii. pp. 95—98. He also says that Aratus, in his *Prognostics*, made use of the Meteorological works of Aristotle.
* Ammonius, Simplicius, and David the Armenian, cited by Brandis, p. 250.
† P. 1076, col. 1, line 28, Bekk. τεθρύλληται γὰρ τὰ πολλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξωτερικῶν λόγων. *Metaph.* xiii. *init.*
‡ P. 1102, col. 1, line 26, Bekk.
§ *Politic.* i. p. 1254, col. 1, line 33, Bekk. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μὴ

Biography.

discourses," he discussed the Philosophy of Life, the relative importance of the several elements which go to make up happiness, and the conditions which the social relation imposes on a man.* And in the same he proposes that an examination of the Idea of Time should be gone into.† Here then we have ample evidence that the most abstruse subjects, physical, metaphysical, and moral, were treated of somehow or other in discourses bearing the name of *exoteric*, a name to which modern usage has almost indissolubly attached the notion of shallowness, if not something like fraud also. Of any thing like freemasonry, any thing amounting to a severance of knowledge into two distinct spheres, the one to be inhabited by the vulgar, the other by choicer spirits, there is not a vestige. If any acroamatic work by Aristotle has come down to us, the Nicomachean Ethics is one. Yet in it is nothing requiring such profundity of reflexion or sobriety of mind as would be demanded by the psychological discussion in the exoteric work to which the author refers. And as for the terms by which Plutarch and Clement of Alexandria denote that class of works which they place in contradistinction to the *exoteric*, they are in part not used by Aristotle at all, and in part used in a totally different sense.‡ The phrases by which he designates such works as appear to stand in opposition to the *exoteric*, are λόγοι ἐγκύκλιοι, λόγοι κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν and μέθοδος,—and in such cases we are always directed to scientific treatises containing a system of several parts methodically arranged and organically cohering, such in short as would be formed by the outline of a continuous course of lectures on some main branch of philosophy. And that the works included under the name *acroamatic* or *acroatic* by the philoso-

Division of other philosophers.

phers since the time of Andronicus Rhodius, were of this description, seems most probable, not only from the appearance presented by those which have come down to us, but from the fact that, at the time when Greek philosophy was first imported into Rome, the word ἀκροάσεις had become the technical term for such productions. Crates Mallotes, who came to Rome on an embassy between the second and third Punic wars, is spoken of by Suetonius in terms which seem to show that a similar distinction to that which obtained in Aristotle's works, prevailed also in his.*

Aristot

If now we keep steadily in view this distinction which it is plain that Aristotle himself made in his discourses, the distinction between *cyclical, methodical, scientific* productions, and *insulated, independent* essays, we shall perceive at once from the nature of the case, that without any premeditated design on the part of the author, the former would only be appreciable by *genuine* disciples, those who were able and willing to afford a steady and continuous application to the developement of the whole, while the latter might be understood by those who brought no previous knowledge with them, but merely attended to the matter in hand;†—that the one required a severe and rigid logic to preserve all parts of the system in due coherence, the other readily admitted of the aid which the imagination affords to the elucidation of single points, but which often becomes mischievous when they are to be combined; that to the first the demonstrative form of exposition would alone be appropriate, to the second any one, narrative or dialogic, or any other, which might be most fit for placing the one matter to be illustrated in a striking light. But we must be very careful not to confuse these *resulting* distinctions with the primitive one from which they flowed, and still more not to suppose that they were the cause of it; for we shall see presently that want of attention to this caused in later writers first of all most inaccurate expressions as to the nature of this celebrated division, and finally, an utterly erroneous view of it, and of the spirit in which it originated.

Primary characteristics.

Secondary characteristics.

Cicero, in two of his letters to Atticus,‡ speaks of having composed two works in the manner of Aristotle's exoteric ones. The points of comparison which these two treatises (the *De Finibus* and the *De Republicâ*) offer, consist in the dialogic form in which they are written, and the prefaces which serve to introduce the *dramatis personæ* who carry on the discussion to the reader. The objections interposed by some of these to the view which it is the design of the author to elucidate

Cicero's imitation

μετέχουσι ζωῆς ἐνεὶ τις ἀρχή, οἷον ἀφυσίας. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἴσως ἐξωτερικωτέρας ἐστὶ σκέψεως.

* *Politic.* p. 1323, col. 1, line 22, Bekk. In a remarkable passage (*Sat.* iii. 67—72.) the Stoic Persius sums up all the great questions with which the philosophy of his school engaged. The parts printed in italics would all have been handled by Aristotle in the exoteric discourses to which he in this passage refers.

——causas cognoscite rerum;
Quid sumus; et quidnam victuri gignimur; ordo
Quis datus; aut metas quam mollis flexus, et unde;
Quis modus argento; quid fas optare; quid asper
Utile nummus habet; patriæ, carisque propinquis
Quantum elargiri deceat; quem te Deus esse
Jussit; et humanâ quâ parte locatus es in re.

It is apparently to this work of Aristotle that Cicero refers, *Acad.* ii. 42. *De Fin.* ii. sec. 13, iv. 18, 20, 26, and probably *De Offic.* iii. 8.

† *Phys. Auscult.* p. 217, col. 2, line 31, Bekk.

‡ Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* c. 7, opposes τὸν ἠθικὸν καὶ πολιτικὸν λόγον to αἱ ἀπορρήτου καὶ βαθύτερου διδασκαλίαι, and describes these latter as ἃς οἱ ἄνδρες ἰδίως ἀφοσιωσάμενοι καὶ ἐντρυφήσαντες σφόδρα τοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς. Clement, *Stromm.* v. p. 575, classes Pythagoras, Plato, Epicurus, the Stoics, and Aristotle together as philosophers who concealed a part of their opinions. λέγουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀριστοτέλους, τὰ μὲν ἐντυπώτερα δὲ εἶναι τῶν συγγεγραμμένων αὐτῷ, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀπόρρητα καὶ ἐξωτερικά· and that as the Pythagoreans have their ἀκουσματικὸν and μαθηματικόν, so the Peripatetics have their ἐνδοξον and ἐντευκτικόν. The terms ἀφοσιωσάμενοι, ἐντευκτικὸς, ἐντρυφῆς and ἐντευκτικὸς are never used by Aristotle, and the word ἐσώτερος only in the ordinary classical sense. Even the phrase ἐξωτερικὸς is often applied by him not in reference to these discourses. For instance, τοῖς ἔξωθεν λόγοις, (*Polit.* p. 1264, line 39,) "with discussions foreign to the subject:" ἐξωτερικὴ ἀρχὴ (*Id.* p. 1272, line 19,) "external rule:" ἐξωτέρω πίπτουσι τοῖς πολίταις τῶν πόλεων, (*Id.* p. 1295, line 32,) "do not apply to the generality of states."

* Suetonius, *De cl. grammat.* cap. 2, "*plurimas* acroases *subitis fecit, assiduèque* disseruit."—Here is obviously a distinction intended between the *dissertations* which he continually delivered, and the *lectures* which he gave from time to time.

† An illustration may perhaps be useful in clearing up what we apprehend to have been the real division. For the demonstration of Pythagoras's celebrated theorem (the 47th proposition of the first book of Euclid) the whole of the preceding part of the book is requisite. This then is an example of a λόγος κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν. But in the particular case of a square, the property of the square of the diameter being equal to twice the square of the side, may be directly shown to a person ignorant of geometry, as it is by Socrates in Plato's dialogue, *Meno*. This we conceive might be described as a λόγος ἐξωτερικός.

‡ *Ad Attic.* iv. 16. *Hanc ego de Republicâ, quam institui disputationem in Africani personam et Phili et Lælii et Manilii contuli: adjunxi adolescentes, Q. Tuberonem, P. Rutilium, duo Lælii generos, Scævolam et Fannium. Itaque cogitabam, quoniam in singulis libris utor procemiis, ut* Aristoteles *in iis, quos* ἐξωτερικοὺς *vocat, aliquid efficere ut non sine causâ istum appellarem, &c. .... Ad Attic.* xiii. 19. *Quæ autem his temporibus scripsi,* Aristoteleum *morem habent; in quo ita sermo inducitur ceterorum, ut penes ipsum sit principatus. Ita confeci quinque libros περὶ τελῶν, &c.* On the same principle he had composed his books *De Oratore, Epp. Attic.* iv. 16. *Epp. ad Famil.* i. 9. sec. 23.

are turned into a means of bringing it out in stronger and bolder relief. This mode of treatment in the hands of a master obviously offers many advantages. The dramatic interest keeps the attention of the reader from flagging, and the peculiar obstacles which the differences of individual temperament not unfrequently interpose to the reception of any doctrine may be in this way most clearly set forth and most easily removed. The Dialogues of Plato are an obvious example of this. But if we consider the *De Oratore*, *De Finibus*, and *De Republicâ* of Cicero to represent with tolerable accuracy the character of the Aristotelian Dialogues, we see at once a very considerable change. The genial productive power of the artist has given way to the systematic reflection of the philosopher. The personages introduced are not living and breathing men with all their feelings, prejudices, and individual peculiarities, they are mere puppets which speak the opinions entertained by those whose name they bear. These opinions may be fairly and lucidly stated, they may be backed by all the pomp and power of rhetoric, as they are in Cicero and as they probably were in Aristotle, but the speakers have no life, the scene no reality, and in spite of the pains taken by the author to prevent it by allusions to particular times, places, and circumstances, we rise from the perusal with our opinions more or less modified, but with no more distinct recollection of the parties by whom the discussion has been carried on than if they had been distinguished by the letters of the alphabet instead of the names of known characters.* But what these productions have lost as works of art, they have gained as works of science. The distinct and explicit exposition of a principle which prevents them from being the former, is a merit in them as the latter. And as the dialogic form, even where it fails in producing the dramatic impression that we receive from Plato, admits to the fullest extent of all the assistance which rhetoric can afford, it is not wonderful that it should have been selected by Aristotle as an appropriate one for many or even most of his *exoteric* treatises.†

Dialogic form.

Style of the exoteric works.

Neither in those cases in which he adopted this form can we be surprised that Aristotle should have made use of a style, which, however unfit for the purposes of a rigidly scientific investigation, is not at all inappropriate to compositions such as we have described. A few relics (and unfortunately a very few) have come down to us of them; about thirty lines in the original Greek are quoted by Plutarch ‡ from one of the most celebrated, and Cicero has in a Latin dress preserved two other small fragments.* The first of these is part of a treatise either addressed to Eudemus, Aristotle's disciple, or written on the subject of his death, and from the nature of the extract, no less than from the name it bore,† seems to be upon the subject of the immortality of the soul, and the miserable condition of man while imprisoned in the body, as compared with that which preceded and will follow the present life. Our existence on earth is regarded as a punishment inflicted upon us by the gods, and in support of this opinion an appeal is made to the experience of the human race manifesting itself to that effect in proverbs and mythological tales. The dead are represented as dwelling in a higher sphere of Being than the living, and as dishonoured by any expressions or feelings on the part of the latter which involve an opposite opinion. The language in which these sentiments are embodied is of proportionate dignity to the theme; it is totally unlike the dry and jejune style in which the works which have come down to us are written; on the contrary, it is rather diffuse and ornamented, and fully enables us to understand the expression of Cicero, "Aristotle, with his golden flood of language,"‡ which, judging from his rigidly demonstrative works alone, we should deem singularly inappropriate. One of the passages preserved in Cicero is even more gorgeous and eloquent than the one in Plutarch, and for the sake of the subject we will endeavour to give some notion of its rhythm and structure, although of course a translation twice removed from the original can do this but very inadequately. The argument is the common one of natural theology, the evidence which the wonders of the universe afford of the existence of an intelligent Creator. Aristotle's reasoning appears to be directed against those who asserted that such an inference was the result of a traditional belief handed down from generation to generation and interpreting all phenomena into an accordance with itself. He attempts by an illustration to show that this is not the case, but that it proceeds from the natural conviction of the human mind, unswayed by any particular bias, as soon as its attention is roused to these objects. "Suppose there to exist," says he, "a race of beings, who had always inhabited a region in the heart of the earth, dwelling in fair and lordly mansions adorned by statues and pictures, and provided with all the appliances of luxury in which those whom the world envies abound, but who never had visited the surface. Now, if these had heard by rumours and hearsay that there was a certain Divine power, living and acting; and then at some time the jaws of the earth were to open and allow them to quit their obscure dwelling-place and come forth into the region which we inhabit,—then, when all at once they beheld earth, sea, and sky, the enormous clouds, the mighty winds,—when they gazed on the sun, and perceived how vast, how beautiful it was, how potent in its operation, how, by diffusing its light through the

* Bishop Berkeley's *Hylas and Philonous* and *Minute Philosopher* make no pretension to dramatic effect. The very names of the collocutors indicate the principles which they profess. In our opinion, Berkeley has acted wisely, but would have done better still to have dropped the dialogic form. Harris's three treatises are an attempt to come much nearer to the Platonic Dialogue, and in our judgment, a signal failure.

† Cicero, although he does not expressly say that the *exoteric* works were *all* dialogues, speaks of them as if they were nearly coextensive. So too Ammonius (*Introd. ad Categ.* sec. 2.) divides the regular treatises of Aristotle into two heads, τῶν συνταγματικῶν, τὰ μὲν αὐτοτρόπων καὶ ἀκροαματικά· τὰ δὲ διαλογικὰ καὶ ἐξωτερικά. But Simplicius and Philoponus prevent us from construing their meaning too rigidly. The former says, δεῖ δὲ διηρῆσθαι αὐτοῦ τῶν συγγραμμάτων, εἴς τε τὰ ἐξωτερικὰ, ἃ τὰ ἐντευξικὰ καὶ τὰ διαλογικὰ, καὶ εἴλεω τὰ μὲν ἄκρως ἀκριβῶς φροντίζοντα,—καὶ εἰς τὰ ἀκροαματικὰ, &c. (*ad Phys. Auscult. init.*) and the latter, speaking of the *exoteric* writings, says, *among which* are the *Dialogues*, of which the *Eudemus* is one, (*ad* Arist. *De Animâ*, i. 138.)

‡ *De Consolat. ad Apollon.* p. 115. He also alludes to the same work in his *Life of Dion*, ch. 22.

* *De Naturâ Deorum*, ii. 37. *De Officiis*, ii. 16.

† Εὔδημος· ἢ περὶ ψυχῆς.

It is probably this treatise which is referred to in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 1102, col. 1, line 26, and which was quoted by Cicero in his Dialogue *Hortensius*, (*ap. Augustin. c. Julian.* vol. x. p. 623. ed. Benedict.) The fragment is given by Orelli in the seventh volume of his edition of Cicero's works, p. 485, 486.

‡ *Veniet, flumen orationis aureum fundens*, Aristoteles, *Acad. Pr.* ii. 38. In another passage Torquatus alleges that his adversary is prepossessed against Epicurus, because his writings are deficient in those "ornaments of style" which he finds in Plato, Theophrastus, and Aristotle, *De Fin.* i. 5. To the scientific works this description is about as applicable as to the *Elements of Euclid*,

Biography.

whole of the heaven, it was the cause of the day;—when, again, after night had veiled the earth in darkness, they observed the whole firmament studded and lit up with stars, the moon with her varying phases, now increasing, now waning, and all rising, and setting, and running on their courses steadily and unvaryingly for an eternity of ages; surely, when they beheld all this, they would believe both that there were gods, and that these mighty works were from their hand!" The passage in the *De Officiis* appears rather to be a summary of Aristotle's expressions in his own words than a translation like the above, but even there the reader will easily recognise an oratorical structure quite unlike what is to be found in any of the philosopher's works which have come down to us.

Popularity of the exoteric works.

From these few and meager specimens of the exoteric works of Aristotle, we may observe without any difficulty that in every respect they were calculated in a rhetorical and superficial age, such as that of the successors of Theophrastus was, to supersede the others. Literature became fashionable in high places. Philosophers thronged to the courts of an Antigonus, a Ptolemy, or an Attalus, and exerted themselves in making royal roads to knowledge for the sake of their patrons. A general acquaintance with the doctrines of the school to which they attached themselves was all that these latter could pretend to, and the instructor soon found out that very little more would be sufficient for himself. Why should he bestow time and labour on what would not be available to his purposes? Why should he trouble himself with thinking out the results which he could find ready provided to his hand? Above all, why should he neglect works which supplied food to his fancy and grace to his style, agreeably and lucidly written, and generally acceptable in literary society, for the dry and laborious systematic treatise, whose only merit was its rigidly logical connection. The very discipline of the Lyceum, as we have shown in an earlier part of this essay, contributed its share to the work of deterioration, by producing an unconscious indifference to the truth of opinions provided only they were plausible and coherent; and the vanity of possessing a multifarious knowledge lost the only check which could have restrained it. The age of thought gave way to an age of mere accumulation of learning, and in such a one what could attract any man to works like Aristotle's scientific ones? In the time of Cicero a considerable impulse had certainly been given to philosophy. Yet how instructive is the story which he relates in the introduction to his *Topica*. His friend Trebatius had stumbled while looking over his library upon the *Topica* of Aristotle, of which he had never heard, and on learning from Cicero the nature of the work was seized with a strong desire to read it. The obscurity of the book repelled him, and an eminent rhetorician to whom he applied for assistance told him that of those works of Aristotle he knew nothing. "This I was by no means surprised at," says Cicero, "that a *rhetorician* should know nothing of a philosopher, *of whom philosophers themselves, with the exception of a very few, knew nothing*."* And although Cicero deservedly prides himself upon being the introducer of Greek philosophy among his countrymen, it is extremely questionable whether, with the exception of those works which have a direct application to oratory, his knowledge of Aristotle was not confined to the exoteric writings. It is certainly these which he takes as his model and his basis in his own philosophical works.

Difficulty of the scientific ones.

Where a writer's opinions are studied rather than his principles and method, where readers do not take the trouble to put themselves upon his standing ground, to enter into his thoughts, and follow them out through the ramifications of his system, there will often appear a want of harmony between the results at which he arrives. There is a point from which all these will appear in their true perspective, but this point is on an eminence which it requires both time and labour to ascend. Such a want of agreement in his results was imputed to Aristotle at an early period, before the time of Cicero, who notes it and gives a partial explanation of it. "On the subject of the chief good," says he, "there are two kinds of works, the one written in a popular manner, and termed by them *exoteric*, the other worked up with greater care, (*limatius*,) which they left in the form of notes, (*quod in commentariis reliquerunt*.) This makes them thought not always to say the same thing; although in the upshot there is no variation at all, in those at least whom I mentioned, [Aristotle and Theophrastus,] nor do the two differ the one from the other."* Here Cicero only speaks of those works which the author kept by him and continually made additions to, a class of works which did not form a large proportion of the scientific ones.† But it is quite plain that the remark might be extended to the whole of these latter; in every one of them might be found instances where Aristotle might "appear not to say the same thing" as in his more popular publications, but where at the same time "in the upshot there would be no variation at all." Now here we have the fact which formed the basis of the subsequent opinion that Aristotle had an *inner* and an *outer doctrine*, an opinion which gathered strength and distinctness as it passed from one hand to another, and is in modern times repeated with a confidence that would lead one to suppose that it rested on the explicit assertion of the author himself. Neither in Strabo, Plutarch, nor Gellius, is there any hint of a wilful suppression of sentiments on the part of Aristotle,‡ although all three of these authors allude to a division of his works into two classes adapted to different mental qualifications in the readers. In Clement of Alexandria appears the first trace of any such notion, and the expressions which he makes use of are hardly sufficient to justify us in concluding that he had any decided opinion on this score.§ But it was a view which would

Aristot

Imputed variance tween A totle's views.

Exoteric and eso- teric doc- trine.

Growth this noti

* *Topica*, i. 1. So too in a fragment in Nonius, *voce* contendere, he says, *Magna etiam animi contentio adhibenda est explicando Aristoteli.*

* *De Finibus*, v. 5.

† Ammonius (*Introd. ad Arist. Categ.*) describes those writings which he calls ἐνσημαντικὰ, answering to Cicero's *Commentarii*, as common-place books kept by Aristotle for his own use, some of them devoted to one subject, some miscellaneous. Simplicius says of them (*Proleg. in Cat.*) λεκτέον δὲ τὰ ἐνσημαντικὰ μὴ πάντη εικαίως ἔχειν τίνα. He, however, does not seem to know much about them himself, for he quotes Alexander Aphrodisias as his authority. But all the ancient commentators are agreed in making the *acroamatic* works a separate class, (and a more important,) than the *hypommematic*.

‡ The word ἀνέκφατα may seem opposed to this statement, (Plut. *Vit. Alex.* sec. 7.) but it seems only intended to indicate those writings which were not published; and which were kept secret not because they contained peculiar doctrines, but from the same reasons which prevent any man from showing a work yet growing under his hands to any but his particular friends. One of these works was the *Rhetoric*, as has been remarked by Niebuhr in a note to the *History of Rome*, vol. i. p. 19. Eng. Trans.

§ Stromm. *loc. supra cit.* After speaking of double doctrines of the Pythagoreans, Plato, Epicurus, and the Stoics, he adds,

not fail to be caught hold of in an age singularly attached, as the declining Roman empire was, to mystical orgies and secret associations. Before Clement indeed Lucian had taken advantage of it for the purposes of a jest, where, in his *Sale of Philosophers*, he puts Aristotle up to auction as a double man;* but obviously this is only a ludicrous version of the fact that his works were of very different kinds, stated, as very likely the later Aristotelians would themselves be fond of doing, in a paradoxical form. Nay, even when we get down to the close of the IVth Century, to the rhetorician Themistius, a very great allowance must be made for the conceits of his affected style, before we form our estimate of his real sentiments. No one can dream of taking in their literal sense such phrases as those of "Aristotle shutting up and fortifying his meaning in a rampart of obscure phraseology, to secure it from the ravages of uninitiated plunderers," † or "considering that knowledge was like food and drugs, one sort proper for the healthy, another for the sick," and therefore "involving his meaning in a wall of cloud, the doors of which two guardians, Perspicuity and Obscurity, like the Homeric Hours, stood ready to open to the initiated and close upon the profane."‡ But after making all proper allowance, there is no question that in the time of Themistius the opinion of a double meaning of Aristotle was widely received.§ Ammonius in the Vth Century thinks it necessary to state, apparently in opposition to the popular belief, "that the Dialogues of Aristotle differ very much from the direct treatises; (*αὐτοπρόσωπα*;) that in the latter, as directing his discourse to genuine students, he not only delivers *his real opinions*, but employs the severest methods, such as people in general cannot follow; while in the latter, as they are written for general use, he delivers *his real opinions*, but employs methods not rigidly demonstrative, but of the kind that the generality of people are able to follow." ‖ But his scholar Simplicius no longer swims against the tide; he asserts that in the "acroamatic works Aristotle aimed at obscurity, in order through it to repel the more indolent from him." ¶ The wit of the satirist and the flourishes of the rhetorician were thus translated into plain prose; and from this time forward the duplicity of Aristotle's doctrines may be considered as reckoned among the most indisputable facts.

Establishment of the opinion of Aristotle's duplicity.

Having now thoroughly satisfied ourselves that the narrative of Strabo requires much qualification, we may inquire whether there is any part of it which is consistent with what from other sources we know really was the case. And there seems nothing to prevent us from believing that Neleus's heirs really possessed some books which had belonged to Aristotle and Theophrastus,—that Apellicon purchased these, and that they were brought by Sylla to Rome and there first made known to people in general. But that these were works of any great importance we have seen could not be the case; nor was the decay of the Peripatetic school owing to the want of them. A part of the story relates to matters of fact, for which Strabo is a most respectable witness; a part to a matter of opinion, on which he is no authority whatever. The one half is reconcilable with the fact that the principal acroamatic works of Aristotle were in the hands of his successors and in the library at Alexandria, during the interval between Neleus and Apellicon; it is in accordance with the notice of Athenæus that Ptolemy bought the libraries of Aristotle and Theophrastus; and with various other stories which, having a less obvious bearing upon the question, we have omitted for the sake of brevity in their proper place, but which will be found stated shortly below in the note.* The other is inconsistent with these and many other facts, and may be rejected without invalidating the reputation of Strabo either for veracity or accuracy as regards matters which came within his knowledge, a reputation which we should be the last persons to desire to destroy. What then was the nature of these documents, the preservation of which was the foundation for so remarkable a story? We can only guess an answer, but we will nevertheless make the attempt.

Qualification of Strabo's narrative.

Athenæus,† quoting from the work of Posidonius the historian, a contemporary of Pompey the Great, gives a sketch of the character of Apellicon, which will perhaps throw a light upon this question. A man of vast wealth and restless disposition, and an adopted citizen of Athens, he appears to have alternately plunged himself into the turbulent politics of his time, and cultivated literature in a spurious kind of way. His taste for letters was a mere bibliomania, and brought him into trouble. He purchased, while the fit for philosophy was upon him, "the Peripatetic books and the library of Aristotle, and a great many others, being a man of large property. Moreover he surreptitiously obtained possession of the ancient original decrees of the Assembly, which were preserved in the temple of the Mother of the Gods, and from the other cities too he got hold of whatever was ancient and curious." This theft obliged him to save his life by flying the country: in the troublous times, however, which soon after succeeded he contrived to procure his recall by joining the party of the demagogue Athenion. This individual had induced his countrymen to take a part in the confederacy which Mithridates had organized against the power of Rome. In an evil hour Apellicon quitted book-collecting for military service. He took the command of an expedi-

Character of Apellicon the Teian.

His passion for curiosities.

λέγουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀριστοτέλους τὰ μὲν ἰωτερικὰ εἶναι τῶν συγγεγραμμένων αὐτῶν, τὰ δὲ κοινά τι καὶ ἐξωτερικά, where the true reading would seem to be *αὐτοῦ* instead of *αὐτῶν*.

* Vol. iii. p. 112. ed. Bipont.

† *Orat.* xxiii. p. 294.

‡ *Orat.* xxvi. p. 319. The allusion is to *Iliad*, v. 750; and there are some others in the context, equally tasteless and strained, to the marshalling of the Median army by Cyaxares (Herod. i. 98.) and to the palace of Agbatana with its concentric sevenfold walls. (Herod. i. 98.)

§ One great reason of this no doubt was the desire of reconciling him with Plato, which is observable in Themistius, and was by his time the great object of philosophers. See especially *Orat.* xx. p. 235, 236. Utterly unable to ascend to the point which would enable them to appreciate both, they endeavoured to establish a spurious agreement by the help of fictions like this.

‖ Ammonius, *loc. supra cit.*

¶ *Ad Auscult. Physic.* fol. 2. 6. line 22.

* I. Dionysius of Halicarnassus mentions it as a prevalent opinion that Demosthenes owed his skill in oratory to the study of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, and takes some trouble to prove by quotations in that work from Demosthenes that all his famous Orations (the twelve *Philippics*, as they were called) were delivered before that work was written. (*Ep.* i. *ad Ammæum.*) II. Theophrastus corresponded with Eudemus concerning certain errors in the copies of the fifth book of the *Physical Lectures*, (Andronicus Rhodius, *ap.* Simplicium, quoted by Brandis, p. 245.) III. Valerius Maximus relates that Aristotle first of all gave his *Rhetoric* to a favourite scholar, Theodectes, and that it was published under his name; but that his greediness for reputation afterwards induced him to claim it for himself, by quoting from it in another work as his own production, (viii. 14.)

† Athenæus, v. cap. liii. p. 214. 215.

Biography.

tion against Delos which was occupied by Orbius the Roman prætor; but displayed such utter ignorance of the commonest duties of a commander that his enemy soon found an opportunity of attacking him unawares, destroyed or captured the whole of his troops, and burnt all the machines which he had constructed for storming the city. The unfortunate dilettante escaped with his life, but died, in what way is not known, before Sylla stormed Athens and seized on the library which had cost him so dear.* It seems almost certain from this account of Apellicon, that it was the possession not of the works but of the autographs of them which was the attraction to him. Can we then conceive that it was the original autographs of Aristotle and Theophrastus which he purchased from the representatives of Neleus's family?—Autographs of what works? Not of the exoteric: for these were so generally known that he would have had no difficulty in filling up the gaps which the damp and worms had caused in his copy. Nor of the systematic treatises; for if the original manuscript of these had existed, Andronicus would have had no difficulty in determining what was by Aristotle, and what not, in the various cases where that question arose. Of neither of these classes of writing then can we imagine that the story of Strabo is to be understood. But if we suppose Aristotle to have left behind him, as every literary man whose energies last to the end of his life will do, collections on various subjects, rough draughts of future works, common-place books, some of a miscellaneous nature, some devoted to particular matters, containing, it may be, extracts from other writers, references to their opinions, germs of thoughts hereafter to be worked out, lines of argument merely indicated;—it is very conceivable that these documents, so long as a healthy and lively philosophical spirit existed in the Peripatetic school, would receive very little attention. If they were too fragmentary and unsystematic for publication they would remain in the possession of Theophrastus and Neleus,† too curious to destroy, too unfinished to make any use of; and if the heirs of Neleus were illiterate men, they would see nothing in them but so many slovenly and disjointed scrawls, and not dream of putting them among the sumptuous collection of books which they sold to King Ptolemy. But in the time of Apellicon, the state of things was changed. The relics of the founder of the school would have acquired a sacred character, and unsaleable as they might have been to Ptolemy, who appears to have been a real lover of literature and not a mere book-fancier, would fetch a good price with the purchaser of stolen records. And it is not at all inconsistent with this view, that a person whose acquaintance with philosophy was of such a kind, should mistake the nature of the documents he had got hold of,—"attempt to supply the gaps when he transcribed the text in new copies,—fill these up the reverse of well,—and send the books out into the world full of mistakes."‡

What the manuscripts of Aristotle were which he obtained.

Such is the theory which, it appears to us, will reconcile the varying accounts respecting Aristotle's writings, and which while it sweeps away all that is adventitious in the statement of the Greek geographer, will leave his testimony substantially unimpaired. And this theory is in fact confirmed by the state in which some of the works of Aristotle have come down to us. For some of these are not merely books kept by the author and continually worked at, like the *Rhetoric*, and Theophrastus's *History of Plants*, nor are they mere notes for lectures, a dry skeleton of the subject, complete in themselves and only requiring the illustration and developement which would be supplied by the extemporaneous efforts of the instructor. Neither of these two descriptions will explain all the phenomena which strike the reader in the *Poetics* and the *Politics*, as these two treatises are found in our manuscripts. Neither of them complete the discussion of the range of topics which they promise, and it is impossible to receive as a satisfactory explication of this fact that they are only fragments of complete works of which the remainder has been lost. This is quite incompatible with what we find in them, namely redundancies—whole paragraphs recast, and standing *together with* those for which they seem meant as a substitute.* Such appearances are only to be understood on the supposition that the work in which they occur was an interleaved *draught* of a *future* treatise, itself never published (nor yet intended for publication) by the author. In such a case we should expect to find what we do find here, and certainly not, to the same extent, in any other work,—scholia containing archæological or historical notes inserted in the midst of metaphysical divisions, imperfect analyses, defective enumerations, tacit references to writings of others or to opinions current at the time, allusions to questions treated on by the author in the work, which are nowhere to be found, gaps where obviously something was to be inserted, and expressions so slovenly as to be almost or wholly ungrammatical. To give instances of all these incongruities would extend this article to a much greater length; and therefore we must oblige our readers to take the assertion on our credit, assuring them that an attentive perusal of the works will supply them with several instances of each.† And if we suppose them to be note-books devoted to the particular subjects on which they treat, kept by the author until the materials they contained had been worked up and published in a complete form, and then discarded by him, we shall see in what relation they probably stood to the works read by Cicero,‡ and named in the catalogues of Diogenes Laertius and the anonymous biographer,§ and understand what kind of writings those in all probability were,

Aristotle.

Reconciliation of the several notices on the subject.

Nature of the *Politics* and *Poetics*

* Stahr, *Aristotelia*, ii. p. 119.

† Parts of some of them may very likely have been incorporated by Theophrastus, Strabo, and others in works of their own; a proceeding which in those days would not have been considered a plagiarism. Such too was doubtless the case with all mere collections, such as the *Problems* and the book περὶ ἀκουσμάτων ἀνωνυμάτων, which, as we have it now, probably contains additions from several hands.

‡ Strabo, *loc. supr. cit.*

* A remarkable instance of this, is *Politic.* iii. p. 1287, col. 1, line 1, col. 2, line 36, which the passage p. 1285, col. 2, line 37, p. 1286, col. 2, line 40, is obviously intended to supersede. The latter is a more digested and orderly arrangement of the topics in the former.

† We must stipulate, however, that the investigator shall not make use of any text previous to that of Bekker for this purpose. The former editors, partly from the want of MSS., and partly from ignorance of the style of thought and language peculiar to their author, have made strange havoc with these writings.

‡ *De legg.* iii. 6. *De divin.* ii. 1. *Epp. ad* Quint. *Frat.* iii. 5.

§ Diogenes quotes περὶ ποιητῶν in three books, προτρεπτικὸν τέχνης ποιητικῆς in two books, ποιητικὰ in one book, (perhaps the treatise we have,) περὶ τραγῳδιῶν in one book,—all of which had some relation to the *Poetics*; and πολιτικὰς in two books, ὑπὲρ Ἀναξίνων in one book, περὶ βασιλείας in one book, περὶ παιδείας in one book, οἰκονομικὰς in one book, πολιτικὰ in two books, πολιτικὴ ἀκρόασις ἣν ἡ Θεοφράστου in eight books, περὶ δικαίων in two books, δικαιώματα in one book, and one hundred and fifty-eight constitutions of democratic,

which descended with the rest of Aristotle's library to Theophrastus and from Theophrastus to Neleus, which were neglected by the librarians of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and emerged from their obscurity in the vault of Scepsis to be purchased by the antiquarian Apellicon. Only in making this estimate we must not forget the different importance which such writings possess for us, deprived for ever of those which were formed out of them,—and for their author and his immediate successors, to whom they would appear in no other light than the scaffold, by the aid of which the cathedral has been erected, does to the architect. And perhaps we may properly imagine that the greater fulness of these procured their preservation after they were recovered, while many others of the same kind, but yet further removed from completeness, were suffered to perish.

Literary notice of the existing writings of Aristotle.

We will conclude this memoir by a brief literary notice of the works published under the name of Aristotle, in the order in which they are given in the edition of the Berlin Academy.

I. *Categories.* (κατηγορίαι, or κατηγορίαι περὶ τῶν δέκα γενικωτάτων γενῶν.) The genuineness of this work was much disputed in the time of the old commentators. Adrastus found a work on the same subject bearing the name of Aristotle, and, singularly enough, consisting of exactly the same number of lines. It was, however, determined to be genuine by them, with the exception of the last part, which treats on what the Latin logicians term the *Postprædicamenta*. This extends from the tenth chapter to the end. The work of Harris, called *Philosophical Arrangements*, is an exposition, very much in the manner of the old commentators, of this treatise. A short but most masterly critique on it will be found in Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, p. 79. Adrastus wished to call the work τὰ πρὸ τῶν τοπικῶν, considering it as merely an introduction to the *Topics*, a proposition which Porphyry disapproves of.

II. *On Interpretation.* (περὶ ἑρμηνείας.) A philosophical treatise on grammar, as far as relates to the nature of nouns and verbs. Some of the old commentators from its obscurity imagined it to be a mere collection of notes, and Andronicus considered it not to be Aristotle's. Alexander of Aphrodisias, however, and Ammonius, prove it to be his, and to have been used by Theophrastus in a treatise of the same name which he wrote.

III. *Former Analytics*, (I. II.) *Latter Analytics*, (I. II.) (ἀναλυτικὰ πρότερα, ἀναλυτικὰ ὕστερα.) Of the former of these treatises the true and ancient title was περὶ συλλογισμοῦ, and that of the latter περὶ ἀποδείξεως. The old commentators found forty books on this subject, professedly by Aristotle, and determined on the genuineness of these only, rejecting all the rest. Their subject is that which in modern times is especially termed logic, but would be more properly called dialectics, that is, an examination of the possible forms in which an assertion may be made and a conclusion established.

Theophrastus, Eudemus, and Phanias, scholars of Aristotle, wrote treatises on the same subjects as these three of their master, and called by the same name, a circumstance which probably had some connection with the number of "Analytics" ascribed to him.

IV. *Topics.* (I. II. III. IV. V. VI. VII., VIII.) (τοπικά.) An analysis of the different heads from which demonstrative arguments may be brought. It was considered by the ancient commentators as the easiest of all Aristotle's systematic works. The Romans, however, as Cicero tells us in the preface to his work of the same name, found it so difficult as to be repelled by it, although he himself praises it no less for its language than for its scientific merits. His own work is an epitome of it, made by himself from memory, during a sea voyage from Velia to Rhegium.

V. *On Sophistical Proofs.* (I. II.) (περὶ σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων.) An analysis of the possible forms of fallacy in demonstration. This work has a natural connection with the *Topics*, as Aristotle himself remarks in the beginning of the last chapter of the second book.

The preceding works taken together complete Aristotle's logical writings, and with Porphyry's Introduction to the *Categories* have gone generally in modern times by the name of the *Organum*, from the circumstance of Aristotle having called Logic ὄργανον ὀργάνων. The philosopher gave this name to the art, because of all others it is the most purely *instrumental*, that is, the most entirely a means to something else, and the least an end to be desired for its own sake. The *term*, however, was in subsequent ages misapplied to mean that it was the *best of all instruments* for the discovery of truth, as opposed to the observation of facts, and the *art* was correspondently abused.

VI. *Physical Lectures.* (I. II. III. IV. V. VI. VII. VIII.) (φυσικὴ ἀκρόασις.) It is a very questionable thing whether this treatise was published by the author as one organic whole. The three last books probably formed a treatise by themselves under the name περὶ κινήσεως,* and the five first another under that of φυσικά. Again of these the first one is quite independent of the rest, and is devoted to the discussion of the first principles (ἀρχαί,†) to which every thing in nature may be resolved. This book is extremely valuable for the history of philosophy before the time of Aristotle. He discusses in it the theories of Melissus, Parmenides, Anaxagoras, Empedocles, and others. The second is taken up with an examination of the ideas of Nature, Necessity, and Chance; and the next three with the properties of Body, or rather with the analysis of those notions of the understanding which are involved in the idea of Body. Of this work abstracts and syllabuses (κεφαλαῖα καὶ συνόψεις) were very early made by the Peripatetic school,‡ and these keeping their attention fixed upon the connection of a system of dogmas, contributed perhaps much to divert them from the observation of nature, and to keep up that confusion between laws of the Understanding and laws of Nature which pervades the whole of the ancient physical speculations.

VII. *On the Heavens.* (I. II. III IV.) (περὶ οὐρανοῦ.) Alexander of Aphrodisias considered that the proper

oligarchal, aristocratic, and monarchical states, all having some bearing on the *Politics*. To these perhaps may be added from the anonymous writer, περὶ εὐγενείας in one book, περὶ συσσιτίων ἢ συμποσίων in one book, θέσεις πολιτικαὶ in two books, πολιτικὴ ἀκρόασις in twenty books, Τρύλλος in three books, διαιρέματα πέλλων in one book. However these writings may have been confused by the unskilful epitomizers of Hermippus, it is quite plain that Aristotle wrote a great deal more on both these subjects than has come down to us.

* Simpl. *ad. Phys. Auscult. f.* 216. Diogenes, however, gives a work, περὶ κινήσεως, in *two* books. This is not conclusive against the opinion quoted in the text. See below, the notice respecting the *Rhetoric*.

† Perhaps it is to this book that the title περὶ ἀρχῶν, in Diogenes's Catalogue, refers.

‡ Simplicius (*Introd. ad Phys. Ausc.* vi. and vii.)

name for this work was περὶ κοσμου, as only the first two books are really on the subject of the heavenly bodies and their circular motion. The two last treat on the four elements and the properties of gravity and lightness, and afford much information relative to the systems of Empedocles and Democritus.

VIII. *On Generation and Decay.* (I. II.) (περὶ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς.) This work treats on those properties of bodies which in our times would be considered to be the proper subject of physiological and of chemical science. Many other notions, however, of a metaphysical nature are mixed up with these, and it is only for its illustration of the history of philosophy that this work, like the rest of the physical treatises, is of any value to the modern student.

IX. *Meteorology.* (I. II. III. IV.) (μετεωρολογικά.) The first of these books was by some in the time of the old commentators held not to be genuine; and Ammonius and others considered that the fourth should immediately follow the second of the last treatise, with which the subjects on which it treats, the changes effected in bodies by heat and cold, moisture and dryness, &c., are certainly more connected.

X. *To Alexander, on the World.* (περὶ κόσμου πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον.) The titles of this tract in the various MSS. differ much from one another. In one it is called περὶ κοσμογραφέας; in another περὶ κόσμου καὶ ἑτέρων ἀναγκαίων; in a third σύνοψις φιλοσοφίας περὶ κόσμου; in Stobæus ἐπιστολὴ περὶ τοῦ παντος, which Fabricius holds to be the true title. He considers the work to be genuine, contrary to the opinion of Scaliger, Salmasius, Casaubon, Voss, and Buhle. Fabricius's opinion has been taken up by Weisse, but the spuriousness of the piece is glaring. Stahr (*Aristoteles bei den Roemern*, p. 165, *et seq.*) has, as we think, satisfactorily shown that it is in all probability a composition of very late date, based upon Apuleius's work *De Mundo*, which has sometimes been taken to be a translation of it.

XI. *On the Soul.* (I. II. III.) (περὶ ψυχῆς.) In the first of these books are discussed the opinions of preceding philosophers upon this subject; in the second, the Soul in its sensible relations; in the third, in its rational ones. A celebrated dialogue of Aristotle's, to which we have before referred,* bore this same title; and such as consider that the *exoteric* works were *all* in the form of dialogues, imagine that in the Nicomachean Ethics he alludes to it. At the same time there are parts of the third book of this treatise which seem apt for his purpose in that place, and although the work serves to make up that system of Aristotle's to which the preceding physical treatises as well as the following belong, it is sufficiently independent of them to allow of its being perfectly understood without their perusal; a character which in our opinion is the only *essential* one of an exoteric writing.

XII. Eight tracts on physical subjects, namely,

(*a.*) *On Perception and Objects of Perception.* (περὶ αἰσθήσεως καὶ αἰσθητῶν.)

(*b.*) *On Memory and Recollection.* (περὶ μνήμης καὶ ἀναμνήσεως.)

(*c.*) *On Sleep and Waking.* (περὶ ὕπνου καὶ ἐγρηγόρσεως.)

(*d.*) *On Dreams.* (περὶ ἐνυπνίων.)

(*e.*) *On the Prophetic Vision in Sleep.* (περὶ τῆς καθ' ὕπνον μαντικῆς.)

(*f.*) *On Length and Shortness of Life.* (περὶ μακροβιότητος καὶ βραχυβιότητος.)

(*g.*) *On Youth and Age, Life and Death.* (περὶ νεότητος καὶ γήρως καὶ περὶ ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου.)

(*h.*) *On Respiration.* (περὶ ἀναπνοῆς.)

XIII. *On Breath.* (περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος.) This treatise, of which the subject is the same as that of the last mentioned, except that there is more reference in it to the lower animals, has been considered by many not to be by Aristotle. Sylburg considers the style to point to Alexander of Aphrodisias as its author. Meursius thought it probably to be by Theophrastus, and Patritius by Strato, principally because such a book is mentioned by Diogenes among the writings of these. Fabricius considers it to be Aristotle's, because Aristotle himself, in his treatise *On the Motion of Animals*, appears to allude to it, and Galen quotes it as his. But neither of these two passages are quite conclusive.

XIV. *Accounts of Animals.* (I.....X.) (περὶ τὰ ζῷα ἱστορίαι.) This work is variously entitled in the manuscripts, περὶ ζώων ἱστορία, τῶν περὶ ζώων ἱστορία. Pliny, (*Nat. Hist.* viii. 17.) where he speaks of Aristotle's magnificent work *On Animals*, in fifty books, appears to include together with this all the treatises on natural history which follow it, (and indeed are naturally connected with it,) as well as some on comparative anatomy, now lost. The same may be said of Cicero's notice of them, (*De Fin.* v. 4.) This work was illustrated by diagrams of the several parts of animals, which together with the necessary explanations perhaps formed a treatise by themselves. They are alluded to in several passages by the phrases ἡ ἐν ἀνατομαῖς διαγραφή· αἱ ἀνατομαί· αἱ ἀνατομαὶ διαγεγραμμέναι. Schneider, who has published an edition of this work most learnedly illustrated as regards the subject, not perceiving in it any traces of the injury which Aristotle's works, according to Strabo's account, received, was induced to consider it as one of the *exoteric* publications. But, in fact, the whole of the works on natural history are as closely connected with one another as the several parts of the *Organum*, and it would be difficult to assign any reason why the one class should be regarded as exoteric and the other not so.

XV. *On the Parts of Animals.* (περὶ ζῴων μορίων.) (I. II. III. IV.)

XVI. *On the Movement of Animals.* (περὶ ζῴων κινήσεως.)

A curious tract investigating the influences which operate *ab extra* upon animals. This treatise, together with the one following, and that *On Breath*, are often put together with the eight tracts before mentioned, (No. XII.) and make up what is called the *Parva Naturalia*.

XVII. *On the Locomotion of Animals.* (περὶ πορείας ζῴων.)

XVIII. *On the Engendering of Animals.* (I. II. III. IV. V.) (περὶ ζῴων γενέσεως.)

XIX. *On Colours.* (περὶ χρωμάτων.)

This has been considered by some critics to be the work of Theophrastus. Plutarch speaks of a treatise by Aristotle of the same name in *two* books.

XX. *From the Book on Sounds.* (ἐκ τοῦ περὶ ἀκουστῶν.)

Apparently a fragment; although Porphyry, who has preserved it in his commentary on the *Harmonicon* of Ptolemy, says that he has given the whole work.

XXI. *Physiognomica.* (φυσιογνωμικά.)

Of this tract the last chapter of the *Former Analytics*

* Page 121*. col. 2.

is a sort of compendium. Buhle considers it spurious. It is not mentioned by any of the old commentators, but is by Stobæus and by Diogenes Laertius in his catalogue.

XXII. *On Plants.* (I. II.) (περὶ φυτῶν.)

Aristotle wrote two books on plants, but not these which we have. They are a translation into Greek from the Latin; and even this version was considerably removed from a Greek original, having been made by some Gaul from an Arabian version, which again was only derived from a more ancient Latin translation. The original of all these, according to Scaliger, was only a cento of scraps taken partly from Aristotle, and partly from the first book of Theophrastus's *History of Plants.* Aristotle's work was already lost in the time of Alexander of Aphrodisias.

XXIII. *On Wonderful Stories.* (περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμάτων.)

This book, in spite of its title, is nothing more than a collection of strange accounts, nor does it appear to have formed a part of a larger work of at all a different description. The latter part is obviously spurious, and with respect to the remainder various opinions have been held. Dodwell considers Theophrastus to have been the author, Scaliger Aristotle. Buhle regards the whole as a patchwork of extracts from the works of the latter. Our opinion is that the germ of the work is to be looked for in one of those note-books or ὑπομνήματα which were appropriated to collections, and from which supplies were occasionally drawn for more systematic works;—and that this was in its transmission down to our times added to by several hands, and some of these most unskilful ones. See our notice of the *Problems* below, (No. XXV.)

XXIV. *Mechanics.* (μηχανικά.)

The first part of this work touches upon the principles of mechanics, and is followed by a number of questions which are resolved by a reference to them. This latter part is probably only a few of the προβλήματα ἐγκύκλια or questions on the whole cycle of science, which we find mentioned as a work of Aristotle's in two books by Diogenes Laertius, and which is quoted by Aulus Gellius.

XXV. *Problems.* (προβλήματα.)

This is a collection of questions on various subjects in thirty-eight divisions, of which the first relates to medical, the fifteenth to mathematical, the eighteenth to philological, the nineteenth to musical, the twenty-seventh and three following to ethical, and the rest mainly to physical and physiological matters. Theophrastus is also said to have compiled a collection of problems, and Pliny quotes him as the authority for a circumstance which we find mentioned in this work.* In his treatises too, περὶ κόπων and περὶ ἱδρώτων, there are several coincidences with the *Problems* of Aristotle; and hence some have held him really to be the author of these, while others have considered those works to be nothing more than a patchwork of Aristotle's *Problems.*

Besides the προβλήματα ἐγκύκλια which we mentioned under the last head, Diogenes mentions two books of προβλήματα ἐπιτεθεαμένα, (*problems reviewed,*) and two of προβλήματα ἐκ τῶν Δημοκρίτου, and Plutarch and Athenæus, and other authors, quote from his προβλήματα φυσικά. That the work which has come down to us is neither any one of these, nor the aggregate of them all, is certain. Sylburg in his preface points out several instances in which Aristotle himself speaks of questions discussed in them, which will be looked for in vain in the present treatise. Neither do we find some of the quotations made by Aulus Gellius, Macrobius, Apuleius, and Alexander of Aphrodisias. On the other hand, some citations which Gellius makes from the προβλήματα ἐγκύκλια, and one of Macrobius from the προβλήματα φυσικὰ are found. So are two citations by Cicero, and one by Galen, quoting generally from the *Problems.* These circumstances indicate that the work has been very much changed since it came from Aristotle's hands; and the most plausible hypothesis seems to be that the nucleus of the work is a selection* of the collections of Aristotle, and that Theophrastus added to it in its course down to us. There are many repetitions to be found in it, some even three times over with the change of only a few words; there is a great difference of style observable in several parts; in many of the more ancient manuscripts parts are omitted and others differently arranged; and as regards the philosophy, it is impossible to suppose that a part could proceed either from Aristotle or Theophrastus, or from any philosopher of an undegenerate age. A great deal is no doubt due to the book-makers under the Roman empire: it was a work particularly well suited to the manufacture of such miscellanies as the taste of that time delighted in, and, with the exception of the works on natural history, appears to have been by far the most generally known of any of the Aristotelian writings at that time. These circumstances render it necessary for the historian of philosophy to be extremely cautious how he infers the opinions of Aristotle upon any subject from it.

XXVI. *On Indivisible Lines.* (περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν.)

This tract is said by Simplicius to have been by some of the ancient commentators ascribed to Theophrastus.

XXVII. *The Quarters and Names of the Winds.* (ἀνέμων θέσεις καὶ προσηγορίαι.)

A fragment from Aristotle's work περὶ σημείων χειμώνων mentioned by Diogenes in his catalogue. This is found in some manuscripts of Theophrastus's work, but Salmasius considers it to be Aristotle's

XXVIII. *On Xenophanes, on Zeno, on Gorgias.* (περὶ Ξενοφάνους, περὶ Ζήνωνος, περὶ Γοργίου.)

This fragment, according to Brandis, is the only one, of all the works which have come down to us under the name of Aristotle's, which presents the least indication of that treatment which the manuscripts are said to have met with at the hands of Apellicon. This, too, and the *Mechanics* are the only works which Patritius allowed to be genuine. It is singular that one of the manuscripts ascribes it to Theophrastus. Another gives as a title κατὰ τὰς δοξὰς τῶν φιλοσόφων.

XXIX. *The Metaphysics.* (I. II.....XIV.) (τὰ μετὰ τὰ φυσικά.)

This collection of treatises is said to have been called by Andronicus by this name, because when he endeavoured to group the works of Aristotle together systematically, these remained after he had completed his physical cycle, and he had no better resource than to put them together after it. Harris† gives a different account of the name, which he grounds on a passage in a manuscript work of Philoponus. Men, he conceives,

* *Prob.* xxxiii. 12. Plin. *Hist. Nat.* xxviii. 6.

* Aristophanes the Alexandrine grammarian epitomized or otherwise abridged Aristotle's collection of Proverbs.

† Additional note to the second of *The Three Treatises*, p. 364, 5.

were led to the study of the highest causes, by an ascent from the contemplation of the lower or physical. Hence the first philosophy which treats of them was, from being subsequent in time to these physical inquiries, called *Metaphysical*. Brandis* relates from a manuscript commentary of Asclepius, (a writer of no great value,) that Aristotle had during his lifetime committed the several treatises, the aggregate of which goes by this name, to his scholar Eudemus, who considered that they were not in a fit state for publication; but that after his death subsequent Peripatetics (*οἱ μεταγενέστεροι*) endeavoured to work them up into a whole, supplying what was deficient from other works of their founder. Whatever may be the truth of this story, it is unquestionable that the arrangement of the several books is merely arbitrary, and several variations have been proposed, among others one by Petiti, which we annex with the addition of those works named by Diogenes Laertius in his catalogue, which he conceived to be identical with the several parts of this work. In the Greek manuscripts, the first book is denoted by the letter (A), the second, not by the letter (B), but by (α), the third by (B), the fourth by (Γ), and so regularly on to the fourteenth.

Greek MSS.	Du Val's arrangement.	Petiti's arrangement.	Works cited by Diogenes Laertius corresponding to the several parts of the Metaphysics.
1	1	5	*περὶ ἀρχῶν, ά.*
2	2	3	*περὶ ἐπιστημῶν, ά.*
3	3	6	*περὶ ἀρχῶν, β'.*
4	4	4	*περὶ ἐπιστημῶν, β.*
5	5	1	*περὶ τῶν ποσαχῶς λεγομένων.*
6	6	7	*περὶ εἰδῶν καὶ γενῶν, ά.*
7	7	8	
8	8	9	*περὶ ὕλης.*†
9	9	10	*περὶ ἐνεργείας.*†
10	10	2	*ἡ ἐκλογὴ τῶν ἐναντίων.*
11	13	14	*περὶ ἐπιστήμης.*
12	14	13	*περὶ φιλοσοφίας, ά.*
13	11	11	*περὶ φιλοσοφίας, β'.*
14	12	12	*περὶ φιλοσοφίας, γ'.*

The thirteenth and fourteenth books are not found in the old Latin version, or that of Argyropylus. The second book (α of the Greek MSS.) was considered by some of the ancient commentators to be the work of Pasicrates the Rhodian, brother of Eudemus. Alexander of Aphrodisias says that it is by Aristotle, but is mutilated. Others have held that it is a sort of scholium, and that its proper place is as a preface to the second book of the *Physical Lectures*. And the circumstance of its being denoted by so singular a mark in the manuscripts would lead us to conclude that some opinion of this sort was widely received.

XXX. *Nicomachean Ethics.* (I. II. III. ....X.) (*ἠθικὰ Νικομαχεῖα.*)

This is one of the most perspicuous, as well as most valuable of the works of Aristotle which has come down to us. Although in a scientific form, there is a reference throughout to practical utility, and Aristotle himself seems to avow that he has sacrificed some of the rigidness of his method to this consideration. It is, however, unequalled to this day as a treatise on Morals. On the subject of the name different accounts are given. Most of the ancient commentators assert that it was so called by Aristotle because inscribed to his son Nicomachus. Cicero appears, as we have seen, to consider the son the author. Petiti endeavours to show that the treatise was written at a time when Nicomachus was not born. It was probably, like the *Rhetoric*, worked at by the author after having been published, and this will account for some of those passages which he considers to be interpolations by him.

XXXI. *The Great Ethics.* (I. II.) (*ἠθικὰ μεγάλα.*)

XXXII. *The Eudemian Ethics.* (I. II. III. IV. V. VI. VII.) (*ἠθικὰ Εὐδήμεια.*)

This work was in ancient times attributed to Theophrastus or Eudemus. The third and three following books agree considerably both in subject and style with the fifth, sixth, and seventh of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Some of this agreement may be artificial and arise from the transcribers interpolating the one work from the other. But it seems highly probable that both this treatise and the *Great Ethics* are books made up from the notes of Aristotle's scholars. They, particularly the last named, which, contrary to what its name would lead us to expect, is by far the shortest, seem to stand in very much the same relation to the *Nicomachean*, as the little book *Anweisung zur Menschen-und-Welt-kenntniss* (which was published by a scholar of Kant's from notes of a course of lectures delivered by him) does to the work *Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht*, which the philosopher himself published.

XXXIII. *On Virtues and Vices.* (*περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ κακιῶν.*

A spurious fragment preserved by Stobæus. The author is by some scholars supposed to be Andronicus of Rhodes; but others think it should rather be attributed to a platonizing eclectic of later times.

XXXIV. *Politics.* I. ... VIII. (*πολιτικά.*)

Of this work we have given our opinion in an earlier part of the Article, (page 124*, col. 2.)

XXXV. *Economics.* (I. II.) (*οἰκονομικά.*)

Of Aristotle's work bearing this name Diogenes Laertius only mentions one book; and of these it seems quite evident that both are not by the same author. Erasmus held the first to be Aristotle's but to be only a fragment, but Niebuhr considers that lately discovered authorities prove it incontestably to be by Theophrastus.

If the second book is Aristotle's, it is probably a collection made by him when collecting materials for his historical and philosophical writings on government. It is chiefly a string of instances of oppression exercised by one people upon another, or by tyrants upon their subjects.

XXXVI. *The Art of Rhetoric.* (I. II. III.) (*τέχνη ῥητορική.*)

Besides these books which contain his exposition of the art, Aristotle wrote one other which contained a history of it and of its professors from the earliest times to his own. Of this Cicero speaks in the highest terms, but it is unfortunately lost. The division into three books is ingeniously conjectured by Stahr* to be due to Andronicus of Rhodes. Some of the MSS. collated by Bekker mark this division as peculiar to the manuscripts of the *Latin* arrangement. The *Greek* one terminated the first book with the end of the ninth chapter, and

* *Rhein. Mus.* i. p. 242, note (19.)

† These are not mentioned by Diogenes.

* *Aristoteles bei den Roemern*, p. 30.

made our second book the third. Jonsius conjectures that the treatise mentioned by Diogenes in his catalogue under the title περὶ συμβουλίας, is the sixth and seventh chapters of the first book of this work. That this work is a different one from that which Aristotle is said to have made over to his scholar Theodectes* appears from a passage† in which he quotes that treatise. Hence it would seem that independently of the *Rhetoric to Alexander*, the author of which is uncertain, Aristotle published three distinct works on this subject, which certainly accords with what Cicero says,‡ that the Peripatetics boasted "that Aristotle and Theophrastus not only wrote better, but wrote *much more* on the subject of oratory than all the professed masters of the science."

But it seems to us more probable that the work which he cites was one *by* Theodectes, his own scholar, and that Valerius Maximus mistook for an act of envy what was more probably meant and taken for a flattering encouragement. The first sketch of the *Rhetoric* was, as is remarked by Niebuhr, published long before it was worked up into the form we have it in now, and in this interval Theodectes, of whom Cicero speaks as a writer on the subject, probably published his book. It will be observed that Aristotle does not cite the treatise as his own; but this was overlooked by Valerius, or the authority whom he followed, and the tale we have mentioned above was coined to illustrate the passage. It may also be remarked that the *double* publication of the *Rhetoric* will serve to account for the growth of that story which Dionysius of Halicarnassus takes so much pains to refute.* No one could have hazarded such a fiction with all the quotations from Demosthenes under his very eyes. It must have originated with some one who used a copy of the *early* edition; while Dionysius in his refutation used the later.

XXXVII. *The Rhetoric to Alexander.* (ῥητορικὴ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον.)

This treatise is not mentioned by Diogenes Laertius in his catalogue of Aristotle's works; and the dedicatory preface at the beginning is a solitary instance, if it be a writing of Aristotle's, of such a proceeding. Quintilian appears to quote it as the production of Anaximenes of Lampsacus, a contemporary of the Stagirite. Neither the style nor the treatment of the subject accords with the character of the last work, and perhaps what most contributed to procure its ascription to Aristotle is the circumstance that the writer claims the authorship of the τέχναι τῷ Θεοδέκτῃ γραφεῖσαι, which, according to the story of Valerius Maximus spoken of in the last Article, could only belong to Alexander's preceptor. In spite of this, Victorius and Buhle have attributed the work to Callisthenes. We should be inclined to consider it the performance of a sophist of a very late date, and should regard the allusion to Theodectes as a confirmation of the opinion.

XXXVIII. *On the Poetic Art.* (περὶ ποιητικῆς.)

On the subject of this work we have already given our opinion. It has been considered by some a fragment of the two books *On Poets*, which Macrobius quotes, but it hardly seems possible to consider it in this light. If it is derived in any way from a published work, it must have been by a process of epitomizing and selecting, and that not very skilfully.

* See above, p. 123*, col. 2, note*, and compare Cicero, *Brut.* 64.
† P. 1410, col. 2, line 2, ed. Bekker.
‡ *De Oratore*, i. 10.

* See above, p. 12 , col. 2, note *.

TIBERIUS GRACCHUS.

U. C. 621. B. C. 133.

Biography. U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

THERE are few portions of history more deserving our attention, than that to which we now return, the civil wars of the Romans. The origin of these wars arose from the conflict between the interests of the two great divisions of society—the rich and the poor. The characters and events which marked their progress, possess every quality most fitted to awaken a lively interest in the reader; and their final issue, in establishing a monarchy as the government of the civilized world, may possibly have exercised an influence over the fate of Europe, which we feel even at this day. They are most remarkable also, as they exhibit the state of mankind at the period immediately preceding the promulgation of Christianity: when, therefore, if experience be the measure of knowledge, the world must have attained to the highest point in intellectual and moral discoveries which it has ever reached without the assistance of revelation. It will surely be no uninteresting inquiry to collect, so far as we can, the general amount of human virtue and happiness antecedently to the great revolution introduced by the preachers of the Gospel; in order that we may judge of the probable result of the destruction of Christianity, which some avowedly, and many indirectly, consider as desirable.

The period then of the civil wars of Rome, which comprises somewhat more than a hundred years, from the Tribuneship of Tiberius Gracchus to the final establishment of monarchy, in the person of Octavius Cæsar, divides itself naturally into two portions The first of these ends at the death of Sylla, and the ascendency of the aristocratical party, which was effected by his government. And it is upon this first division that we now prepare to enter.

At Rome, as in many other countries, the original distinctions between the different ranks of society were wholly arbitrary. The patricians and plebeians were two separate castes, between which insurmountable barriers existed. No wealth, nor talents, nor virtues, could raise a plebeian to the rank and privileges of a patrician; and as all intermarriages between the two classes were unlawful, the government was an hereditary oligarchy, from which the bulk of the nation, with their posterity for ever, were by law utterly excluded. The details of the particular events by which this system was overthrown, belong to the unknown period of Roman history. Before the Punic wars, however, it was entirely subverted; all offices of state were laid open to the plebeians, while the Tribuneship was still, as before, exclusively their own: and a more liberal aristocracy was formed, in which nobility began to be derived from the possession of high political dignities, instead of being the necessary previous qualification for obtaining them. But a third caste in the commonwealth still subsisted, composed of those persons who either by birth, or by captivity in war, or by the violence of regular slave traders, were doomed to the condition of slavery. The fortune of this caste was not so totally without hope as that of the old plebeians, because a slave might be enfranchised; and when once a freeman, the course of time, or extraordinary personal merit, might remove the taint of slavery from his blood, and raise his posterity to honours and power. But so long as he remained a slave, his degradation was complete; he was not considered as a member of the commonwealth, he could hold no property except by his master's sufferance; and his protection from the extremity of personal violence was little better than nugatory. The little notice which the ancient writers have paid to this class of men, has perhaps prevented us from sufficiently estimating their effect on the state of society. We cannot, however, form a correct notion of the relative situations of the rich and the poor at Rome, without keeping in mind the existence of so large a proportion of the whole population in the condition of slavery. The numbers of slaves increased greatly with the increasing dominion of the republic; we have already seen how many were carried off from Africa, in the descents made on that coast in the two first Punic wars; fifty thousand more are mentioned as having been taken at one time in the destruction of Carthage; and no fewer than a hundred and fifty thousand were sold for the benefit of the army that had defeated Perseus, collected from the sack of seventy towns in Epirus. These were purchased in large multitudes, and probably at a low price, by the great landed proprietors of Italy; and generally superseded the use of free labourers, as their work was much cheaper, and could be exacted with greater severity. In consequence of this, the lower orders of freemen were reduced to great distress, and their numbers were rapidly diminished; insomuch, that in process of time, there was no such thing as a free peasantry to be found in some parts of Italy; slaves being used almost exclusively as agricultural labourers, and forming probably by much the largest proportion of those employed in trade or manufactures. At the same time, the legions were filled with none but freemen; and they whose swords gained the republic her conquests, were impatient at seeing the fruits of their victories pass into the hands of others, while their own condition was absolutely rendered worse by the consequences of their own valour. For we must not attribute our own notions on public matters to the citizens of the ancient commonwealths. The states of antiquity being for the most part only single cities, political association was regarded very much in the light of a commercial partnership, of which national property formed as it were the stock; and any acquisitions made by the national arms were looked upon as the profits of the trade, in which every partner ought to share. Thus, when territory was gained in war, the bulk of the people wished to have an immediate division of it made amongst them; whilst the government, or managing partners, were anxious that it should still be employed in advancing the joint interests of the whole body, instead of enrich-

Tiberius Gracchus. U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

ing the individual shareholders. In other words, they wished it to be sold to the highest bidder, and the price to be thrown into the treasury to supply the usual wants of the public service. This in fact was the system usually adopted at Rome; and thus large landed estates came into the hands of the rich, whilst the poor fancied that they did not gain in their due proportion from the growing greatness of their country. To remedy the evil, a popular Tribune in the early ages of the republic, C. Licinius, had proposed and carried the famous law which bears his name; and which limited the amount of land which any citizen might possess, to 500 jugera, calculated by Arbuthnot at equal to 330 English acres. But this law was sometimes evaded, by land being held for the proprietor under other names;* and was sometimes openly disregarded. During the second Punic war, however, and the period that followed it for several years, the nobility enlarged their estates without opposition; partly, perhaps, because the aristocratical interest was at this time all powerful; and partly, because as the lands were alienated by regular sale, so long as the former owners could find employment as tenants or labourers, and were not superseded by the general substitution of slaves, the change in their condition was patiently borne. But when they found themselves every where supplanted by a class of men whom they so thoroughly despised, they either saw themselves debarred altogether from rearing a family, or they were forced to migrate to Rome, and swell the multitude of needy citizens in that city. The temptation thus offered to them to disturb the existing order of things, was peculiarly strong. As individuals, the poor often suffered from the grasping and oppressive spirit of the rich: yet, as members of the popular assembly, they formed a part of the sovereign power in the state, and might amply retaliate on the higher orders for the losses they had suffered. And here it becomes an exceedingly curious question, what was the general character of the popular party at Rome; what was their station in society, and what were their moral and intellectual attainments; as it is on a knowledge of these points, that our judgment of the disputes which so long distracted the commonwealth must mainly depend. For if the *Comitia* were no better than an ignorant and profligate rabble, no true friend to liberty can possibly sympathize with their cause: but if they consisted of men industrious though poor, of men whose views were directed towards a reasonable and definite object, whose private morals were fair, and who respected law and order; we shall then not brand them with the name of anarchists, merely because the reform which they proposed to effect, could in our days be attempted by none but the most desperate enemies of the peace of society.

The Roman plebeians, or all those citizens not of patrician extraction, whose property did not entitle them to be ranked among the equestrian order, may be divided into two classes; those who lived habitually in Rome, and those who were settled as small landed proprietors, as tenants of national property, or as labourers, in different parts of Italy. The former were naturally those who chiefly composed the popular assemblies, and they consisted of shopkeepers and mechanics, and of that lowest description of populace by which great towns in a genial climate are especially infested; where shelter and fuel and clothing being less important, they can more easily live without regular employment, as having fewer wants to provide for; and where even the food required is of a lighter quality, and consists of articles procurable at the cheapest rate, such as fruit, vegetables, oil, and the light wine of the country. These men would have all the qualities fitted to make them mischievous: idleness, improvidence, a total absence of all the feelings of honest independence, and a great sense of their own importance, both as freemen, while so many who enjoyed far more personal comforts were slaves, and as members of a body whose power was the greatest in the world. Nor must we at all judge of the shopkeepers at Rome by those of London or Paris. The sale for their goods would lie chiefly among the common people; because the rich supplied themselves with most of the articles they consumed, from the produce of their lands and the labour of their slaves. Their profits therefore were not likely to be very considerable, and their rank in society would be proportionably low. If we then remember the illiterate state of the Roman people in general at the period of which we are now speaking; and if we reflect besides, that whatever literature did exist, must have been confined almost exclusively to the higher orders from the expensiveness of books; we cannot ascribe much general or political information to the plebeians of the city. Last of all, we know what the morals of the lower classes in large cities are at this day, when their opportunities of being rightly taught are far greater than could possibly have been enjoyed at Rome. Without descending to the mere idle and dissolute populace, we should probably have found in the bulk of the plebeian inhabitants, a sense of their own interest generally predominant, a violent and cruel spirit towards those whom they looked upon as their opponents, and an obstinacy in maintaining blindly their own notions, mixed at the same time with many kind and generous affections towards their families and friends, and an attachment to the name and institutions of their country, which was liable indeed to be misled or overpowered for a time, but which was in the main strong and sincere. The plebeians of the country are generally spoken of by Roman writers, as a more respectable class than those of the city. They were more steadily industrious, as having less to call off their attention from their own employment: they were more domestic in their habits, and not only less apt for political contests from their manner of living, but in their houses and fields they possessed a property which they were less willing to hazard in civil commotions. The beautiful picture which Virgil gives of the simplicity and happiness of the small landed proprietors of Italy, although of course highly embellished, was doubtless not altogether imaginary; and it may be added, that the hard-heartedness to the general welfare of the poor, which is so often the fault of our farmers, was less called into action among the Romans; in whose country there were no poor-rates nor parochial offices to excite a continual soreness in an uneducated mind; and where the farmer had scarcely any connection with more than his own household and labourers; a class of people whom it is most natural and obvious to treat with kindness and familiarity. Yet the agricultural plebeians must have been ignorant, and were likely to

* Plutarch, *Vita Tib. Gracchi*, c. 8.

Biography. inherit the violence and obstinacy by which ignorance is ever accompanied. They must have entertained too a peculiar jealousy of the great nobility, by whom their own rank in society had been in so many instances overwhelmed; and when they came to the *Comitia* in the city, they were incapable of resisting the eloquence of popular orators, ever ready to encourage their angry feelings against the rich, to flatter their self-importance, and to persuade them that their interests were the same with the public good. Above all, the nature of mankind is such, that even the best and most highly educated individuals, when assembled together in a numerous body, are apt to be more swayed by passion and less by principle than if they were deliberating alone or in a small society. Much more is this the case when the inhabitants of a great city are promiscuously crowded together; for then the evil predominates with a fearful ascendency, and a physical and moral excitement is created, which destroys the exercise of the judgment, and drowns the voice of moderation and self-restraint; leaving the mind open to any unreasonable impression that may be produced, whether of ridicule, of indignation, of compassion, or of pride.

It results then, from this view of the state of the plebeians, that the popular party in the times of Tiberius Gracchus was made up of very heterogenous elements; that one division of it, the mere city populace, was thoroughly worthless; but that others were composed of industrious and often well meaning men, whose great misfortune it was to have a power placed in their hands collectively, far more than proportioned to their knowledge. On the other hand, the aristocratical party consisted of materials not less discordant. Among those who had engrossed the landed estates of Italy, there were many who in the command of armies or in the government of provinces, had given the utmost proofs of cruelty and rapacity, and who displayed the same temper to their poorer countrymen at home. Others again sought merely to gratify the pride of nobility by the enjoyment of a large fortune and influence: these were men whose selfishness was passive, so long as it was indulged to the utmost, but who could behave with the most unscrupulous cruelty towards any who should attempt to restrain it. A third class consisted of those whose minds were loftier, and whose ambition was of a nobler character: men who delighted in conducting the councils or heading the armies of the state; who wished to promote the greatness of their country, perhaps without being conscious to themselves how far a love of their own individual greatness mingled in the wish; and who felt the besetting vice of great abilities, contempt for the ordinary race of mankind. Such persons, like the magnanimous man of Aristotle's philosophy, having done the state great service, thought it just that their station in it should be preeminent; and scorned the thought of admitting the lower classes of the people to a participation in their grandeur, as an outrage on the majesty of Rome. So complicated are the motives by which we are actuated, and so hard is it where our own welfare coincides with what we deem the public good, to decide how much of a selfish bias determined us in forming our opinion. There yet remained a fourth description of supporters of the aristocracy, in those who by their own merit had raised themselves to a fair and honourable affluence; those who had inherited, or acquired by commerce, a respectable but not an overgrown fortune; those who, content with little had obtained consideration by their eloquence, their military services, or their tried integrity; and those of the nobility themselves, who though poor were without covetousness, and were more aristocratical from the influence of birth and connections, than inclined to take the popular side from their poverty. Amongst this last class were numbered the majority of the equestrian order; and some of the most eminent individuals in Roman history: Scipio Æmilianus, in the times of the Gracchi, and at a later period M. Cicero and M. Cato.

Tiberius Gracchus.

Many years had now passed since Rome had been disturbed by civil dissentions. We are told indeed, that when the Senate, immediately on the conclusion of the second Punic war, proposed to begin a fresh contest with the King of Macedon, the people were strongly disinclined to the measure,* and complained that the nobility sought to involve the nation in perpetual hostilities, for the gratification of their own ambition. But when the seat of war was removed far away from Italy, and an uninterrupted succession of conquests flattered at once the national vanity, and often enriched the soldiers by the plunder which it threw into their hands, the popular aversion to war probably subsided. It was likely to be changed into fondness for it, from the period that the acquisition of the revenues of Macedon, added to the large income derived from other provinces, relieved the citizens of Rome from taxation altogether. Those changes indeed in the state of property, which were afterwards to occasion such fatal quarrels, were in the meanwhile silently being effected; but they were not yet so great as to call off the public attention from subjects of more immediate interest; and it has ever been the case, that the gradual approach of financial troubles has been unheeded, till the moment when the clouds have covered the whole face of the sky, and the storm has burst in thunder.

It has been already mentioned when speaking of the war with Numantia, that C. Macinus, one of the Consuls employed in that service, was obliged to purchase the safety of his army by an unfavourable treaty; that the Senate violated the agreement thus made, and ordered the general who had concluded it to be delivered up to the enemy, as if the perfidy of the government could be so atoned for. The officer who had been particularly employed in drawing up this obnoxious treaty, was the Consul's Quæstor,† Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus; and it was said that the Numantines were chiefly induced to treat, from their respect to his name: his father having served in Spain, and by his honourable conduct having won the esteem and regard of the natives. When then the Senate resolved to surrender to the Numantines not only the Consul but all his principal officers, the popular assembly interfered; and considering that Gracchus had done no more than save the lives of many thousand citizens, when the Consul's misconduct had exposed them to destruction, it determined that all the other officers should be exempted, and that Mancinus should be given up alone. The different treatment which Gracchus on this occasion received from the Senate and from the people, is said to have predisposed him

U. C. 621 — B. C. 133.

* Livy, lib. xxxi. c. 6. † Plutarch, *Vita Tib. Gracchi*, c. 5.

Biography. to thwart the one, and to enlist on the side of the other. About three years afterwards, in the year of U. C. 621. Rome 621, he was elected one of the Tribunes of the people.

— B. C. 133. The great accumulation of slaves in Italy, and the consequent dearth of free labourers, was now become a serious evil. Gracchus had been struck with it, we are told, as he passed through Tuscany on his way home from Spain; observing, that the visible population consisted for the most part of foreign slaves, who were working in fetters under their taskmasters. The dangers of this system had been also made manifest by an insurrection which had lately broken out among the slaves in Sicily; for the immense estates possessed in that island by Roman or Latin citizens,* were, like those in Italy, cultivated entirely by slaves, whose numbers became so formidable, that being roused to arms by one of their body, they maintained a long and bloody war with the Roman government, spread devastation over the whole island, and defeated no fewer than four Roman Prætors, who were sent against them. Plutarch tells us besides, that Gracchus being known as a young man of enterprise and ability, was called upon in many addresses written upon the walls in different parts of the city, to stand up in the cause of the poor, and to recover for them the public lands which the rich had monopolized.

Thus instigated at once by the pressing evils of the existing system, by personal predilections, and by the allurements of an evident popularity, Tiberius Gracchus entered on his unfortunate career. The remedy which he proposed for the growing distresses of the poor, consisted in a revival of the Licinian law with certain modifications: that is to say,† he allowed a father of a family to hold five hundred jugera of public or conquered land in his own right, and two hundred and fifty more in right of each of his sons: but any man who possessed more than this amount, was to restore it to the nation on receiving a price for it from the treasury. To this proposition was added, that the lands thus recovered, should be divided among the poorer citizens, and that it should be unlawful at any time that any of these allotments should be sold: and finally, in order to provide for the execution of the law, three Commissioners were to be appointed annually, with powers to see it duly carried into effect, and its enactments observed unbroken. It is said by Plutarch, that in proposing these measures Gracchus acted with the concurrence of some individuals of distinguished rank, and of great legal knowledge; such as P. Crassus, then Pontifex Maximus, and P. Mucius Scævola, one of the Consuls; both of whom are often mentioned by Cicero‡ as eminent for their acquaintance with the civil law, as well as for their general eloquence and ability. If this be true, it is a proof that the mischievous tendency of an Agrarian law was not so palpable to the Romans as it is to us, and the apparent extravagance of Gracchus's conduct is much lessened. Indeed we should remember, that he only professed to enforce, even in mitigated severity, an actually existing law; and that though time had seemed to sanction the encroachments of the rich, he might yet not unnaturally think that the people could never lose their rights by mere disuse; and that his proposed indulgencies to the holders of national property, abundantly compensated for any wrong they might sustain by the sudden revival of a long dormant claim. It is not possible that we, with the added experience and knowledge of more than nineteen centuries, can hesitate to condemn his scheme as pernicious and impracticable; nor indeed did it appear otherwise to calm and sensible men at that very time; for C. Lælius, known by the name of the Wise, endeavoured in his Tribuneship a few years before, to remedy the evils arising from the accumulation of estates; but finding that they could not be removed without greater mischief, he abandoned the attempt altogether. But still, although the conduct of Gracchus was violent and unwise, it does not imply in him such a degree of profligacy or folly, as would be justly imputed to a similar proposal now.

Tiberius Gracchus. U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

The aristocracy in general warmly opposed the projected law; and Gracchus, impatient of any opposition to a scheme which he deemed so beneficial, at once lost his temper; and dropping the more conciliatory clauses, proposed merely that the holders of national lands beyond the legal amount, should be obliged to give them up immediately.* This only added to the vehemence of the opposition against it; and the question being one of such universal interest, great crowds of people flocked to Rome from all quarters of Italy, to take part with the friends or enemies of the law.† But the aristocratical party, well knowing how the tribes were likely to vote if it were left to their decision, had secured the negative of M. Octavius, one of the Tribunes: and this being resolutely interposed, whenever the measure was brought forward, it was impossible for Gracchus, according to the forms of the constitution, to carry his point. He too however availed himself of his power as Tribune to embarrass his opponents; for he suspended by his negative the functions of every officer in the state,‡ and sealed up the doors of the treasury; thus stopping all issues or receipts of money for the public service. So strange was the extent of the Tribunitian authority, that Gracchus in these violent proceedings was acting agreeably to law; and the nobility unable to resist him, went into mourning to show their sense of the distressed and dangerous state of the republic.

Still, while Octavius persisted in his opposition, the law could not be carried.§ Gracchus, therefore, resolving to overbear every obstacle, and having endeavoured to win over his colleague by entreaty, as he was personally well known to him, and by the utmost efforts of his eloquence; at last finding him immoveable, openly declared, that two men so opposed to one another ought not to continue in office together: that either Octavius or himself ought therefore to be forced by the people to lay down the Tribuneship. And with a mockery of fairness, he desired Octavius first to submit to the *Comitia* the question, that Tiberius Gracchus should be no longer Tribune. When this was declined, he announced his own intention of proposing a similar resolution on the following day with regard to Octavius. Accordingly, when the assembly met,

* Florus, lib. iii. c. 19.

† Plutarch, *Vita Gracchi*, c. 9. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 9. 10.

‡ *De claris Orator.* c. 26. *De Oratore*, lib. i. c. 50, 55. *De Officiis*, lib. ii. c. 13.

* Plutarch, *Vita Gracchi*, c. 10.

† Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 10.

‡ Plutarch, *Vita Gracchi*, c. 10.

§ Ibid. c. 11, 12. Appian, c. 12.

Gracchus, after another personal appeal to his colleague, entreating him to yield to the wishes of the people, and finding him still resolute in his refusal, proposed to the tribes the sentence of degradation. Seventeen successively voted for it; and as the total number of the tribes was thirty-five, the votes of one more would constitute a majority. At this point, then, Gracchus paused; and once more conjured Octavius to spare him the necessity of proceeding to such a painful extremity. Octavius, it is said, was staggered; but the sight of the nobility, who anxiously watched his behaviour, and the shame of being intimidated by personal considerations, gave him fresh firmness; and he told Gracchus to do whatever he thought proper. The eighteenth Tribe then gave their votes for his degradation; and the measure being carried, Gracchus sent one of his officers to drag Octavius down from the seat which he occupied as Tribune. When this had been done, and Octavius had been thrust out among the people, the mob immediately fell upon him; and although Gracchus tried to check them, he found that a demagogue has little power in restraining his followers from violence; and Octavius with difficulty escaped from their fury, by the efforts of the nobility, and the zeal of his own slaves, one of whom lost his eyes in defending his master.

After such an example, no Tribune ventured any more to impede the progress of the law; which was passed immediately without difficulty. But it appears that Crassus and Mucius were either disgusted at the late conduct of Gracchus, or that he began now to throw himself entirely into the arms of the common people; for neither their names, nor those of any other distinguished senator unconnected with the Tribune, were to be found among the Commissioners appointed to carry the law into effect. The list consisted of Gracchus himself,* of his younger brother Caius, a youth of only twenty years of age, and at this time serving under Scipio in Spain, and of his father-in-law, Appius Claudius. It was evident that the real power of the Commission would rest solely with Tiberius Gracchus; and this circumstance was likely to embitter still more the feelings of the Senate towards him. Their hatred betrayed itself in a manner at once impolitic and mean; for they refused him the usual allowance granted to a public Commissioner,† and reduced it to a denarius and a half, or about one shilling a day. Both parties were full of suspicion against each other; a friend of Tiberius happening to die suddenly, the appearance exhibited by his body was attributed to the effects of poison; and Tiberius himself, as if afraid for his own life, put on mourning, and with his young children in his hand, went round among the people, recommending his family to their protection, in case he himself should fall a victim to his enemies. On the other hand, Gracchus began to incur the imputation which had proved so often fatal to former demagogues, that of aspiring to make himself Tyrant of Rome.‡ Attalus, the last King of Pergamus, was lately dead; and one of his ministers had arrived in Rome with his will, by which he bequeathed his dominions and treasure to the Roman people. Gracchus immediately proposed a law, that the treasure should be divided among those citizens who should receive allotments of land under the new Commission, in order to enable them to stock their farms; and that the disposal and management of the kingdom should be lodged exclusively with the popular assembly. Under the odium which such conduct excited, any accusation against him was readily listened to; and a senator, whose house was next to that of Gracchus, stood up in the Senate, and asserted on his own knowledge, that the Minister of the late King of Pergamus had presented Gracchus with a diadem and a scarlet robe, preparatory, as he insinuated, to his usurping the regal state of which those decorations were the insignia.

But his conduct towards Octavius afforded his enemies a surer ground of censure. Even many of the people, it is said, were struck with the unprecedented violence of that measure; and Gracchus thought proper to justify himself at some length, and endeavoured to shew that the sacredness of the Tribunitian office was destroyed, when a Tribune turned his power to the injury of that part of the people whose interests he was especially appointed to guard. What effect his arguments produced on the minds of his hearers cannot be known; but in the judgment of posterity his conduct has appeared indefensible. The negative of the Tribunes was their peculiar and constitutional privilege; and it had often been exerted in defence of individuals against popular violence, as well as in behalf of the interests of the commons collectively against the encroachments of the aristocracy. To set it aside whenever it opposed the inclinations of a majority of the *Comitia*, and far more to degrade the Tribune who interposed it, was a direct injury to the personal liberty of every citizen, and left him absolutely without defence against the wildest tyranny which the popular assembly might be excited by its orators to commit. It was a violation of the letter of the constitution, not on the plea of necessity, but merely of expediency; and it furnished a pretence for the more flagrant violation of it, of which the opposite party, in their turn, were soon proceeding to be guilty. Meanwhile the crowds who had flocked to Rome, during the discussion of the Agrarian law, had left the city and returned to their homes, elated with their triumph.* It was possible that Gracchus might not always be able to command a majority in the *Comitia*; and in that case he had the prospect before his eyes of impeachment, condemnation, and exile. He resolved, therefore, to avail himself of his present popularity, for the purpose of being reelected Tribune for the following year; and he trusted that his supporters from the country would reassemble on such an occasion, and would secure his election. To win still more the favour of the multitude, he allured them with the hope of a number of popular measures, which he proposed to carry in his next Tribuneship: the term of military service,† to

* Appian and Plutarch, *ubi suprà*.
† Plutarch, *Vita Gracchi*, lib. xiii.
‡ Plutarch, *ubi suprà*. Vell. Patercul. lib. ii.

* Appian, c. 13.
† Plutarch, c. 13, seems to speak of these laws as actually proposed by Tiberius Gracchus; but as the one which regards the judicial power is ascribed both by Paterculus and Appian to his brother Caius, and no one mentions any of these measures among the actual offences of Tiberius, I have thought it most probable that they were only talked of by him, and were never carried into effect.

Biography. U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

which every citizen was bound by law, was to be shortened; the judicial power in ordinary criminal causes, which had hitherto been confined to senators, was to be shared with the equestrian order; and Paterculus adds, that he promised to procure the freedom of Rome for all the inhabitants of Italy. These were indeed the proceedings of a dangerous demagogue; but it is impossible to decide whether Gracchus desired a second Tribuneship as a defensive or an offensive measure: whether he wished it only as a protection for himself, or whether he meditated plans still more subversive of all good government than those which he had already avowed. But fear has been justly numbered among the causes which led them into injustice; and acts which he might have deemed necessary to his own safety, might have been of a nature no less violent than such as the most deliberate treason against his country would have dictated.

The season of election was now approaching;* and the friends of the aristocracy insisted, that the same person could not legally be appointed Tribune two years successively. Accordingly, on the day of election, a demur on this point was made by the Tribune who presided at the *Comitia*, and who accepted or refused the votes of the citizens. He was requested to resign his office to Mucius or Mummius, a warm partisan of Gracchus, and the man who had been lately elected to fill the place of Octavius. But the other Tribunes objected to this arrangement, and a dispute ensuing, the friends of Gracchus perceived that the result was likely to be unfavourable to them, and contrived to protract the discussion to so late an hour, that the assembly was obliged to be adjourned to the following day. During the remainder of the afternoon and evening, Gracchus again went about in mourning with his children, appealing to the compassion of the people; and so strong a sentiment was excited in his behalf, that a great crowd watched through the night around his house, in order to secure him from the violence which he affected to dread. He himself meanwhile was concerting with his friends the measures to be pursued on the morrow; and a signal was agreed upon amongst them,† to be used in case it should be necessary for them to employ force. The Capitol was occupied by his party while it was yet dark; and in the morning he left his house to join them, and was received with the loudest acclamations; a crowd of his friends ranging themselves around his person, in order that no one on whom they could not depend might approach too near him.

From this point the relations of Plutarch and Appian vary; nor have we any contemporary account which might teach us how to reconcile them with each other, or assist us in judging which of the two we ought to follow. We shall attempt to compose such a statement as may be probable in itself, and not inconsistent with either of our authorities. At the first outset, the Tribunes who were opposed to Gracchus,‡ and the partisans of the nobility, endeavoured to interrupt the election, on the ground which had been urged on the preceding day, that a Tribune could not be reelected for the following year. A disturbance thus arose among the multitude;§ and at the same moment Fulvius Flaccus, a senator attached to the popular party, arrived in haste from the Senate; and making signs that he wished to speak to Gracchus, obtained a passage through the crowd. He brought information that the nobility, being unable to procure the sanction of the Consul, were preparing of themselves to attack the *Comitia*; and had armed for this purpose a considerable body of their friends and of their slaves. The popular faction, already in a high state of agitation, were roused to the utmost by these tidings. They tucked up their gowns to prepare for action, seized the staves from the hands of the ordinary officers who kept order in the *Comitia*; broke them and distributed the fragments amongst their own party; and when Gracchus gave the concerted signal,* by raising his hand to his head, they at once fell upon the Tribunes who had opposed them, and on the rest of the supporters of the Senate, and drove them from the place of assembly. All now became tumult; the Priests of Jupiter shut the gates of the Temple in the Capitol; and a thousand vague and exaggerated rumours were carried to the Senate; some saying that Gracchus was deposing the other Tribunes from their office; others, that he was nominating himself to a second Tribuneship, without waiting for the votes of the people; while a third set, who had from a distance seen him raise his hand to his head, affirmed that he was instantly to be appointed King, and that he had actually signified his desire to receive from the people a crown.

Tiberius Gracchus. U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

These several reports reached the senators who were assembled in the Temple of Faith. P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, a man of the highest nobility, of great landed property, and of a stern and determined temper,† called upon P. Mucius, the Consul, to take instant and vigorous measures for the destruction of the tyrant. To this Mucius answered, that he would not set the example of shedding blood, nor destroy any citizen without trial; but if the people were seduced or terrified by Gracchus into any illegal resolutions, he should consider such resolution to be of no authority. Nasica then exclaimed, "The Consul deserts the Republic; let those who wish to preserve it follow me." At once the senators arose, wrapped their gowns around their left arms as a shield, and proceeded in a body towards the Capitol. Nasica led them, with a fold of his robe thrown over his head; and the train was swelled by the friends and slaves of the senators, who had provided themselves beforehand with clubs and sticks. On the approach of this band, consisting of all the nobility of Rome, the people made way before them, and fled in all directions. The senators seized the staves which their opponents dropped in their flight, or armed themselves with the fragments of the benches which had been broken down in the confusion of the crowd. With these weapons they attacked all who fell in their way; and Gracchus himself endeavouring to escape, and stumbling over those who had already fallen, was killed by repeated blows on the head. About three hundred of his friends shared his fate, being all killed by clubs or bludgeons, which were the only weapons employed. The bodies of all the slain, including Gracchus himself, were ordered to be thrown into the

* Plutarch and Appian, *ubi suprà*.
‡ Plutarch and Appian.
† Appian, c. 15.
§ Plutarch, c. 18.

* Appian, c. 15.
† Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. i. c. 30. *De Claris Orator.* c. 28.

Biography. U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

Tiber, and the Senate following up their victory, put to death afterwards several of the partisans of the late Tribune; some of them, it is said,* with circumstances of atrocious cruelty.

It throws a remarkable light on the notions entertained by the Romans on political justice, that Cicero, a man whose moral principles were far purer than those of his countrymen in general, speaks more than once of the murder of Gracchus in terms of the warmest praise.† So accustomed were the Romans to have recourse to the plea of necessity or public utility, to justify the violation of the existing laws of the commonwealth. Now, as it is obvious that these abstract principles are of a far more pliable nature than written forms of law can be, all parties in turn might appeal to such an excuse with plausibility, when the laws, if duly observed, would have passed on each a just condemnation. No doubt there is an extreme on the other side; and a blind devotion to the letter and forms of the constitution on all occasions, may really compromise those great interests for the sake of which alone forms are valuable. But there cannot be a question that the adherence to rules, and the respect for particular institutions, which remarkably distinguish our English lawyers, are a most valuable security to personal liberty, and that they serve to subject the fury of contending factions to one impartial and unimpassioned decision. At Rome public expediency was successfully appealed to, to justify the degradation of Octavius and the death of Gracchus; whereas a truer knowledge of the interests of justice and liberty would have taught them to abhor both those actions as illegal and tyrannical: the last, as is usual in cases of retaliation, far exceeding the former by which it was provoked, in violence and atrocity.

Tiberius Gracchus. U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

* Plutarch, *Vita Tib. Gracch.* c. 20.
† *De Officiis*, lib. i. c. 22. 30.

CAIUS GRACCHUS.

FROM U. C. 621. B. C. 133. TO U. C. 633. B. C. 121.

Biography From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

THE murder of Tiberius Gracchus was so much a sudden and isolated act, that it did not at all interrupt the execution of those laws which he had proposed and carried in his Tribuneship. His death occasioned a vacancy among the Commissioners for carrying into effect his Agrarian law; and P. Licinius Crassus,* who was nominated to succeed him, perishing shortly after in the war against Aristonicus,† in Pergamus; and Appius Claudius,‡ another of the original Commissioners, dying also about the same time, the Commission finally was composed of C. Gracchus, the younger brother of Tiberius, C. Papirius Carbo, and M. Fulvius Flaccus. But the extreme youth of C. Gracchus, and possibly the impression produced on his mind by the fate of his brother, prevented him from immediately taking an active part in public affairs. His colleagues, however, were well disposed to make up for his absence; and they proceeded to fulfil the duties of their appointment in that summary and absolute manner which was so familiar to the magistrates of Rome. They readily received accusations against any persons who were charged with holding national lands;§ and decided on all these cases by their own sole authority. It often happened that property alleged to be public was intermixed with estates lawfully belonging to the inhabitants of the allied states of Italy; and now the present Commission extended its inquiries to the titles by which these estates were held; and their owners were called upon to shew how they had acquired them; and to produce either the deeds of the purchase, or the grants by which they had received them from the Roman government. Sometimes these documents were not to be found; and then the Commissioners decided at their discretion upon the property of the land; and removed at pleasure from their estates men who had peaceably inherited them from a remote period. It appears, also, that for the encouragement of agriculture, permission had been given to individuals on former occasions, to enclose and cultivate the waste lands in their neighbourhood, on the payment probably of a rent, scarcely more than nominal, to the treasury. In process of time, the distinction between the freehold and rented parts of an estate was forgotten; the boundaries between the two were removed; and the whole was looked upon as held by the same tenure. But no prescription was any security against the new Commissioners; all public land whatever was to be recovered out of private hands, and to be divided amongst the poorer citizens, according to the provisions of the Sempronian law. Nor was the distribution of the lots to be thus assigned less arbitrary.* The law allowed an individual to hold five hundred jugera of national property; but it seems that the Commissioners might allot them to him in whatever part of Italy they thought proper. Many persons, therefore, were deprived of the lands which they held adjoining to their own estates; and received in exchange an allotment often less valuable in itself, and generally far less conveniently situated. Men obnoxious to the Commissioners, either on political or personal grounds, were thus subjected to numberless vexations; while their partisans, their creatures, and their friends, might be most unduly favoured. It is probable, indeed, that the most industrious and peaceable among the poorer citizens would be by no means the greatest gainers from the distribution of land;† but that the opportunity would be seized to reward the most violent supporters of the democratical party in

Caius Gracchus. From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

* Plutarch, *in Tib. Gracch.* c. 21.
† Livy, *Epitom.* lib. 59.
‡ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 18.
§ Ibid.

* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 18.
† Conf. Cicero, *de Lege Agrariâ contra Rullum; Orat.* ii. c. 29. 31

Biography. From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

the popular assembly; and to encourage the riotous and seditious for the future, with the hope of earning for themselves a similar prize, by an active and unscrupulous obedience to the prevailing demagogues of the day.

It strongly marks the character of the Roman constitution, that at the very time when a Commission so favourable to the wildest claims of the democratical party was actually in existence; the Consuls,* P. Popilius and P. Rupilius were proceeding to inflict the penalty of banishment on several of the partisans of Tiberius Gracchus, by no other authority than a vote of the Senate, and in manifest contempt of the Valerian law. This, as was natural, was on a future occasion strongly resented by the popular party; and thus in the tyrannical powers which both sides in turn allowed themselves to exercise, there never were wanting to either pretences of retaliation, whenever they could gain the ascendency.

P. Scipio opposes the Commissioners of the Agrarian law.

Meantime the proceedings of the Agrarian Commissioners excited a general indignation amongst the inhabitants of the provinces of Italy,† many of whom had been dispossessed of estates to make room for some of the poor citizens of Rome. In looking out for a man who might espouse their cause with effect, they were led to fix their eyes on P. Cornelius Scipio Æmilianus, who was distinguished for his military services, and had lately returned to Rome, after having effected the destruction of Numantia. Scipio had become acquainted with many of the Italians, when serving under him as allies in the Roman army; and was well able to appreciate their value; he was inclined also of himself to oppose the popular party; and he came forward therefore with complaints of the excessive power vested in the hands of the Commissioners; and proposed that all points in dispute between them and the occupiers of land, should be decided, not by themselves, but by a more impartial jurisdiction. This seemed so fair, that it was acceded to; and C. Sempronius Tuditanus, one of the Consuls, was appointed judge of all appeals against the measures of the Commissioners. But this officer, disgusted with the difficulties of the office, soon resigned it, and departed to his province of Illyricum; whilst as no one acted in his place, the Commissioners again were enabled to defy all opposition. The attempt however to lessen their power had rendered Scipio odious to their party; nor was this the only way in which he offended them; for he had on a former occasion procured the rejection of a law

U. C. 623.

brought forward by Carbo,‡ and supported by Gracchus, to allow the same person to be reelected Tribune, as often as the people should choose. He did not abate in his opposition to their power as Commissioners, till on the night preceding the day on

U. C. 624.

which he was going to address the people fully on the subject, he died suddenly in his bed: § and his death was attributed by the violence of party to the contrivances of Carbo and Gracchus. But the general and the most probable account was, that his death was natural;‖ nor indeed is secret assassination a crime consistent with that which we know of the character

Death of P. Scipio.

of the Roman political quarrels at this period of the republic.

Caius Gracchus. From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

The Agrarian law of Tiberius Gracchus, which had arisen immediately out of the relative situation of the rich and poor citizens of Rome, began now in its operation to affect other interests, and to bring forward new claims, and new changes. It has been mentioned, that the landholders among the allied states of Italy felt themselves particularly aggrieved by it, and that they had applied to Scipio to undertake the defence of their cause. After his death they continued their opposition to it,* in conjunction with the aristocratical party at Rome; and thus the execution of the law was delayed and impeded, and its supporters might have despaired of ever carrying it into full effect, while there were such powerful interests arrayed against it. Upon this a scheme was devised, which should at once conciliate one part of the opponents of the laws, and set them at variance with the other part. Hopes were held out to the Italian allies, that they should be admitted to all the privileges of Roman citizens; and in return for so splendid a gift, it was expected that they would renounce their opposition to the Agrarian law. Besides, the popular leaders might probably calculate on making the strength of their party irresistible; if so many thousand members, indebted to them for their right of voting, should be added to the popular assembly; and as the number of citizens would then be so great, that an actual meeting of the whole people in one place would be impracticable; the *Comitia* were likely to consist of an assemblage of the idlest and most worthless of the community; to be more than ever incapable of reason, and more than ever liable to become instruments of mischief in the hands of their favourite orators. However, the proposed grant of citizenship completely answered the views of the popular leaders: the Italians, forgetting the Agrarian law in the seducing prospect now opened to them, crowded to Rome to witness the decision of the question, and to influence it in their favour by every means in their power. While on the other hand, the Senate considering this new measure as more dangerous than even the division of the national lands, prepared vigorously to oppose it; and M. Junius Pennus,† one of the Tribunes, brought forward a law under their authority, commanding all aliens to depart from Rome, and prohibiting them generally from access to it. The law was carried, and the success of the Senate in this previous struggle deterred, as it seems, the popular leaders from bringing on the main question for the present. At this time also they lost one of their number, C. Gracchus; who

U. C. 627.

having been elected Quæstor was sent into Sardinia with L. Aurelius Orestes‡ one of the Consuls, to quell some disturbances in that island.

U. C. 628.

In the succeeding year M. Fulvius Flaccus, one of the Commissioners of the Agrarian law, was elected Consul; and availing himself of the power of his office, he threatened to bring the question concerning the Italian allies to an issue. The Senate conjured him, it is said,§ to desist from his purpose; and finding that he treated them with contempt, they

The popular leaders conciliate Italian allies by the hope of obtaining the rights of Roman citizens.

The scheme defeated by the Senate.

Renewed unsuccessfully by Fulvius Flaccus.

* Velleius Paterc. lib. ii. Plutarch, *in C. Gracch.* c. 4.
† Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 19.
‡ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lix. *Cicero, de Amicit.* c. 25.
§ Appian, c. 20. Vell. Paterc. lib. ii. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lix.
‖ Vid. Paterc.

* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 21.
† Vid. Ciceron. *de Claris Orator.* c. 28. *De Officiis*, lib. iii. c. 11.
‡ Plutarch, *in C. Graccho.* c. 1.
§ Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 5.

averted the evil for the time by sending Fulvius on foreign service;* availing themselves of the opportunity afforded by the Salyes, a tribe of Transalpine Gaul, who had attacked the dominions of the city of Marseilles, an ally of the republic. But the hopes which his proposed measures had excited in the minds of the Italians could not be at once forgotten; and some among them were disposed to assert their claims by force, without depending on their friends at Rome. The people of Fregellæ are mentioned as having revolted from the Romans; and Cicero goes so far as to speak of the "war with Fregellæ."† But the war which a single city could maintain against the Roman empire could not have been very serious. Fregellæ was betrayed by one of its citizens;‡ and the Prætor, L. Opimius, who was employed on this occasion, after having killed so many of the inhabitants as to encourage him to claim a triumph, § received the submission of the survivors, ‖ and razed their city to the ground.

U. C. 629.

It was late in the succeeding year, when C. Gracchus, after an absence of about two years, returned from Sardinia without the permission of his General, intending at the ensuing elections to offer himself as a candidate for the Tribuneship.¶ His conduct in thus leaving his province was complained of, and was noticed by the Censors; but he defended himself successfully both on this and on other occasions, when he was accused of having been concerned in the revolt of Fregellæ. He obtained also the office of Tribune which he desired, but was so vigorously opposed by the Senatorian party, that he could only obtain the fourth place in the list. He was now about thirty years of age, and possessed all the qualifications requisite in a popular leader. His eloquence was of a very high order,** at once sensible and commanding; his education†† had begun early under the care of his mother Cornelia, and exceeded that of most of his contemporaries: his activity and diligence were great, and the fate of his brother, as well as the circumstances of his early political life, marked him out as a determined enemy of the Senate, and partisan of the popular cause. Accordingly his Tribuneship was marked by a succession of acts, all prompted evidently by party views, and which appear to have originated far less in honest feelings of compassion for the sufferings of the poor, than the laws of his brother Tiberius. The truth is, that there were now two parties in the state more distinctly formed: and men under such circumstances are too apt to believe that the good of their country can only be promoted through the medium of the ascendency of their party.

First Tribuneship and Character of C. Gracchus.

Sketch of the authorities for this part of Roman history.

In the accounts which we are now to give of the measures pursued by C. Gracchus, the want of a good contemporary historian whom we may follow with confidence will be severely felt. And here it may not be improper, once for all, to acquaint the English reader with the nature of those materials from which our knowledge of this part of Roman history is derived: for this is not made sufficiently clear by the generality of modern compilers, and their narrative proceeds with as little hesitation, as if they were copying from the fullest and most respectable authorities. The most detailed account of the times with which we are now engaged, is to be found in Plutarch's life of Caius Gracchus. Now from whom Plutarch chiefly copied, he does not inform us; and neither his knowledge of the Roman laws and forms, nor his general accuracy, nor even his object in writing, are such as to render him a valuable guide in stating the provisions of particular statutes with exactness, or the order in which they were proposed. Appian who has written more briefly, is equally silent as to the authorities for his history, and quotes the enactments of the different laws too vaguely. It is to be observed, that he relates several facts in a different order from that followed by Plutarch. We should remember then, that the writers whom we must chiefly consult were two foreigners, who lived more than two hundred years later than the period for which we refer to them,—in whose times a totally new order of things had succeeded to the old government, and who appear to have had a very superficial knowledge of the laws and constitution of the Republic. In addition to Plutarch and Appian, we have the sketch of Roman history drawn by Velleius Paterculus, in which the acts of Gracchus are enumerated all together without any detail of circumstances: we have the epitomes of the lost books of Livy, which are also a mere sketch, and compiled by an uncertain author, and we have the meagre outlines of the life of Gracchus given by Florus and Aurelius Victor. When these writers differ from one another, we know not to whose statements we ought most to listen, unless the point be determined incidentally by some allusion to it in an earlier writer; or unless we venture to decide by internal probability. The voluminous works of Cicero do indeed often throw light on the affairs of the times preceding his own; and his legal and constitutional knowledge make his authority highly valuable. But it is easy to understand, how very insufficient such scattered fragments of information must be towards giving a full and connected history of any transaction. We proceed then, but with hesitation and doubt, to offer the best account in our power of a period, which well deserves to have been commemorated by able and more careful historians.

U. C. 630.

Laws of C. Gracchus. Leges Semproniæ.

According to Plutarch, C. Gracchus commenced his career as Tribune by inflammatory addresses to the people, in which he bewailed continually the fate of his brother, and painted the iniquity of his murder. He then brought forward two laws, the one, to disqualify any magistrate who had been deprived of his office by the people, from being afterwards appointed to any other post of authority; the other, making it a crime cognizable by the popular assembly, if any magistrate banished a Roman citizen without trial. The former of these was merely a fresh mark of the hatred of the popular leaders towards M. Octavius, who had been degraded from the Tribuneship, as has been already mentioned, for his opposition to the Agrarian law when first proposed by Tiberius Gracchus: and the unworthy feelings in which the measure originated were so evident, that C. Gracchus himself was persuaded by his mother to procure its rejection. The second law was particularly directed against P. Popilius, who, as we have seen, had during

* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 34. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lx.
† *De Lege Agrariâ*, lib ii. c 33.
‡ Cicero, *De Finibus*, lib. v. c. 22.
§ Valerius Maximus, lib. ii. c. 8.
‖ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lx.
¶ Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 2.
** Cicero, *De Claris Orator.* c. 33. 58. †† Ibid.

Biography. From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

his Consulship exercised the vengeance of the Senate against several of the partisans of Tiberius Gracchus. Popilius, fearful of being brought to trial, withdrew from Rome; and Gracchus then carried a law,* by which he was forbidden the use of fire and water in Italy, the usual form of passing a sentence of banishment. After these preparatory acts, intended perhaps to intimidate the friends of the aristocracy, Gracchus brought forward such measures as, by gratifying the common people, were likely to bind them to support him in all his future proceedings. The Agrarian law, passed during the Tribuneship of his brother Tiberius, was again confirmed; † and some provisions were probably made to ensure its execution. By another law it was ordered,‡ that the soldiers should be provided with clothing without deducting from their pay the money thus expended; and that no one should enlist under seventeen years of age. A third enacted, that corn should be distributed monthly to the people,§ at the price of five-sixths of an as for the modius or peck; which would make the value of the quarter nearly 1*s.* 8*d.* of our money. What quantity was thus to be given to every citizen, we have not been able to find: but whether it were much or little, the injustice and impracticability of this Roman poor-law are equally striking: for its operation would in the end have fed the Roman people at the expense of the subject provinces; and by discouraging industry and encouraging population would have filled Rome with a mere multitude of idle paupers, incapable of government, and so completely worthless, that the rest of the world would not long have endured their dominion, or their existence. This law was warmly opposed by the aristocratical party, and amongst the rest by L. Calpurnius Piso,‖ who had been Consul during the year in which Tiberius Gracchus was killed. It passed however in spite of their opposition, and soon after Piso was seen amongst the crowd of poor citizens, who came to receive their portion of corn. Gracchus observing him, charged him with inconsistency, for taking the benefit of a law which he had so strongly opposed: to which Piso replied,—"I should very much object to your giving away my property amongst the people: but if you were to do it, I should certainly try to get my share of it." In addition to all these acts, another was passed to gratify the Italians,¶ by granting them the right of voting in the assemblies at Rome; but without communicating to them the other privileges of Roman citizenship. But the most formidable attack upon the Senate still remained to be made: the Judges who sat with the Prætors for the ordinary trial of criminal causes, had hitherto consisted of Senators alone:** and in the strong party feeling which bound the members of the different orders of the republic to the support of each other, a Senator when tried by Senators was likely to meet with more favour than justice. This was particularly the case when officers of high rank were tried for corruption or misconduct in the provinces: and instances of partiality had lately occurred in the acquittal of L. Aurelius Cotta and Marcius Aquilius, the former of whom had been accused by P. Scipio Æmilianus,* and had been brought before the court eight successive times; and the latter may be well judged capable of any crime, since he has been already mentioned, as guilty of poisoning the wells, when engaged in the war against Aristonicus in Asia. The odium excited by these cases favoured the wishes of Gracchus; and he succeeded in introducing a most important change in the Constitution, by transferring the judicial power from the Senate to the equestrian order; either by ordering, that the Judges should henceforth be appointed solely from the latter; or, as the account of Livy's *Epitomizer* leads us to suppose, by providing, that for every Senator among the Judges there should be henceforth named in addition two equites or knights, thus giving a decided majority to their order. Plutarch here gives us an instance of his ignorance respecting the simplest facts in the history of the Roman Constitution. For he tells us, that whereas there were before three hundred Judges, all Senators; by the law of Gracchus, three hundred from the equestrian orders were added to them, so that the influence of the two orders in judicial proceedings was henceforward equal. He confounds the Sempronian law with the laws of Plotius and Lirius, which were passed on purpose to alter its provisions. Of the effects of this alteration it is difficult to judge: Appian asserts, that the Judges of the equestrian order soon became as corrupt as the Senators,† and were as unjustly severe towards all Senators who were tried before them, as the former Judges had been unduly partial. Whereas Cicero declares,‡ that during the whole period of nearly fifty years in which the law of Gracchus continued in force, there had never arisen even the slightest suspicion against the integrity of any of the Judges. It should be remembered, however, that this is said in the course of his pleadings as an advocate;—and on such occasions the greatest allowance must be made for the wide deviations from truth continually practised both by the orators of Greece and Rome.

Corn law. Lex Frumentaria.

Law concerning the judicial power.

Caius Gracchus From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

These popular acts raised Gracchus to a height of influence and consideration among the people, such as rendered him almost absolute. To increase the number of his dependents at the same time that he was throwing lustre upon his administration, he brought in several laws for making roads, § constructing bridges, erecting storehouses for the corn that was to be distributed among the people, and executing various other works of ornament and utility. As Gracchus, from his present popularity, enjoyed the power of appointing the persons who were to be employed in these undertakings, he was constantly surrounded by a crowd of contractors, artificers, engineers, public officers, men of science, and workmen of various descriptions, all courting his patronage, soliciting his judgment on their several proposals, and ready to support him meanwhile in all his enterprises. The activity of his mind, and the versatility of his talents,

Gracchus promotes many public works.

* Cicero, *pro Domo sud*, c. 31.
† Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lx. Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 5.
‡ Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 5.
§ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 21. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lx.
‖ Cicero, *Tusculan. Disputat.* lib. iii. c. 20.
¶ Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 5. Appian, c. 23.
** Appian, c. 22. Velleius Patercul. lib. ii.

* Cicero, *Divinatio in Cæcil.* c. 21. Valerius Maximus, lib. viii. c. 1.
† Appian, lib. i. c. 22.
‡ Cicero, *in Verrem, actio prima*, c. 13.
§ Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 6. Appian, lib. i. 23.

Biography. From U. C. 621 — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

enabled him to enter into the views of all; the depth of a statesman's knowledge on scientific or common subjects is not very strictly scrutinized by those who are flattered with his attention in noticing them at all; and thus Gracchus obtained the character of a man of universal information, who could at once understand and feel interested in those humbler pursuits, which persons in high power and station are generally suspected of despising.

Second Tribuneship of Gracchus.

The year was meanwhile drawing towards its close, and the law as it now stood prevented Gracchus from offering himself a second time as a candidate for the Tribuneship. But it appears from Appian,* that the force of this law was partly rendered null, by the people possessing the power of an unlimited choice, in case fewer than ten candidates should offer themselves. It happened on the present occasion that the requisite number of candidates did not come forward; the strong tide of popular feeling towards Gracchus deterring perhaps many from attempting to exclude him; and thus he was again elected, although his own mother, in a letter still extant,† dissuaded him most forcibly from taking the office. His career U. C. 631. continued to be the same as before: he now moved that colonies of poor Roman citizens should be planted in several parts of Italy,‡ and that the Latins should be admitted to all the civil rights of Roman citizenship. Finding it hopeless to oppose him in a direct manner, the Senate engaged Livius Drusus, another of the Tribunes, to bring in measures still more popular under the sanction of the Aristocracy; hoping thus to rival the credit of Gracchus, and to conciliate the affections of the multitude to themselves. Drusus proposed to send out no fewer than twelve colonies, a number much exceeding that mentioned by Gracchus; and the colonists were to be exempted from the rent usually paid by them to the treasury for the lands assigned to them.§ This liberality, which Drusus ascribed entirely to the concern felt by the Senate for the welfare of the common people, so far won the gratitude of the multitude, that he ventured boldly to interpose his negative on the other measure brought forward by Gracchus, respecting the grant of citizenship to the Latins.‖ Besides, Drusus carefully avoided assigning to himself any office in the new colonies; and kept himself clear from any suspicion of desiring places of patronage or emolument; thus offering his own conduct as a strong contrast to that of Gracchus, who had taken so large a part in the direction of all the public works executed in compliance with his laws. Thus the credit of Gracchus was somewhat lessened, and to prevent him from regaining his influence by popular speeches, or by any new popular laws, the Senate contrived to procure his nomination as one of the Commissioners for planting a colony in Africa, near the site of Carthage; for in the present emulation among the Tribunes, which should go farthest in gratifying the people, one of them, named Rubrius,* had carried a law, by which this new addition was made to the number of colonies already to be founded under the acts of Gracchus and Drusus. During the absence of Gracchus his opponents were enabled, as they had hoped, to supersede him more and more in the affections of the people; and they found also a way to attack his measures, by representing it as impious to build again the walls of Carthage, which Scipio had solemnly devoted to perpetual desolation. It was reported also, that several supernatural accidents had delayed the progress of the work; and on these grounds the party of the Senate having gained a zealous and active leader in L. Opimius, U. C. 632. the new Consul, determined to propose to the people, That the law of Rubrius for planting a colony on the site of Carthage should be repealed.† Gracchus had returned to Rome some little time before; and the year of his Tribuneship having expired, he was reduced to the condition of a private citizen. What course his own inclinations might have led him to follow, is doubtful; but unfortunately for himself, he chose to associate himself to the counsels of M. Fulvius Flaccus, one of the Commissioners for the execution of the Agrarian law, and a man whose character was respected by no party in the republic. The reputation of Gracchus had already suffered from his connection with Fulvius; and now he took part with him in designs which can be considered as nothing less than treasonable. Charging the Senate with spreading false reports in order to alarm the religious scruples of the people, the two popular leaders assembled a numerous body of their partisans armed with daggers; and being thus prepared for violence they proceeded to the Capitol, where the people were to meet in order to decide on the repeal of the law of Rubrius. Here,‡ before the business of the day was yet begun, a private citizen, who happened to be engaged in offering a sacrifice, was murdered by the partisans of Fulvius and Gracchus, for some words or gestures which they considered as insulting. This outrage excited a general alarm; the assembly broke up in consternation; and the popular leaders, after trying in vain to gain a hearing from the people, while they disclaimed the violence committed by their followers, had no other course left than to withdraw to their own houses. There they concerted plans of resistance, which however they might believe them to be justified on the plea of self-defence, were justly considered by the bulk of the people as an open rebellion against the government of their country. The Consul § exaggerating perhaps the alarm which he felt from

Caius Gracchus From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

Cabals of Gracchus with Fulvius Flaccus.

They openly resist the authority of the government

* Appian, lib. i. c. 21. The words are these, τις ἤδη νόμος κεκύρωτο, Εἰ δήμαρχος ἐνδέοι ταῖς παραγγελίαις, τὸν δῆμον ἐκ πάντων ἐπιλέγεσθαι. We have no doubt that Schweighæuser in his note on this passage has given the true interpretation of it, which we have expressed in the text; but at the same time, we are ignorant what law it is that Appian alludes to, or at what period it was enacted.

† Vid. *Epistolæ Corneliæ, apud Fragmenta Cornelii Nepotis.*

‡ Appian, lib. i. c. 23. Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 8. Patercul. lib. ii.

§ Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 9.

‖ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 23. One concession, however, of considerable importance was made to the Latins by a law of Drusus, to which the Senate gave their support; and which enacted that the Latins when serving in the Roman army should be exempted from flogging on ordinary occasions. So says Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 9. We have added the words "on ordinary occasions," because otherwise the statement is untrue; for it appears from Sallust, that Metellus ordered one of his officers to be scourged and put to death, which he might do, "because," says Sallust, "the man was a citizen of Latium." Vid. Sallust, *Bell. Jugurth.* c. 69. But we are by no means clear that Plutarch has not again mistaken a law passed by another Livius Drusus, U. C. 662, for one passed by his namesake, the opponent of Gracchus.

* Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c 10.

† Appian, lib. i. c. 24.

‡ Appian, c. 25. Plutarch, *in C. Graccho*, c. 13.

§ Appian, c. 25. Plutarch, c. 14.

Biography. From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

the late outrage, hastily summoned the Senate together; the body of the murdered man was exposed to the view of the people, and the Capitol was secured by break of day with an armed force. The Senate being informed by Opimius of the state of affairs, proceeded to invest him with absolute power to act in defence of the commonwealth, in the usual form of a resolution, "That the Consul should provide for the safety of the Republic." At the same time Gracchus and Fulvius were summoned to appear before the Senate, to answer for the murder laid to their charge. Instead of obeying, they occupied the Aventine Hill with a body of their partisans in arms, and invited the slaves to join them, promising them their liberty. They sent the son of Fulvius, a youth under eighteen years of age, to the Consul with proposals of negociation; but were answered, that they must first lay down their arms; and till they did so, the Senate would hold no intercourse with them. The son of Fulvius, however, was sent back once more in the hope of better success; but Opimius arrested him, as having come in defiance of the declaration of the Senate; and then without further delay proceeded to attack the rebels. He was followed by the Senators and the members of the equestrian order, who, with their dependents, had armed themselves by his order; and he had also with him a body of regular soldiers, amongst whom some Cretan archers are particularly noticed.* In the meantime the behaviour of Gracchus was that of a man irresolute in the course which he pursued, and with too much regard for his country to engage heartily in the criminal attempt into which he had suffered himself to be drawn. He had left his house, it is said,† in his ordinary dress; he had been urgent with Fulvius to propose terms of accommodation to the Senate, and now when the Aventine was attacked, he took personally no part in the action. The contest indeed was soon over; the rebels were presently dispersed; Fulvius was dragged from the place to which he had fled for refuge, and was put to death; while Gracchus, finding himself closely pursued, fled across the Tiber, and taking shelter in a grove sacred to the Furies was killed at his own desire by a single servant who had accompanied his flight. His head, together with that of Fulvius, was cut off and carried to the Consul, in order to obtain the price which had been set upon both by a proclamation issued at the beginning of the engagement; and the bodies, as well as those of all who perished on the same side, were thrown into the river. In addition to this the houses of Gracchus and Fulvius were given up to plunder, their property was confiscated, and even the wife of Gracchus was deprived of her own jointure. But a yet more atrocious cruelty disgraced the victorious party; for Opimius ordered the son of Fulvius,‡ whom he had detained in custody, to be put to death; an act of party vengeance as unjust as it was inhuman. It is said that in this sedition there perished altogether of the partisans of the popular leaders about three thousand, partly in the action, and partly by summary executions afterwards, under the Consul's orders.

But are defeated and put to death by the Consul L. Opimius.

The career of the two Gracchi was in many respects so similar, and the circumstances of their deaths bore so much resemblance to each other, that it is not wonderful that historians should have comprehended both the brothers under one common judgment, and have pronounced in common their acquittal or their condemnation. But the conduct of Caius admits of far less excuse than that of Tiberius; and his death was the deserved punishment of rebellion, while that of his brother was an unjustifiable murder. It is true, the aristocratical party were likely to overturn all the measures which he had carried in his two Tribuneships; but the ascendency which they had suddenly gained, was the fruit of no illegal acts or violence; it arose simply out of the natural revolutions of popular feeling, and from the conciliatory laws which the Senate had of late been forward to encourage. If the popular assembly was disposed to take part with the consul Opimius; if not even a single Tribune could be found to interpose his negative against the proposed repeal of the law of Rubrius; by what pretence of right could Gracchus and Fulvius appear in the Capitol at the head of an armed body of partisans? and still more, when a murder had been committed by some of their friends, and they were called before the supreme council of the state to answer for their violence; by what right could two private citizens defy the authority of their government, and take up a military position with an armed force in the heart of the capital to maintain their disobedience? Under such circumstances, although there is much in the character of Gracchus to awaken compassion for his fate, he yet only paid the just penalty for conduct which was treasonable in fact, and which on the most favourable construction of his motives, was criminally rash and intemperate. Still however the triumph of the Senate was more that of an enraged party than of a firm and impartial government: the execution of the son of Fulvius was an act of gratuitous cruelty; and the severities exercised after the sedition was over, were conducted without any forms of law, and had no other limit than the inclination of the aristocratical leaders. So bad indeed was the Constitution of Rome, that the laws for the punishment of state criminals were uncertain and inadequate; and necessity was thus supposed to allow the correction of an evil by summary and illegal means, because the legal means could not always be depended upon. It may be safely pronounced, that there is no surer criterion of an ill-framed and barbarian government, than the admission of irregular acts of violence by any party on the plea of the public safety.

Caius Gracchus. From U. C. 621. — B. C. 133. to U. C. 633. — B. C. 121.

The laws of the Gracchi are mostly eluded or repealed.

It is an important inquiry, to find what effect was permanently produced on the condition of the poor by the laws of the two Gracchi; or how long any of their measures were allowed to survive their authors. The Agrarian law of Tiberius Gracchus was indirectly subverted by a law which permitted the poor to sell the shares of land allotted to them;* and which thus exposed them to the temptations of the high prices which the rich could afford to offer them, or of the various vexations by which a powerful neighbour might drive them to give up the land he coveted. But who was the proposer of this law, or at what precise period it passed, we have no information; we can only suppose that it was carried soon after the death of C. Gracchus, when the power of the aris-

* Plutarch, *in C. Gracche*, c. 16. † Ibid. c. 15.
‡ Velleius Patercul. lib. ii. Appian, c. 26. Plutarch, c. 17.

* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 27.

tocracy was likely to be most predominant. By two subsequent laws* the state of property was restored nearly to what it was before Tiberius Gracchus commenced his career; the first, forbidding any further division of lands, and securing the actual possessors in the enjoyment of the estates which they held; but transferring the rent which they had been accustomed to pay to the treasury, and ordering that it should henceforth be distributed among the poorer citizens: the second, reversing this last provision, and depriving the poor of all share either in the property or income of the national lands. There is great difficulty in settling the precise date of these two laws; but we may suppose them to have been carried before the year of Rome 649, when a new Agrarian law† was proposed, but soon given up, by L. Marcius Philippus; at which time he asserted in one of his speeches, that there were not two thousand individuals in the commonwealth who were worth any property. The duration of the act of C. Gracchus for the distribution of corn appears to have been much longer; though it is hardly possible to conceive that it was always fully executed. It was repealed by M. Octavius;‡ and, as far as can be made out from the scanty information remaining to us, the repeal took place about the year of Rome 678;§ the new law still providing that some support should be given to the poor at the public expense, but reducing it to a much smaller amount. But it is probable, that the law of Gracchus had long ere this become obsolete; and that the act of Octavius, although far less liberal in its grants, was welcomed as a popular measure; inasmuch as it substituted an actual distribution of corn for one which had been long since abandoned as impracticable. In short it appears that the reforms proposed by the Gracchi were in the issue most injurious to the interests of the common people; for we are told that* for some years after the death of C. Gracchus the oppression and corruption of the aristocracy prevailed to a greater extent than ever; insomuch that the liberties of the people were well nigh extinguished; and allowing something for the prejudices of the writer from whom this statement is taken, it is yet too consonant to the usual revolutions of parties to be in the main rejected.

* Appian, *Loco citato.* † Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. ii. c. 21.

‡ Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 60.

§ Vide Macri Licinii *Oration. apud Fragm.* Sallust. However, whether the law alluded to in that speech be the Octavian law or not, is certainly a mere matter of conjecture. But Ferguson must be wrong in fixing the Octavian law in the year immediately following the death of Gracchus; for Cicero expressly ranks Octavius with Cotta, Sulpicius, Curio, and others, who flourished after the sedition of Saturninus, U. C. 653, and continued to be distinguished as orators down to a much later period. In Plutarch's *Life of Marius*, it is said that Marius, when Tribune, U. C. 634, opposed with success a law for the distribution of corn among the people. But Plutarch is so little to be trusted for accuracy in such matters, that nothing can be concluded from his statement. Possibly the attempt which Marius resisted was one to confirm and enforce the Corn law of C. Gracchus; in the same manner as Gracchus had brought in a law to confirm and enforce the Agrarian law of his brother Tiberius, although it had never been repealed since its enactment.

* *Oratio* C. Memmii, *apud* Sallust. *Bell. Jugurth.* c. 31.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XX.

SKETCH OF THE INTERNAL STATE OF ROME FROM THE DEATH OF CAIUS GRACCHUS TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE SOCIAL WAR.

FROM U. C. 633. B. C. 121. TO U. C. 662. B. C. 92.

The ascendency acquired by the party of the Senate after the death of C. Gracchus is marked by a striking fact. C. Papirius Carbo, one of the Commissioners under the Agrarian law, and formerly so distinguished as a popular leader, deserted his former friends, and was chosen one of the Consuls for the ensuing year. During his Consulship he undertook the defence of his predecessor in office, L. Opimius, who was impeached by one of the Tribunes* for punishing citizens in the late tumults in an illegal manner. The trial came on before the people; and Carbo, in the defence of his client, maintained that the resolution of the Senate by which the Consul had been charged to provide for the safety of the republic,† fully justified him in dispensing with all the usual forms of law. And this dispensing power in the Senate was so far recognised by the assembly, either from conviction or fear, that Opimius was acquitted. Carbo, however,‡ was accused soon afterwards by L. Crassus, then a very young man; and was charged by him with insincerity in defending Opimius, while the manner in which he had constantly lamented the fate of Tiberius Gracchus, the pernicious laws which he had brought forward in his Tribuneship, and above all his share in the murder of Scipio, sufficiently demonstrated his real principles. For what particular crime he was accused, we cannot discover; but he was condemned, and destroyed himself in order to escape sentence. It is remarkable also that Crassus might venture to charge him with the murder of Scipio; although no inquiry had ever been instituted respecting that event, nor was it ever proved that Scipio was murdered at all.

The Senate enjoy a complete ascendency.

During the few years which elapsed between the death of C. Gracchus and the war with Jugurtha, the Roman nobility appear to have been plunged in a state of extreme corruption. The government of the empire was in their hands, and there were no circumstances of peculiar difficulty to render great public virtues necessary, or to tempt ambitious men in the hope of distinguishing themselves to relinquish the pursuit of selfish enjoyments. Commands in the provinces were sought for as a means of acquiring wealth, either by direct extortion and oppression, or by provoking a war with some neighbouring tribe of barbarians, and acquiring plunder and spoil together with some military renown. At home the rich nobles stood aloof from the bulk of their countrymen, being separated from them by the immense disparity of their fortunes; and having little occasion for their services, while their own numerous slaves supplied them with labourers, tradesmen, stewards, agents, nay even with instructors for their children. In such a state of things it mattered little, that the people as a body could exercise the most absolute power, and sometimes could enact laws which were very injurious to the interests of the rich. Their force when united was but a poor compensation for their individual weakness: and many a member of the sovereign assembly, when he had left the Forum, and became no more than a single poor citizen, was treated by the rich with a pride and oppression, from which the humblest labourer in England is secure. The causes of this are to be found in the want of a graduated scale of society, and of an enlightened public opinion. The different parts of the commonwealth were too distinct and too dissimilar to blend together; and too many of the intermediate links in the chain were wanting. And there being thus nothing to answer to that which is with us so emphatically called "the Public," public opinion could scarcely exist; and at a distance from the capital it had no means of making itself heard, nor of gaining the information by which alone it can itself be formed. This it will be observed is exactly the state of society fitted to breed violent revolutions. A people smarting under individual degradation, ignorant of the true means of delivering themselves from it, and possessing as a body the most sovereign power, were likely, when roused by some active leader, to exert their strength in blind and furious acts of vengeance. An aristocracy, on the other hand, equally ignorant of the real evils of the existing order of things, and seeing nothing but the dangerous violence of the Tribunitian seditions, were anxious to keep the people quiet, sometimes by bribes, sometimes by flattery, and sometimes by coer-

Character of the Roman nobility at this period.

* Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxi.
† Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 31 32.
‡ Ibid. lib. ii. c. 39.

History. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92. The popular party begin to recover their strength. U. C. 642. U. C. 643.

cion, that so they might preserve their own ascendency, and maintain the actual constitution of the republic. Selfishness on both sides, an habitual familiarity with bloodshed, and a general absence of a pure morality with sufficient sanctions, easily gave to the civil wars that ensued that character of ferocity and rapacity which marks them so peculiarly.

The indifference shown by the nobility towards the crimes of Jugurtha, an indifference ascribed by the people to the effect of his bribes, first interrupted that ascendency which the aristocratical party had enjoyed since the death of Gracchus. An active Tribune,* C. Memmius, availed himself of the favourable opportunity; the people, roused by his invectives against the corruption of the nobility, began to reassume their share in the management of affairs; their voice forced the Senate to declare war against Jugurtha; and the misconduct of the Generals employed in the first campaigns giving additional strength to their complaints of corruption, a formidable court of inquiry consisting of three members was instituted,† with a general commission to investigate all cases of public delinquency. The inquisitors conducted themselves with the utmost rigour; and five persons of the highest rank,‡ amongst whom was L. Opimius, were on this occasion found guilty of corrupt practices, and were either condemned to pay heavy fines or were banished.§ Soon after Q. Cæcilius Metellus, a man of spotless reputation, was appointed to take the command in Africa; and by his ability, and that of his successor C. Marius, the war with Jugurtha, as has been mentioned in a former part of this work, was brought to a triumphant end.

Marius changes the character of the army.

But we must not omit to notice here a memorable change introduced by Marius, when Consul, in the constitution of the Roman army. Hitherto the old aristocratical principle, so universal among the commonwealths of Greece, had been carefully observed; and none were admitted to serve in the regular infantry of the legions, except they possessed a certain amount of property:|| the poorest citizens, unless under circumstances of urgent necessity, were only employed in the naval service. But Marius,¶ when raising soldiers to accompany him into Africa, disregarded the usual practice altogether; and enlisted into the legions citizens of the lowest and most indigent classes of society. His motives for this unprecedented measure are variously stated; but it may be most probably imputed to a mingled feeling of personal ambition, and of hatred towards all those who were any way distinguished for birth or fortune. Himself sprung from the lowest of the people, and having forced his way to the high station which he filled amidst the scorn and aversion of the nobility, it was his delight to be the Consul of the populace, and as he had risen by their favour, to show that he cared for the support of no order in the state besides. He knew moreover that an army formed out of those who have no property to lose, becomes the ready instrument of its General's ambition, and easily transfers to him the duty and affection which it owes to its country and its government. Marius stands conspicuous among those who have risen to greatness by favouring the envy and hatred of the dregs of the community towards all above them, and who have purchased the forgiveness of the multitude for their crimes and their tyranny, because every thing most noble, most exalted, and most sacred has been especially the object of their persecution.

Rome. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92. U. C. 647.

About the end of the Jugurthine war, Q. Servilius Cæpio, being then Consul,* procured an alteration of that law of C. Gracchus, which had committed the whole judicial power to the equestrian order. By the new law, the Judges were to be chosen jointly from the Senate and the knights. The character of Cæpio seems to render it probable, that the tribunals as at that time constituted, were very strict in the punishment of corrupt and oppressive magistrates; and that he wished, by restoring a share of the judicial authority to the Senate, to secure a greater chance of impunity for such offenders. At least, it is remarkable that during his command in Gaul,† where he was stationed to oppose the expected invasion of the Cimbri, he committed a robbery of the sacred treasure belonging to a temple at Thoulouse, which was held by the inhabitants in particular veneration. Nor was his ability as a General greater than his integrity; for he was accounted the principal cause of the bloody defeat sustained by the Romans in the following year, when the united armies of himself and his successor in the Consulship, Cn. Mallius, were overthrown by the Cimbri, with the loss of eighty thousand men. The popular cry was loud against him, and he was accused some time afterwards by C. Norbanus one of the Tribunes;‡ but the aristocratical party made a strong effort to save him, and his condemnation was only procured by actual violence. It appears that his trial was attended by a furious riot, in which M. Æmilius Scaurus, the first on the roll of the Senate, was wounded by a stone; and two of the Tribunes, who were preparing to interpose their negative on the proceedings of the Judges, were driven by the populace from the court. In this manner Cæpio was condemned and banished; and it is said that his sentence was accompanied by the unusual disgrace of having his property confiscated by order of the people.§

Q. Cæpio alters the law of Gracchus concerning the judicial power.

U. C. 648.

Career of L. Appuleius Saturninus.

The war with the Cimbri and the other northern tribes was not yet finished, when the most profligate of demagogues, L. Appuleius Saturninus, made himself for the first time conspicuous. His animosity to the Senate is attributed by Cicero to a personal slight which he received when he was Quæstor;|| for at a period of scarcity, the charge of superintending the supply of the markets was taken away from him, and given to M. Æmilius Scaurus, one of the most distinguished of the nobility. He had been one of the Tribunes for the year of Rome 650, and in the following year Q. Metellus,¶ who was then Censor, noticed him for the infamy of his general life, and would have degraded him from his rank by virtue of his Censorial power, if his colleague in the Censorship had not refused to concur with him in the sentence. In the year next succeeding, when Marius was in his fifth Con-

* Sallust, *Bell. Jugurth.* c. 27. 30, 31.
† Ibid. c. 40.
‡ Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 34.
§ Opimius was banished, as appears from Cicero, *in Pisonem*, c. 40. || Polybius, lib. vi. c. 19.
¶ Sallust, *Bell. Jugurth.* c. 86.

* Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 43. *De Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 49. Cassiodorus, *Chronicon*.
† Strabo, lib. iv. p. 204. Edit. Xyland.
‡ Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 49. § Livy, *Epitome*, lib. 67.
|| Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 17.
¶ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 28.

History. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

sulship, Saturninus declared himself a second time candidate for the Tribuneship; but finding himself rejected, he waylaid one of the successful candidates, A. Nonnius, on his way home from the place of election; drove him into an adjoining tavern, and there by the aid of an armed rabble murdered him. His partisans, availing themselves of the general consternation, assembled early the following morning, and elected him Tribune without opposition; and such was the state of things at Rome, that this mockery of all law was submitted to, and Saturninus was recognised in the character which he had usurped by murder. He was not however without associates; they were C. Servilius Glaucia, who was at this time one of the Prætors, and C. Marius, who still unsatisfied with the honours he had gained, was now aspiring to a sixth Consulship; and was glad to acquire the support of a man so popular with the multitude as Saturninus. It is said that Marius gained his election as little from the unbiassed choice of the people as his friend Appuleius had done:* but that bribery was unscrupulously used, and that his old soldiers at the same time were introduced into the city to overawe by their tumults the decisions of the Comitia. In this manner the cause of the factious and worthless part of the people obtained an unusual triumph, and might well anticipate the gratification of its wildest hopes, when Rome beheld at the same moment C. Marius a Consul, C. Servilius Glaucia a Prætor, and L. Appuleius Saturninus a Tribune of the people.

U. C. 653. His Tribuneship and policy.

The proceedings of the following year seem hardly consistent with the faintest shadow of regular government; for both parties in turn had recourse without hesitation to measures of open violence. But we may observe that Saturninus did not tread in the steps of the Gracchi, nor was it the interest of the poor citizens of Rome that he professed to espouse. He seems to have adopted a policy yet more mischievous, and to have framed his laws for the enrichment of the needy soldiery who had served under Marius in his successive Consulships, and who might easily be induced to raise their favourite General to the utmost height of his ambition. He proposed an Agrarian law,† for the division of certain districts in Gaul, which, having been overrun by the Cimbri, had after their defeat fallen into the hands of the Romans: and he added to the law a clause, by which the Senators were bound to swear obedience to it, within five days after it should have passed the assembly of the people. But it was apprehended that the soldiers of Marius were likely to be the only gainers from the projected allotment of lands: and among these there was a large proportion of citizens of the allied states of Italy, and also of the agricultural labourers; a class of men which offered an excellent supply of hardy soldiers; and of which Marius had largely availed himself, enlisting, we are told,‡ slaves as well as freemen. Many of these men had received, from their General, admission to the rank of Roman citizens,§ for their gallant behaviour in the late war: for example, he had at one time conferred this reward on a thousand soldiers‖ of Camerinum and its district, and had defended himself, when charged with having acted illegally, by saying, that the din of arms had prevented him from hearing the still voice of the laws. So that the party of Marius and Saturninus consisted not so much of the citizens of the capital, as of a country and provincial interest: and in the disturbances that followed, the inhabitants of Rome espoused generally the side of the aristocracy; as feeling that the projects of the three associates were as little favourable to them as to the Senate itself. On the other hand a multitude of citizens,* or of men who hoped to become such, flocked in from the country to support the proposed laws of Saturninus; and as force seemed likely to be more employed than any legal methods, many came to Rome on this occasion, who, although they could not vote in a lawful assembly, were yet able to give their party a powerful support by clamour and violence. It was by these arms indeed that Saturninus triumphed. Bæbius,† one of his colleagues, who interposed his negative on the Agrarian law, was driven from the place of meeting by showers of stones; and when some of the aristocratical party exclaimed, "that they heard thunder," a sound which according to the custom of the Romans should at once have broken up the assembly, Saturninus replied, "that it would hail presently, if they were not quiet." The people of the city incensed at this open violence, endeavoured to maintain their ground by force, but they were overpowered by the armed mob at the disposal of Saturninus, and being obliged to abandon the field, the law was passed amidst the shouts of the victorious party. Other laws in the same spirit were carried in the same manner; one, decreeing a division of lands in Africa to the veteran soldiers, and assigning a hundred jugera to each man: another, ordering that colonies should be planted in various parts of Sicily and Greece; and a third, appropriating the treasure plundered at Thoulouse by Q. Cæpio for the purchase of lands to be distributed amongst the poor. To these laws, as has been already mentioned, the Senate was ordered to swear obedience within five days; a step concerted by Marius and his associates to procure the destruction of Q. Metellus, whose undaunted integrity they knew would never allow him to consent to a measure which he deemed mischievous, or to submit to an usurped and unlawful authority. Saturninus and Glaucia hated him, because he had noticed them both when he was Censor for the infamy of their lives. Marius had been patronised by him and his family in early youth,‡ and had since deprived him of the honour of finishing the war with Jugurtha by his intrigues and calumnies. A vile nature hates none so much as those from whom it has received kindness, and whose kindness it has recompensed with injury; there was enough therefore, besides the constant antipathy which evil bears to good, to make Marius the determined enemy of Metellus.

As soon as the law was passed, Marius,§ in his quality of Consul, expressed his indignation against it in the Senate, and declared that he would never submit to take the oath required. Metellus made a similar declaration, and the Senate applauding their firmness, was prepared to offer an unanimous resistance to the oath. But on the evening of the fifth day, Marius

Rome. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

* Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 28.
† Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 29.
‡ Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 9. § Cicero, *pro Balbo*, c. 20.
‖ Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 28.

* Appian, lib. i. c. 29.
† *Auctor de Viris illustribus*, *in Vita Saturnini.*
‡ Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 4. § Appian, lib. i. c. 30.

History. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

hastily called the Senate together, and told them, that it was too dangerous openly to oppose the will of the people; he judged it expedient therefore to take the oath with a qualification, swearing to obey the law so far as it was lawful. They would thus pacify the people for the moment, and when the multitude of citizens from the country should have returned to their homes, it would be easy to show, that the law had not passed legally, the assembly having continued to vote after thunder had been heard; and thus the obligation of the oath would be null and void. Confounded by this display of the Consul's treachery at a moment when there was no time left to concert any new plan of proceeding, the Senators listened to him in silence; and he without giving them leisure to recover themselves, led them out instantly to the Temple of Saturn, and there was himself amongst the first to take the oath. The rest of the Senate followed his example, no man being willing to expose himself as an individual to the fury of the multitude, with the single exception of Metellus. With admirable firmness, that excellent citizen resisted all the arguments and entreaties of his friends, and persisted in his refusal to swear; saying to those around him,* "that a good man was distinguished by his adherence to what was right in defiance of personal danger." On the following day Saturninus exhorted his followers,† who now usurped the functions of the Roman people, to pass an act of banishment against Metellus, and to order, that the Consuls by a public proclamation, should interdict him from the use of fire and water within the limits of Italy. The citizens of the capital wished to make another attempt on this occasion to shake off the tyranny under which they were labouring; and offered Metellus to oppose to the utmost the sentence that was to be proposed against him. But he, rightly judging it the duty of a good subject to submit peaceably to physical force, as much as it had been to refuse active obedience to an illegal command, declined their proffered assistance; and telling them, "that he never would permit the safety of his country to be endangered on his account," withdrew quietly from Rome. The law of banishment passed without opposition, and Marius had the gratification to proclaim it, and to utter the usual prohibition of the use of fire and water.

Banishment of Q. Metellus.

It is mentioned that Saturninus amongst his other laws,‡ proposed also to confirm the corn law of C. Gracchus, by which corn was to be distributed monthly to the people at five-sixths of an *as* for the *modius* or peck. This sufficiently shows that the law of Gracchus had tacitly become obsolete. Its renewal was resisted strongly by the aristocratical party, and some of the colleagues of Saturninus interposed their negative upon it. But he disregarding all legal impediments, proceeded to put it to the vote; when Q. Servilius Cæpio, one of the Quæstors, and son to the Consul who had fallen a victim to the indignation of the people on account of his ill success against the Cimbri, made an attack upon the assembly at the head of a body of citizens attached to the Senate, overthrew the balloting urns, dispersed the multitude, and prevented the passing of the law. So wretched was the condition of Rome, that those who called themselves the friends of order, were driven to support the Constitution by acts of illegal violence.

Another law, as is probable,* was proposed and carried by C. Servilius Glaucia, to repeal the late act of the Consul Q. Cæpio, and to restore the judicial power entirely to the equestrian order, according to the law of C. Gracchus. The knights were thus won over to favour the pretensions which Glaucia was now making to the Consulship; and their support, together with that of the popular party, was likely to decide the election in his favour. Saturninus also intended to offer himself a third time as a candidate for the office of Tribune; and together with himself he brought forward a man of the lowest rank, named Equitius,† who professed to be a younger brother of Tiberius and C. Gracchus; and although his claim had been utterly rejected by the family, it yet won him some favour with the people, who regarded the name of Gracchus with great affection. When the elections came on, Saturninus and Equitius were chosen Tribunes; but the hopes of Glaucia were in danger of being disappointed, for M. Antonius, so famous for his eloquence, easily obtained his nomination as one of the Consuls, and C. Memmius was a formidable competitor for the place of the other. But Saturninus had committed so many outrages with impunity, that he seemed now to bid defiance to the laws; and an armed party, acting under his orders, assaulted and murdered Memmius in the midst of the election, and at once dispersed the people from the Comitia in consternation at this new crime. But this last violence awakened the Senate, and M. Æmilius Scaurus,‡ the first on the roll of the Senators, and the same person who twelve years before had moved that the Consul Opimius should defend the republic against the party of Gracchus, now again persuaded the Senate to commit the same authority to the Consuls Marius and Valerius Flaccus, and to give them the usual solemn charge to provide for the safety of the commonwealth. Alarmed at this resolution, Saturninus, Glaucia, Equitius, and a body of their followers in arms, seized the Capitol, and declared themselves in open rebellion. Marius, their old associate, and still secretly their friend, could not however avoid acting upon the orders of the Senate, and summoned every citizen to maintain the cause of the republic. All the Tribunes,§ except Saturninus; all the Prætors, except Glaucia; all the senators, all the equestrian order, and all the most respectable citizens in Rome, assembled at the Consul's call; and formed a force so formidable, that Marius was reduced to the condition of an unwilling instrument in their hands, employed by them against a party with which in his heart he entirely sympathized. The rebels however resisted for some time, till Marius cut off the pipes by

Rome. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

Rebellion of Saturninus.

* Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 29. † Appian, lib. i. c. 31.
‡ *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, lib. i. c. 12.

* Cicero says in his treatise, *De claris Oratoribus*, c. 61. that Glaucia had attached to himself the equestrian order by the law which he had carried in their favour; "*Equestrem Ordinem beneficio Legis devinxerat.*" It is supposed that this law was a repeal of that lately passed, U. C. 647, by Q. Cæpio; because it appears from Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 49, that the equestrian order were again in possession of the judicial power at the trial of C. Norbanus, which must have taken place within four or five years of the Prætorship of Glaucia; and Livius Drusus, U. C. 662, attempted once more to give the Senate a place among the judges, which in his time they did not enjoy.
† Valerius Maximus, lib. iii. c. 8. 3. 6. Appian, lib. i. c. 32.
‡ *Auctor de Viris illustribus, in Vita M. Æmilii Scauri.*
§ Cicero, *pro Rabirio*, c. 7.

which the Capitol was supplied with water,* and thus obliged them to surrender. They submitted themselves to him with no great reluctance, relying on his known dispositions in their favour; and he, anxious to save their lives, promised them their safety† without the authority of the Senate, and restraining the indignation of his followers, shut them up in the Curia Hostilia,§ the building originally appropriated for the meetings of the Senate, under pretence of reserving them for an impartial trial hereafter. But the armed citizens under his command, mistrusting the lenity of the Consul, assaulted the place of their confinement; and mounting upon the roof of the building, they took off the tiling,§ and destroyed with missile weapons the whole of the defenceless prisoners below. It is almost peculiar to Roman history, that the vengeance finally inflicted even on so great a criminal as Saturninus, should more resemble a murder than a legal execution.

He and his partisans are put to death.

The late popular leaders were by no means regretted by the people as the Gracchi had been; for not only was their conduct so desperate as to have disgusted all but the most profligate, but their measures, as has been observed, had been less immediately directed to the advantages of the citizens of Rome. It appears rather that Saturninus was generally regarded as an enemy to his country; and two remarkable instances of this feeling are recorded, which deserve to be noticed as illustrative of the arbitrary and violent spirit by which the administration of justice at Rome was characterised. C. Decianus,‖ a man, it is said, of the utmost respectability, was accusing P. Furius, of whom more will be added presently, before the people. In the course of his speech, he happened to complain of the manner in which Saturninus had been put to death; and for this offence he not only lost his cause, although Furius was notoriously a man of most infamous life, but was himself brought to trial and condemned; whether to a fine, or to banishment, is not stated. Sex. Titus also was tried and condemned,¶ for having a statue of Saturninus in his house. Now it is obvious that there could have been no law by which either of these acts was made a crime, and they were punished merely on the principle, that a man might be found guilty for any thing which his Judges chose to consider as criminal; whether it were an offence defined by law or not. The fate of Furius, who escaped, owing to the imprudent speech of his accuser, was, according to Appian,** in itself sufficiently extraordinary. He was one of the Tribunes for the year which followed the sixth Consulship of Marius: and when after the death of Saturninus attempts were made to procure the recall of Metellus from banishment, he interposed his negative upon them all. The son of Metellus threw himself at his feet in vain before the assembled people; and with tears entreated him to relent. But the people, we are told, affected by this scene, decreed that Metellus should return in spite of the Tribune's opposition; and felt so much indignation against Furius, that when he was accused before them for his resistance to their will, the multitude without waiting to hear his defence, fell upon him and tore him to pieces. This story however is only related by Appian, and does not seem altogether probable. So unusual a burst of popular fury is not likely to have been excited by such a cause, when the lapse of some months must have effaced the impression at first produced by the sight of the treatment shown to the prayers of a son in behalf of his father. But here, as in so many other instances in Roman history, the want of good authority, and the imperfection of all existing reports of the times, render it impossible to attain to a knowledge of the truth.

His memory is held in detestation.

Recall of Q. Metellus.

About this time Marcus Aquilius, who commanded in Sicily as Proconsul, concluded a bloody war which had long devastated that island. We speak of the insurrection of the slaves, to which we have before briefly alluded, and which may here deserve to be noticed somewhat more particularly.

Revolt of the Slaves in Sicily.

The termination of the second Punic war had left the whole of Sicily in the quiet possession of the Romans. The inhabitants, when the immediate evils of the contest were over, were on the whole mildly treated. Some of them had indeed adhered throughout to the cause of the Romans; and even in those states which had most vigorously opposed them, there were several considerations which might move the conquerors to forbearance. They had long been the zealous allies of Rome during the reign of Hiero; their revolt had been of short duration, and the bulk of the people had been either deceived or forced into taking a part in it; besides that the importance of the island to Rome and its neighbourhood to Carthage, rendered it expedient to conciliate the inhabitants as much as possible to the Roman government. Accordingly whilst some of the Sicilian states were exempt from all taxes whatsoever,* the great majority were subject only to the same burthen which they had supported under their native princes; the payment namely of a tenth part of the produce of the soil; and the collection of this tax was so well regulated by law, that the farmer was fully protected from paying more than a just tenth, or from suffering any thing vexatious in the manner of payment. Land, thus comparatively unincumbered, and enjoying the highest reputation for fertility, became a desirable object of purchase to the wealthy citizens of Rome and Latium: large estates were accordingly bought up by them,† and were stocked with vast numbers of slaves; the use of whom at this time, as we have already noticed, began almost entirely to supersede that of free labourers. In order to derive from them the greatest possible profit,‡ they were miserably fed and clothed; and were thus driven to support themselves by robbery; their manner of life as shepherds, in which service a large proportion of them was employed, affording them great facilities in the practice of plunder. It is said moreover that the governors of the island were deterred from punishing these offenders by the wealth and influence of their masters; who were well pleased that their slaves should provide for their own wants at the expense of the public.

First revolt headed by Eunus.

In this state of things,§ the slaves began to entertain projects of a general insurrection, and a leader was not long wanting to call them forth into action.

* Cicero, *pro Rabirio*, c. 11. † Ibid. c. 10.
‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. § Appian, lib. i. c. 32.
‖ Cicero, *pro Rabirio*, c. 9. Valerius Maximus, lib. viii. c. 1.
¶ Cicero and Valerius Maximus, *ubi suprà*.
** *De Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 33.

* Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. iii. c. 6.
† Florus, lib. iii. c. 19. Diodorus Siculus, lib. xxxiv. *Eclogæ secundæ* Edit. Rhodoman.
‡ Diodorus Siculus, lib. xxxiv. *Ecl.* 2.
§ Ibid. *ubi suprà*.

History. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

Eunus, a Syrian by birth, was the slave of a citizen of Enna named Antigenes; and had acquired great influence amongst his companions in bondage by pretending to divine inspiration, and particularly to a knowledge of the future. Amongst many guesses into futurity, some were likely to be verified by the event; and these established his reputation; so that at last he professed himself to be favoured with constant communication from heaven; and it is said that he used to secrete in his mouth some lighted combustible substance, and thus amazed the vulgar by seeming to breathe forth smoke and fire, as if under the immediate impulse of the god who spoke from within him. The belief in his miraculous endowments was so general, that the slaves of another citizen of Enna named Damophilus, unable to bear the cruelty with which they were treated both by their master and his wife, and bent on revenging themselves, applied first to Eunus, and inquired of him if the gods would grant success to their attempts. He eagerly caught at the opportunity thus offered him; assured them of the favour of heaven, and exhorted them to execute their purpose without delay.* The slaves employed on the several estates in the neighbourhood of Enna were excited by the call of the slaves of Damophilus; a body of four hundred men was collected; and they entered the town under the command of Eunus himself, whose trick of breathing fire is said to have produced a great impression on the minds of his followers. The insurgents were instantly joined by the slaves in the town; and an indiscriminate massacre of the free inhabitants followed, in which men, women, and children, were treated with equal cruelty. Damophilus and his wife were seized at their country house, dragged in triumph to Enna, and there murdered; but their daughter was saved by the slaves, in gratitude for the kindnesses which they had always met with at her hands. Meantime Eunus spared out of the general slaughter such of the citizens of Enna as understood the manufacture of arms, and compelled them to labour in order to supply his followers with weapons. He also took to himself the title and the ensigns of a King, while he bestowed those of Queen on the female slave who lived with him; and he formed a Council consisting of those of his associates most eminent for their courage or ability. In three days he was at the head of six thousand men tolerably armed, besides a great multitude provided only with hatchets, spits, or any other weapons which they could find: and the number of the insurgents daily increasing, he was enabled to overrun the country, and several times to encounter with success the Roman forces which attempted to oppose him. The example presently became contagious: a Cilician slave, named Cleon, took up arms in another part of the island; and far from attempting to rival Eunus, he immediately acknowledged him as King, and acted in every thing by his orders. L. Hypsæus, one of the Prætors, who arrived from Rome about a month after the commencement of the revolt, brought a regular army of eight thousand men against the insurgents; but was out-numbered by them and defeated. Several other Roman officers met with the same bad fortune; and the slaves made themselves masters of many of the towns of that island. Their career was first checked by M. Perpena one of the Prætors, * and afterwards was finally stopped by the Consul, P. Rupilius,† who has been already noticed as the author of measures of extreme severity against the partisans of Tiberius Gracchus. This officer first recovered the town of Taurominium, after a long blockade, in which the slaves were reduced to the utmost extremities of famine; and having put to death all those who fell into his hands, he proceeded to besiege Enna, the first scene of the revolt, and the principal stronghold of the insurgents. The sure process of blockade rendered the condition of the besieged desperate; Cleon was killed in a sally; and the place was in a short time betrayed to the Romans. Eunus escaped from the town, but was soon afterwards taken, and died, it is said, in prison of a loathsome disease; after which Rupilius proceeded to regulate the state of the island, and ten Commissioners were sent from Rome to assist in the settlement,‡ exactly in the manner which we have seen regularly practised by the Senate after the conclusion of its wars with Antiochus, Perseus, Achaia, and Carthage.

Rome. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

The revolt quelled by P. Rupilius.

The revolt was thus apparently suppressed; but the cause of the insurgents found every where so many who sympathized with it, that similar attempts were made within a few years in several other parts of the empire. One of these deserves notice from its singularity. A Roman knight of the name of T. Minucius,§ having incurred a debt beyond his means, and being pressed for the payment of it, purchased five hundred suits of armour, and having conveyed them secretly into the country, employed them in arming his slaves; and then usurping the style and dignity of a king, invited the slaves in general to join him, and murdered his creditors whom he contrived to get into his power. Ridiculous as this leader was, he assembled round him above three thousand followers, and was not reduced by the Prætor who was sent against him without maintaining an obstinate struggle. But a far more serious disturbance soon broke out for the second time in Sicily. When C. Marius was looking for troops in every quarter to oppose the invasion of the Cimbri,‖ a decree of the Senate empowered him to demand assistance from the more distant allies of the republic; and he sent accordingly to Nicomedes King of Bithynia, requiring of him a certain contingent of soldiers. Nicomedes excused himself by saying that so large a portion of his subjects had been carried off and sold for slaves in different parts of the empire, that he was unable to raise the force demanded of him. Upon this the Senate issued an order, that no freeborn native of any state in alliance with Rome should be kept as a slave in any of the Roman provinces; and the provincial magistrates were desired to institute inquiries, and to liberate within their several jurisdictions all those who came within the terms of the Senate's decree. Licinius Nerva, the Prætor of Sicily, began accordingly to set at liberty above eight hundred slaves within a few days; but he was soon persuaded by the rich slave-owners in the island to suspend his proceedings, and

Second revolt headed by Athenio.

* Diodorus Siculus, lib. xxxiv. *Ecl.* 2.

* Florus, lib. iii. c. 19.
† Diodorus, lib. xxxiv. *Ecl.* 2. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lix.
‡ Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. ii. c. 13. 16.
§ Diodorus Siculus, lib. xxxvi. *Ecl.* 1.
‖ Ibid, lib. xxxvi. *Ecl.* 1.

History. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 98.

he in future referred all those who applied to him for their liberty to the decision of their own masters. The slaves thus suddenly disappointed of the hopes which they had felt themselves encouraged by the Senate itself to entertain, * resolved to obtain their freedom for themselves: insurrections broke out in several parts of the island, and although at first partially suppressed revived again with redoubled fury. Sabrius and Athenio were two of the chief insurgents: and the latter displayed considerable military talents, paying more regard to the quality than to the numbers of his army, and accustoming his men to regular discipline. He also, like Eunus, appealed to the superstition of his followers; and declared that the stars had foretold that he should be King over all Sicily. Several Roman Prætors were defeated with loss in successive attempts to reduce the revolters; and the whole of Sicily became a scene of plunder and destruction; many free inhabitants of the poorer class availing themselves of the general confusion, and carrying on an organized system of devastation throughout the country. At length Marcus Aquilius, the colleague of Marius in his fifth consulship, was sent against this obstinate enemy. He followed the example of Rupilius, by shutting the insurgents up in their strongholds, and surrounding them with lines of circumvallation till famine obliged them to surrender. Many however had fallen by the sword in several previous engagements; and those who at last submitted were sent to Rome, and destined there to afford sport for the populace by being exposed to fight with beasts in the amphitheatre. But it is said that they preserved their fierceness to the last, and instead of combating with the beasts turned their swords against one another, and shed their blood upon the altars appointed for the sacrifices usually performed at the games, the last survivor completing the slaughter by killing himself. The peace of the island thus with difficulty restored, was maintained for the future by regulations of extreme severity. No slave was allowed to carry a weapon; † and on one occasion when a boar of remarkable size had been sent as a present to L. Domitius, at that time Prætor of the island, he inquired who had killed it; and finding that it was a slave employed as a shepherd, he summoned the man before him, and asked him how he had contrived to destroy so large an animal. The shepherd replied, that he had killed it with a boar spear; upon which Domitius ordered him immediately to be crucified for having used a weapon in defiance of the law. In consequence of this arbitrary system, we read of no more revolts of the slaves in Sicily for a very long period.

Quelled by Marcus Aquilius.

Trial and acquittal of Aquilius. U. C. 654.

But whatever were the military services of Manius Aquilius, in subduing the insurgent slaves, his conduct as a man too much resembled that of his father whom we have seen poisoning the wells in Asia, and afterwards tried for his corruption and oppression. His son was in like manner brought to trial on a similar charge; and it appears that his guilt could not be denied; for M. Antonius, the orator, who acted as his advocate, could only save him by a violent appeal to the feelings of the Judges.* He contrasted the former honours of the accused with his present condition; and at last he tore open the dress of his client, and exposed the wounds which he had received in the course of his services as a soldier. So little were the duties of a court of justice observed at Rome, that this most irrelevant mode of defence was completely successful; and Aquilius escaped condemnation. How hard is it for good government and equal justice to exist among a people who allow their feelings to influence them against their reason in the discharge of a solemn duty!

Rome From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

In the following year an attempt was made to check the violent measures sometimes proposed by the Tribunes, and which the people were used to approve without due consideration. A law was passed which bears the names of both the Consuls, Q. Cæcilius Metellus Nepos, a cousin of Q. Metellus Numidicus, and T. Didius; and by which it was enacted, that every law should be published on three successive market days,† before it could be submitted to the votes of the people; it was also provided that the people should not be obliged to accept or reject any clause of a law contrary to their wishes, as was often the case at present, when several enactments being contained in one law, and proposed to the votes of the assembly all together, it was necessary either to approve or to negative the whole without discrimination.

U. C. 655.

The Cæcilian and Didian law.

Origin and progress of Sumptuary laws.

The year of Rome 656 is marked by some discussions which arose on the subject of Sumptuary laws. In a constitution which permitted the magistrates to interfere with the private life of every citizen to the extent practised by the Censors, the expenses of the table were not likely to escape the control of the law. We read of various statutes passed from time to time, with a view to restrain what was called luxury: in the year 538, only a year after the battle of Cannæ, C. Oppius, one of the Tribunes, ‡ brought forward a law to regulate the degree of ornament which might be allowed in female dress, and forbidding the ladies of Rome to use a carriage within the city, except in their attendance on the public sacrifices. But after the end of the second Punic war, it was contended that such provisions were fitted only for a season of national distress, and the Oppian law was repealed. Of the laws directed particularly against the expenses of the table, the first in order of time is fixed about the year 571, § and was proposed by Orchius one of the Tribunes, on the recommendation of the Senate. It limited the number of guests at any entertainment, and ordered, as we are told, that the doors of the house should be left open during the meal to guard against any violation of its enactments. A little more than twenty years afterwards, in the interval between the overthrow of Perseus and the third Punic war, the attention of the Senate was again directed to the same subject. By a decree of that assembly, ‖ the principal

* Diodorus Siculus, lib. xxxvi. *Ecl.* 1. It may be observed that the testimony of Diodorus is more than usually valuable in his account of these transactions, from his being himself a Sicilian, and always showing a lively interest in events that happened in his own country.

† Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. v. c. 3,

* Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 48. *In Verrem*, lib. v. c. 1.

† *Ibid. Philipp.* v. c. 3. *Pro Domo*, c. 20.

‡ Livy, lib. xxxiv. c. 1.

§ Macrobius, *Saturn.* lib. ii. c. 13. *Apud Facciolati Lexicon, in Voce "Orchia."*

‖ Gellius, lib. ii. *apud Sigonium, Commentar. in Fast. et Triumph.*

History. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

citizens who were in the habit of giving entertainments to one another, during the celebration of the games in honour of Cybele, were obliged to make oath before the Consuls that they would not expend on any meal more than a hundred and twenty *asses*, or 7*s.* 9*d.* sterling, exclusive of the sum paid for bread, vegetables, and wine; that they would use no other wine than that made in Italy, and that they would not have more than a hundred pounds weight of silver displayed at their table. Afterwards in the same year, a law was passed bearing the name of C. Fannius,* one of the Consuls, which restrained the expense of meals still more. On the greatest festivals no man was allowed to exceed an hundred *asses*, 6*s.* 5¼*d.*: on ten other days in every month he might go as high as thirty *asses*, or 1*s.* 11¼*d.*; and at all other times he was limited to no more than ten, about 7½*d.* of English money. By the same law,† also the consumption of poultry and all kinds of birds was expressly forbidden, with the exception of a single hen at each table, and this, it was added, must not have been regularly fatted. This was repeated as a favourite clause in all future laws on the same subject; and other articles of food were prohibited by successive enactments;—as for example, M. Æmilius Scaurus, one of the Consuls in the year 638, excluded dormice from the table,‡ which little animals the Romans, it appears, were accustomed to catch in great numbers, and regarded them when fatted as a peculiar delicacy. It is natural enough that men of small or moderate fortune, who could not indulge in the magnificence of splendid villas, numerous slaves, or costly furniture, should bear with great impatience these restrictions upon that peculiar gratification which was to them most accessible; besides that, they looked upon any interference in such matters, as an encroachment on their just liberty of doing what they chose with their own money. We find accordingly that M. Duronius, one of the Tribunes,§ procured the rejection of a new Sumptuary law brought forward about the year of Rome 656, to enforce the provisions of the law of Fannius. For this action, Duronius was shortly after expelled from the Senate by the Censors M. Antonius and L. Flaccus; and a Sumptuary law was in fact carried by the Consul P. Licinius Crassus,‖ limiting the quantity of meat which might be brought to table on ordinary occasions, but still permitting an unrestricted consumption of vegetables. There is in one of Cicero's letters,¶ testimony to show that these regulations remained in force for many years; and that their intention was completely evaded by the arts of cookery, which found means to provide a luxurious and expensive meal out of the common productions of the garden.

In the Consulship of P. Licinius Crassus, and Cn. Lentulus, is also dated a decree of the Senate for the abolition of human sacrifices.** When the republic was engaged in any dangerous war, the superstition of the Romans believed that to bury alive in the midst of Rome an individual of the adverse nation, was a powerful charm to secure victory. This had been put in practice in the second Punic war; and although now forbidden, was repeated afterwards on more than one occasion till long after the first preaching of Christianity.*

Rome. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

It is with pleasure that we are now called to contemplate two rare instances of integrity and humanity: Q. Mucius Scævola, and P. Rutilius Rufus. Q. Scævola filled the office of Consul in the year of Rome 658, together with L. Licinius Crassus, so celebrated as an orator. On the expiration of the year, he was appointed as Proconsul to the government of the province of Asia;† by which name the Romans meant to express those countries on the western side of Asia Minor, which had formerly composed the kingdom of Pergamus. P. Rutilius attended him as his lieutenant,‡ and cordially co-operated with him in all his proceedings. He only held his command for nine months,§ but during that short period he so endeared himself to the people whom he governed, by the equity of his administration, and by the firmness with which he protected them against the oppressions of the farmers of the revenue, that a festival was instituted in commemoration of his goodness,‖ and continued to be observed for many years afterwards in Asia; while at Rome his name became identified with that of an upright and merciful magistrate,¶ and his conduct was long held up by the Senate as a model which officers appointed to similar stations should diligently endeavour to copy. Q. Mucius was happy moreover in never being exposed to the malice of those whose interests had suffered from his pure and incorrupt government. But his lieutenant P. Rutilius was less fortunate. The judicial power according to the law of C. Gracchus, (which after a short interruption had been lately put in force again by C. Servilius Glaucia,) was as we have stated, vested entirely in the equestrian order. This class of men was closely connected with the farmers of the revenue, and entered warmly into their complaints of the treatment which they had received from Mucius and Rutilius. Rutilius was accused of corruption in his province, perhaps by some of those very individuals whose own corruption he had repressed: and was brought to trial before a court consisting entirely of citizens of the equestrian order. His conduct on his trial was consistent with the high principles of his general life. He refused to employ any celebrated orator in his defence,** nor would he suffer any attempts to be made to work upon the feelings of his Judges. His friend Q. Mucius spoke in his behalf, confining himself only to a clear and simple statement of the truth. But the tribunal which had so lately acquitted the guilty Aquilius, when defended by an appeal to its passions, now condemned a man of the most spotless innocence, who disdained any support but that of reason and justice.

Just administration of Q. Mucius in Asia.

Trial of P. Rutilius.

* Macrobius, *Saturnal.* lib. ii. c. 13.—*apud Facciolati Lexicon, in Voce "Fannia."*
† Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. 10. c. 50. ‡ Ibid. lib. viii. c. 57.
§ Valerius Maximus, lib. ii. c. 9.
‖ Aul. Gellius, lib. ii. c. 24.—*apud Facciolati in Voce "Licinius."*
¶ *Epistol. ad Familiares*, lib. vii. ep. 26.
** Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. xxx. c. 1.

* Pliny, lib. xxviii. c. 2.
† Livy, *Epitom.* lib. 70. Others place his government of Asia about four years earlier, and say that he obtained the province as Proprætor.
‡ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. 70.
§ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. v. ep. 17.
‖ Ibid. *in Verrem*, lib. ii. c. 21.
¶ Ibid. *in Cæcilium*, c. 17. Valerius Maximus, lib. viii. c. 15.
** Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. i. c. 53.

History. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

Rutilius was banished, and retired to Smyrna,* in the country which was the scene of his alleged corruption, but which was in truth the best witness of his virtue. The people whom he was accused of misgoverning, sent deputies from all their several towns to welcome his arrival once more amongst them; nor did they shew less respect to him in his exile than when invested with the authority of a Roman officer.† The citizens of Smyrna gladly gave him the freedom of their city;‡ and in this adopted home, Rutilius spent in peace the remainder of his life; nor could the solicitations of Sylla when Dictator, ever prevail with him to return to Italy.

Censorship of Domitius and Crassus.

In the year of Rome 661 some curious particulars are recorded of the Censorship of Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, and L. Licinius Crassus. The study of eloquence daily becoming more popular at Rome, there arose a number of persons who professed to teach it, and who opened schools for the instruction of young men in this accomplishment. Of these teachers some were Greeks, and if they only interpreted and expounded the works of some of their distinguished countrymen, they must have communicated to their hearers much new and valuable knowledge. An acquaintance with the rhetoric of Aristotle must have opened an unknown world to the mind of a young Roman, and have furnished him with innumerable subjects of thought, while it led him to examine the motives of actions, and the causes of feelings; while it embraced, with wonderful conciseness, the principles of almost every argument that could be used in all questions, judicial and political; and while with intuitive good sense it displayed the excellencies to be aimed at, and the faults to be avoided, in the language and arrangement of a writer or an orator. But besides these Greek instructors, some of the Romans themselves professed to open schools of Rhetoric; and being for the most part men of little education, and delivering their lessons probably on cheaper terms than the Greek teachers, their scholars consisted chiefly of the poorer class of citizens, and particularly, we may suppose, of those individuals, who wished to qualify themselves for the part of noisy and factious leaders of the populace. It was on these grounds, as Cicero makes Crassus himself affirm, in the *Dialogue de Oratore*,* that the Censors, in the exercise of their arbitrary power, thought proper to put a stop to the proceedings of the Latin teachers of eloquence: because, in the language of Cicero, "they could teach their pupils nothing but impudence." In the course of the year, the two Censors are said to have had a very unbecoming quarrel with each other: the expensive habits in which Crassus indulged in his manner of living, appearing to his colleague to be unworthy of his Censorian dignity. It appears, that Crassus had six date trees in his garden,† of remarkable size and beauty, which he valued very highly; and four pillars of the marble of Mount Hymettus in his house,‡ a material which had not hitherto been used in any public building at Rome, and which, in a private house, was thought to argue excessive luxury. Another ridiculous charge was brought by Cn. Domitius against his colleague;§ that he had gone into mourning on the death of a favourite fish, which was kept in one of his fish-ponds. Crassus, we are told, confessed the truth of the story,—saying, "that he had indeed wept at the loss of a fish; but that Domitius had borne the loss of three wives without shedding a tear." The History of Rome presents us at once with instances of the strangest extravagance of conduct in some characters, combined with a most complete intolerance of every thing eccentric, in the general feelings of the magistrates and the spirit of the laws.

Rome. From U. C. 633. — B. C. 121. to U. C. 662. — B. C. 92.

The succeeding year, in which Sextus Julius Cæsar and L. Marcius Philippus were Consuls, witnessed the origin of the Italian war. But as the parties formed on this occasion were not without their effect in the Civil war that followed; and as Sylla took a distinguished part in the contest maintained by Rome against her revolted allies, we shall include our account of these transactions in the narrative of that individual's life, which we are now preparing to lay before our readers.

A. U. C. 662. — A. C. 91.

* Cicero, *de Republicâ*, lib. i. c. 8.
† Valerius Maximus, lib. ii. c. 10.
‡ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iv. c. 43.

* Lib. iii. c. 24.
† Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. xvii. c. 1.
‡ *Ibid.* lib. xvii. c. 1.
§ Macrobius, *Saturnal.* lib. ii. c. 1

LUCIUS CORNELIUS SYLLA.

PART I.

FROM U. C. 616. A. C. 138. TO U. C. 666. A. C. 88.

Biography. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

THE Cornelian family was one of the most ancient and honourable in Rome; and two of its branches, the houses of Scipio and Lentulus, furnished the commonwealth with a long list of distinguished officers, in the several departments of state. A third branch bore the surname of Rufinus; but although its members occasionally appear on the lists of magistrates, none of them, till a much later period, rose to any high personal eminence. In the second Punic war, in the year of Rome 540, P. Cornelius Rufinus, being then Prætor, celebrated for the first time* the *Ludi Apollinares*, or Games in honour of Apollo, which the Sibylline books had directed the Senate to institute; and from this circumstance he is said to have changed his name of Rufinus, for that of Sibylla;† which was afterwards corrupted into the shorter appellation of Sylla. His great grandson was L. Cornelius Sylla, the subject of our present narrative, who was born‡ about the year of Rome 616, in the Consulship of M. Æmilius Lepidus, and C. Hostilius Mancinus, four years before the death of Tiberius Gracchus.

The father of Sylla did nothing to promote either the honour or the wealth of his family, and his son was born with no very flattering prospects, either of rank or fortune. We know not by whom his education was superintended; but he acquired, either from his instructors or by his own exertion, in after life, an unusual portion of knowledge; and had the character of being very profoundly versed in the literature§ of the Greeks. But intellectual superiority affords no security for the moral principles of its possessor: and Sylla, from his earliest youth,‖ was notorious for gross sensuality, and for his keen enjoyment of low and profligate society. He is said to have lived in lodgings at Rome,¶ and to have rented one floor of a house, for which he paid 3000 nummi, or about £24. 4*s.* 4½*d.* a year: a style of living which seems to have been reckoned disgraceful to a man of Patrician family, and to have inferred great indigence. For his first advancement in life, he was indebted to the fondness of a prostitute, who had acquired a large sum of money, and left it all to him by her will; and he also inherited the property of his mother-in-law, who regarded him as her own son. He was chosen one of the Quæstors in the year of Rome 646, and accompanied Marius, then in his first Consulship, into Africa; where, as has been mentioned elsewhere, his services were very remarkable, and it was to him that Jugurtha was at last surrendered by Bocchus King of Mauritania. This circumstance excited, as it is said, the jealousy of Marius: but Sylla** nevertheless acted under him as one of his lieutenants in the war with the Cimbri; where he again greatly distinguished himself. But finding the ill-will of his General daily increasing, he left him, and served in the army of Lutatius Catulus, the colleague* of Marius: and in this situation, being charged with the duty of supplying the soldiers with provisions, he performed it so well that the army of Catulus was in the midst of abundance, while that of Marius was labouring under severe privations. This still further inflamed the animosity with which Marius already regarded him.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

For some years after this period Sylla seems to have lived in the mere enjoyment of his favourite pleasures of intellectual and sensual excitement. At length, in the year of Rome 657, he became a candidate for the office of Prætor, but without success. He attributed his failure, according to Plutarch,† to the disappointment of the people at his not first suing for the Ædileship; it being a long-established custom that the Ædiles should exhibit shows of some kind or other for the amusement of the multitude, and Sylla's friendship with the King of Mauritania, seemed to promise that he would procure from Africa an unusual number of lions and other wild beasts, to be hunted in the Amphitheatre. However, in the following year, Sylla was elected Prætor, without the previous step of going through the office of Ædile: and not to deprive the people of the gratification they expected, he exhibited no fewer than a hundred lions; the first time, it is said, that the male lion‡ was ever brought forward in the sports of the Circus. On the expiration of his Prætorship, he obtained the province of Cilicia;§ and was commissioned to replace on his throne Ariobarzanes, King of Cappadocia, who had been lately expelled by Mithridates. This he easily effected; for Mithridates was not yet prepared to encounter the power of Rome: and it is further mentioned, as a memorable circumstance in the life of Sylla, that while he was in Cappadocia, he received the first communication ever made to any Roman officer by the sovereign of Parthia. Arsaces, King of that country, perceiving that the Romans extended their influence into his neighbourhood, sent an embassy to Sylla to solicit their alliance. In the interview between the Roman Prætor and the Parthian ambassador, Sylla‖ claimed the precedence in rank, with the usual arrogance of his countrymen; and by this behaviour, in all probability, left no very friendly feeling in the mind of Arsaces; and rather encouraged than lessened that jealousy of the Roman power,

Sylla obtains the Prætorship.

His proceedings in his province.

* Livy, lib. xxv. c. 12.
† Macrobius, *apud Facciolati Lexicon, in Voce Sulla.*
‡ Velleius Patercul. lib. ii. c. 17.
§ Sallust, *Bell. Jugurth.* c. 95.
‖ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 2.
¶ Ibid. *in Sylla*, c. 1. ** Velleius Patercul. lib. ii. c. 17.

* Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 4.
† Ibid. *in Sylla*, c. 5.
‡ Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. viii. c. 16.
§ *Auctor de Viris illustribus, in Vitâ Syllæ.* Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 5. Livy, *Epit.* 70.
‖ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 5.

Biography. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

which the Parthians, in the sequel, were often enabled to manifest with more success than any other nation since the time of Hannibal.

On Sylla's return to Rome, he was threatened with a prosecution for corrupt proceedings in his province;* but the matter was never brought to a trial. It is said also that Bocchus, King of Mauritania, presented to the Romans about this time a group of figures in gold, representing himself betraying Jugurtha into the hands of Sylla. This excited anew the jealousy of Marius, who is represented to have attempted in vain to hinder the figures from being received and dedicated in the Capitol.

Consulship of L. Philippus, and Sex. Jul. Cæsar. A. U. C. 662.

We are now arrived at the memorable Consulship of L. Marcius Philippus and Sextus Julius Cæsar. Since the death of Saturninus the state of affairs at Rome had been generally tranquil; and the accounts given of this period in ancient writers are proportionably scanty. But to this calm a terrible storm was now to succeed, and Rome, for the first time since the second Punic war, was to be engaged in a desperate contest in the very heart of Italy. It appears that the Senate bore† with impatience the great power enjoyed by the equestrian order in possessing the whole judicial authority in the commonwealth. To attack this formidable body it was necessary that the Senate should effect a coalition with the popular party, and court it by a series of popular enactments. M. Livius Drusus was at this time one of the Tribunes; the son of that M. Drusus who had been one of the colleagues of C. Gracchus in his Tribuneship, and who had greatly undermined the popularity of Gracchus, by proposing, with the authority of the Senate, laws even more grateful to the multitude than his. His son was now prevailed upon to act a similar part, and to bribe the people at almost any price to assist in the meditated attack upon the equestrian order. But Drusus was not of a temper to be the mere instrument of the designs of others. He is described as a man of great talents and great pride: insomuch, that during his Ædileship,‡ when one of his colleagues suggested something as beneficial to the state, Drusus scornfully replied, "What business have you to interfere in the affairs of our commonwealth?" and when he acted as Quæstor in Asia, he disdained the usual insignia of the office, as if his own personal dignity needed not any external marks of honour. In his Tribuneship he was willing to promote the popularity of the Senate, but not so as to resign to it all the credit that his measures might acquire: he rather aspired to be, as it were, the moderator of the republic, to balance the claims of contending factions, and to secure to himself the respect and gratitude of all. The imperfect accounts of these times which remain to us, do not allow us to arrange the order of his proceedings with exactness: but it appears that he at first attempted merely to restrain any abuse of power in those who filled the stations of Judges,§ by making them responsible for their verdicts; and liable to be tried, if there were any grounds for accusing them of corruption. Three of the most eminent individuals of the equestrian order, amongst whom we find the name of C. Mæcenas, an ancestor of the famous minister of Augustus, opposed the law of Drusus in behalf of the whole body to which they belonged; and their arguments, as recorded by Cicero,* are too remarkable to be omitted. They insisted that the Roman Knights, in declining to sue for those offices which might have raised them to the rank of Senators, had deliberately sacrificed their ambition to their love of security; that the high dignities which a Senator enjoyed, were fairly compensated by his greater liability to have his conduct called in question: while, on the other hand, the equestrian order, which was obliged by law to undertake the office of Judges, ought not to be exposed to prosecution for the manner in which they discharged it. Strange as this reasoning appears to us, it was admitted as just at Rome: the Plebeians fully sympathized with the Knights, and they succeeded in rejecting the proposed law, and in repelling all inquiry into the conduct of the Judges, however great might be the iniquity of their decisions. Thus baffled, Drusus had recourse to a stronger measure, and proposed to restore the law of Q. Servilius Cæpio, by which the judicial power had been divided between the Senate and the equestrian order. By a curious coincidence one of his warmest opponents was a son of the very man in whose steps he was treading, Q. Cæpio.† Common report assigned a ridiculous cause to their mutual opposition, by tracing it back in the first instance, to a dispute at a public sale about a valuable gold ring, which each of them was eager to purchase. Personal motives may very possibly have added virulence to their political differences; but Q. Cæpio, as a member of the equestrian order, was naturally disposed to resist the measures of Drusus; and the same vehemence of temper, which induced him, on a former occasion, to defy the power of the Tribune Saturninus, would lead him to take an equally prominent part on the side that he now espoused. The proposed law met with another powerful antagonist in the Consul L. Philippus. He seems to have been actuated by a settled feeling of opposition to the aristocracy; as we have seen him, when Tribune, eager to bring forward an Agrarian law; and now, as Consul, he continually, in his speeches to the people, inveighed against the Senate‡ with the utmost severity. On the other hand, Drusus pursued his schemes with the overbearing violence to which the pride of his nature prompted him: on one occasion he threatened Cæpio,§ that he would order him to be thrown from the Tarpeian rock; at another time, when Philippus was speaking against him in the Forum, he caused him to be seized and dragged to prison; and when, from the tightness with which the officer grappled him, the blood burst forth from his nostrils, Drusus exclaimed, in allusion to the supposed luxuriousness of his manner of living, "that it was the pickle of his favourite fish." In order to further his views, he proposed a new Corn law, and a law for the establishment of several new colonies, to conciliate the common people; and to win the favour of the Italian allies, he renewed the hopes for-

Tribuneship of M. Livius Drusus.

Laws of M. Drusus.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

Opposed by Q. Cæpio and L. Philippus.

* Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 5, 6.
† Livy, *Epitom.* lib. 70. Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 13.
‡ *Auctor de Viris illustribus, in M. Druso.*
§ Cicero, *pro Rabir. Postumo*, c. 7. *pro Cluentio*, c. 56.

* *Pro Cluentio*, c. 56.
† Cicero, *pro Domo*, c. 46. Florus, lib. iii. c. 17.
‡ Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. i. c. 7.
§ *Auctor de Viris illustribus in M. Druso.*

merly held out to them by C. Gracchus and M. Fulvius Flaccus, of obtaining the privileges of Roman citizens. The Senate, for a long time, cordially supported him; and this circumstance gave occasion to the violent speech of the Consul, L. Philippus,* "That it was impossible for the republic to go on with such a Senate." But, at length, their zeal in his cause began to cool: while he professed to defend their dignity, he almost pretended to act as their patron; and on one occasion,† when they sent for him into the Senate house, he replied, "That the Senate should rather adjourn to the Curia Hostilia," anciently used as the place of their meetings, "that so they might be near him while he was addressing the people, if they wanted him."—It is said, that the Senate actually complied with his proposal; but such an instance of his pride must have taught it, that it was possible to buy too dearly its deliverance from the arbitrary power of the equestrian order. Meanwhile the laws of Drusus were successively carried: the judicial power was to be divided between the Senate and the equestrian order; new colonies were to be planted; corn was to be sold at the rate fixed by the Sempronian law; all the several parties whom Drusus had courted, had received the benefits which he had promised them, excepting only the Italian allies. To admitting them to the rights of citizenship, all orders in Rome were equally averse; and they seemed likely to meet the usual fate of strangers who interfere in domestic quarrels, and whose interests are sacrificed to promote the reconciliation of the contending parties. But finding that Drusus was unable to satisfy their expectations, and that nothing was to be looked for from the freewill of the Romans, they prepared to apply themselves to other measures. A conspiracy is said to have been formed by the Latins‡ to assassinate the Consul, L. Philippus, whom they considered as one of their greatest enemies, while he was performing a sacrifice on the Alban Mount. Drusus, aware of their design, warned Philippus to provide for his own safety, and the plan was thus frustrated; but the public mind, throughout Italy, was in the highest state of agitation, and every thing seemed to presage an impending contest.

But are mostly carried.

Drusus is murdered.

It was at this time, when all parties were united in their invectives against Drusus as the author of these disturbances, that one day, when he was returning home from the Forum,§ encircled by an immense crowd of his followers, he was murdered at the door of his own house by some unknown assassin, who stabbed him, and left the knife sticking in his side. He was carried in immediately, and soon after expired; and such was the state of the times, that no inquiry was made to find out the murderer. But it was commonly asserted that Q. Varius Hybrida, ‖ a vehement enemy of the Senate, was the perpetrator of the crime.

And his laws repealed.

After the death of Drusus, the general feeling ran so strongly against his measures, from the sense entertained of his criminal rashness in encouraging the claims of the Italian allies, that the Senate now concurred with the Consul Philippus in declaring all his laws invalid;* grounding this decision on the authority of the Consul, who was also one of the Augurs, and who alleged that they had been passed without due attention to the forms of religion in observing the auspices. It is remarkable, that the law for the regulation of the judicial power, which the Senate had so strong an interest in maintaining, was notwithstanding annulled, together with the rest; as if the aristocracy had not dared to retain any benefit from the support of a man, who was now considered as an enemy to his country by all parties equally.

The allies, however, had not yet broken out into open hostilities when the new Consuls, L. Julius Cæsar and P. Rutilius Rufus, entered upon their office. In the mean time the equestrian order having thus successfully repelled the attack made against it, resolved to follow up its victory, and to terrify its enemies by an unsparing exercise of that judicial power of which it had been vainly attempted to deprive it. A law was proposed and carried by Q. Varius Hybrida,† the reputed assassin of Drusus, and now one of the Tribunes of the people, that an inquiry should be set on foot in order to discover what persons had given encouragement to the pretensions of the Italians, and that all who had done so should be held guilty of a treasonable offence. This was a favourite method of annoying the nobility; and we have seen it practised already with success at the beginning of the war with Jugurtha. The Knights promised themselves the same results from it on the present occasion. Accusations were brought against M. Æmilius Scaurus,‡ the first on the roll of the Senate; against M. Antonius, § the famous orator, against C. Cotta,‖ Q. Pompeius, L. Memmius, and several others of the Senators. But the majority of those whom we have named obtained their acquittal; and the whole proceeding had little other effect than that of exasperating the Italians still further, when they saw that to have shewn any encouragement to their petitions was considered at Rome as a crime.

A. U. C. 663.

Confederacy among the Italian states.

Accordingly the different cities of Italy ‖ entered into a secret league with each other, and began to make an interchange of hostages. Their intrigues were first discovered at Asculum, a town of Picenum; and Q. Servilius, with Proconsular authority, was sent thither to punish the offenders. But not being supported by a sufficient military force, he provoked the inhabitants to proceed at once to open violence; and they accordingly massacred him and his lieutenant Fonteius,** together with all other Roman citizens who happened to be found in Asculum. Immediately after the perpetration of this outrage, the Italians with one consent flew to arms: the Marsi,†† the Peligni, the Samnites, the Lucani, the Vestini, the Manucini, the Picentes, the Hirpini, and the Japygians,‡‡ almost every nation in Italy, except the Latins, Tuscans, and Umbrians, took part in the Confederacy. They fixed upon Corfinium as their seat of government,‡‡ giving it the

Revolt of the Italian allies.

* Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. iii. c. 1.
† Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 5.
‡ *Auctor de Viris illustribus, in M. Druso.*
§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 14. Cicero, *pro Milone*, c. 7.
‖ Cicero, *de Naturâ Deorum*, lib. iii. c. 33.

* Cicero, *de Legibus*, lib. ii. c. 6, 12.
† Valerius Maximus, lib. viii. c. 6. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 37.
‡ Cicero, *Fragm. Orat. pro M. Scauro.*
§ Ibid. *Tuscul. Disput.* lib. ii. c. 24.
‖ Ibid. *de Claris Orator.* c. 56, 89.
¶ Appian, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. i. c. 38.
** Cicero, *pro Fonteio*, c. 14.
†† Appian, lib. i. c. 39. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. 72.
‡‡ Diodorus Siculus, *Eclog.* lib. 37.

name of Italicum; and there a Senate was formed out of the principal individuals in the several states; and two officers were elected with the title of Consuls to conduct the operations of the war; each, in imitation of the practice of the Romans, having one half of Italy assigned him as his province, and six generals, with the title of lieutenants, to act under his command. A deputation was sent to the Roman Senate, representing the reasonable claims of the Italians to enjoy their share of the privileges of a city, whose greatness was in so large a proportion the work of their own courage and fidelity; but an answer was returned with the usual spirit of the Romans, that no proposals would be received until the Italians should express contrition for their rebellion, and return to their obedience. Thus an end was put to all negociation, and the war was commenced on both sides with the utmost vigour and animosity.

Of the nature of the ancient system of alliance between a stronger and a weaker power.

That the reader may more fully understand the nature of this quarrel, and of the connection which subsisted between Rome and the different nations of Italy, it will be proper to refer to the history of an earlier period, and to notice that system of alliances between the stronger and weaker powers which is one of the most peculiar points in the political relations of antiquity.

Nothing can be imagined more miserable than the condition of the weaker states in those ages of barbarism which subsisted both in Greece and Italy long after the establishment of political societies or commonwealths. That superior power conferred a right of dominion, and that foreigners might be freely plundered, unless protected by some particular treaty, were two principles generally acted upon; and which exposed all small communities to the double evils of oppression from their neighbours, and of kidnapping and robbery from any one who had the means of occasionally reaching them. Their only resource was to form a connection with some nation strong enough to defend them; and the protection of which they purchased by binding themselves to serve it faithfully in all its wars; or, in other words, by surrendering their national independence. Unhappily the system of government which prevailed in those times led them to preserve their municipal independence, and substituted the connection of alliance, for that of union under the same executive and legislative power. The origin of most of the cities of Greece and Italy resembled that of the European settlements in America; they were the colonies of a more civilized people seating themselves in the country of barbarians; and thus instead of freely naturalizing themselves and spreading over the face of the land, they advanced timidly and slowly beyond the walls of their first fortified habitation, and were accustomed to contract their feelings of patriotism within the limits of a single city. The spirit of a town is naturally somewhat republican; men are thrown more completely together, they live in the sight of one another, and all are readily summoned together to consider on any thing that may affect the common interest. Thus the principle of representation does not suggest itself to their minds; where all can meet to consult for themselves, they are not likely to intrust others with the power of acting for them. In this manner, it came to be considered as an axiom amongst the political writers of antiquity, that where any portion of liberty was enjoyed, there some points at least must be subject to the decision of the collective body of the people; and even where property was made a qualification, and the poorest citizens were excluded from the public assemblies, still those who had a voice in the commonwealth always exercised it in their own persons collectively, and not through the medium of representatives; and thus the national council, if so it might be called, was always a considerable portion of the whole population, and formed too large a body to be contained within the walls of a single building. This circumstance rendered it impossible for the dependent allies of a state to become incorporated with it: the inhabitants of many towns could not habitually meet together in one common assembly; and the citizens of the Capital or seat of government would then in effect hold in their hands an absolute sovereignty over all the rest of the nation. Whereas, by retaining a municipal independence, the allied cities still enjoyed an entire freedom in their internal government, lived under their own laws, held in their own hands the administration of justice, and confined to themselves all offices of civil honour and emolument. But at the same time their interests were thus kept distinct from those of their protecting ally; they were regarded always as subjects and not as fellow-citizens, and were liable to have their property taxed, their trade shackled, and their people called to serve as soldiers, whenever it suited the policy or pleasure of the sovereign state.

Reasons why alliance was preferred to a complete union.

Causes which placed the Romans at the head of an alliance.

The invaluable histories of Thucydides and Xenophon afford a complete picture of these alliances among the Greeks; and it is from these that we must derive our knowledge of the same system, as it was practised in Italy. We find that Rome,* so early as the first year of the commonwealth, was strong enough to act as the protecting ally of several small adjacent cities, among which Ardea, Antium, Laurentum, Circeii, and Tarracina, are particularly mentioned. They were thus secured against the descents which the Carthaginians often made on the coasts of Italy, for the purposes of plunder, and especially of carrying off the inhabitants as slaves; for Rome being of importance enough to treat with Carthage, stipulated that all her own dependent allies should be secured from molestation: but with regard to all the other cities of Latium, it was provided, that if the Carthaginians took any of them, they might carry off the people, and the movable property, but might not convert the towns into establishments or garrisons for themselves. Thus they were allowed to plunder all who did not put themselves under the protection of Rome; and this permission was doubtless intended to exalt the benefits of the Roman alliance in the estimation of the neighbouring states. In process of time the Romans found means to include all the nations of Italy in the number of their allies, and thus to place all the military force of the peninsula at their own disposal. They actually were preparing to call it into action when the Gauls invaded Italy between the first and second Punic wars; and caused returns to be made to them of the whole number of citizens able to bear arms in the several states of their Confederacy.† In every war, the troops of the

Their authority over their allies, 1. In war.

* Polybius, lib. iii. c. 22. † Ibid. lib. ii. c. 23, 24.

Italian allies formed one half of the Roman army: they were levied by orders from the Consuls,* who named the states from which the contingents were to be drawn, the number of them to be raised, and the time and place at which they were to be ready to put themselves under the command of the Roman Generals. They had officers of their own,† and their own pay-masters, but these were entirely subordinate to Generals appointed by the Romans to command them, with the title of Prefects of the allies. The Prefects had the power of punishing by fine or by flogging; and the Consuls, as appears from a passage in Sallust, to which we referred on a former occasion, might even condemn any of the soldiers of the allies to death.‡

2. In peace.

It is more difficult to state exactly what was the power of Rome over the Italian nations in time of peace. Generally speaking, the Roman laws were not binding on the allies, unless they themselves chose to adopt them:§ but a large reservation was made of all such things as the Romans held to concern their dignity or prerogative, and in all these their decisions were of paramount authority to any municipal laws of their allies. For example, it was held that the Senate or people of Rome, or that any of their Generals, might confer the freedom of Rome on any meritorious individuals in the allied states;‖ although it seems that the Italians viewed the exercise of this power with some jealousy, probably because they thought that it gave the Romans too great an influence among them. But with whatever reluctance they might see the rights of Roman citizenship conferred on individuals amongst them by the patronage of Roman magistrates, the allies had long entertained a wish to share universally in these rights, and to find the road open before them to the command of armies, to the administration of provinces, to a participation in short in all the dignities and emoluments so largely enjoyed by the citizens of Rome. The Latins, or at least some states among them, possessed indeed the right of voting in the Roman assemblies; but it appears that they were all comprehended in one of the Roman tribes,¶ and could influence consequently no more than a thirty-fifth part of the whole number of voters; so that there was little inducement for them as a body to interest themselves in the business of the Forum. The rest of the Italians did not enjoy even so much political consequence as this; and both were alike incapable of being elected to any magistracy at Rome, or to any military command in the provinces. It is no wonder therefore that they bore with impatience such a state of exclusion: and a modern reader may be surprised that their efforts were directed towards obtaining a closer union with Rome, rather than towards asserting their complete independence; and he may think it strange also, that the Romans should have risked the very existence of their commonwealth, rather than adopt a measure which promised to strengthen it by the accession of so large a number of citizens, whose interests would from henceforth have been identified with that of Rome. But the allies on their part considered, that if they became independent, they would lose the fruits of all those conquests which they had so largely helped the Romans to acquire. Instead of being a sovereign nation, exempted from taxes, and deriving a large accession of wealth every year from its subject provinces, they would have relapsed into the condition of poor and petty republics, none of which had any claim to become a centre of union to the rest, while their separate strength would have been utterly incompetent to withstand the power of Rome, by which, long before it had reached its present eminence, they had already been successively overwhelmed. On the other hand, the pride of the Romans induced them to revolt at the notion of raising their inferiors to the rank of their equals. The Senate besides, by admitting so many new competitors, diminished each individual Senator's prospects of obtaining honours and emoluments: the equestrian order dreaded lest their exclusive possession of the judicial power should be invaded, or their profits, as farmers of the taxes, wrested from them by the competition of some of the wealthy Italians: whilst the bulk of the people were unwilling to lessen the value of their votes in the public assembly, by extending the right of suffrage so largely. All parties in the commonwealth trusting to the well known discipline of the Roman armies, to the superior experience of their Generals, and to the usual dissensions and weaknesses of confederacies, resolved to hazard the issue of a war; not without the hope perhaps of establishing their power over their allies on a firmer basis, and silencing for ever all their claims to a participation in the rights of Roman citizenship.

The allies are anxious to obtain the privileges of Roman citizenship.

The Italian war. First campaign.

Accordingly the two Consuls, L. Julius Cæsar and P. Rutilius Rufus, took the field; having under them as their lieutenants all the officers of highest reputation in the commonwealth.* Under Rutilius were employed C. Marius, who seems to have rested in inactivity since the sedition of Saturninus; Cn. Pompeius, the father of Pompey the Great; Q. Servilius Cæpio, who had made himself conspicuous by his opposition to M. Drusus during his late Tribuneship; C. Perpenna and Valerius Messala. Under L. Cæsar were Licinius Crassus, P. Lentulus, Titus Didius, and L. Sylla. These several officers acted in their different quarters against the Generals of the confederate Italians; but as we have no account of the war written by a contemporary, or by a military historian, we know not what were the plans for the campaign on either side; and the reports which we possess contain little more than an unconnected list of battles and sieges, devoid alike of information and of interest. It is mentioned that the Consul L. Cæsar† was joined by an auxiliary force of Gauls and Numidians; but that the latter were rendered useless to him by an able expedient of the Italian commander, C. Papius. Oxyntas, a son of the famous Jugurtha, had been detained a prisoner in Italy since the death of his father, and now falling into the hands of Papius was by him invested with the ensigns of royalty, and studiously presented to the sight of his countrymen in the Consul's army. Numbers of them immediately deserted to him, looking upon him as their King: and L. Cæsar, suspicious of those who remained, was obliged to send them back into Africa.

In the first year of the war the Romans‡ met with

* Polybius, lib. vi. c. 21. † Ibid. lib. vi. c. 21, 26, 34.
‡ Sallust, *Bell. Jugurth.* c. 69. § Cicero, *pro Cornelio Balbo*, c. 8.
‖ Ibid. c. 9. ¶ Livy, lib. xxv. c. 3.

* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 40. † Ibid. lib. i. c. 42.
‡ Ibid. c. 43, 44. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxiii.

Biography. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

some severe losses: the Consul P. Rutilius, and Q. Cæpio, one of his lieutenants, were, on separate occasions, defeated and slain. L. Postumius, one of the Prætors, was killed at Nola; and that town, which had been so faithful to Rome in the second Punic war, now fell into the hands of the Samnites. Several other cities were either taken by the Italians, or were encouraged to join their cause of their own accord; and towards the close of the year the Umbri and the Tuscans showed evident signs of their intention to follow the general example. This last danger seemed so alarming, that the Romans were driven to avert it by concession; and they passed a law, admitting all the Italians who had continued faithful to Rome to the rights of citizenship.* This fixed the Latins to their cause, and stopped the Tuscans from revolting as they had meditated; the Umbri, however, probably not being aware of it in time, actually joined the confederates. Yet although Rome had thus been obliged to concede in some measure, her strength in the field had been too resolutely and successfully exerted to allow the enemy to calculate on the speedy attainment of his object by force of arms. Sylla and Marius had obtained a great victory over the Marsi;† L. Cæsar had defeated the Samnites, and Cn. Pompeius, having obtained some advantage over the Picentes, was enabled to lay siege to Asculum. On the other hand the Romans were so pressed for want of soldiers, that they enlisted even freedmen into the legions;‡ and as their victories had been fully counterbalanced by defeats, it became evident that concessions must be made, and the difficulty consisted in disarming the resentment of the enemy without seeming to be actuated by fear; to yield the point in dispute without sacrificing the national honour.

Second campaign. A. U. C. 664.

The military events of the next campaign tended however in a great degree to preserve the reputation of the Romans; and enabled them to extricate themselves without degradation from this alarming war. L. Porcius Cato and Cn. Pompeius Strabo were chosen Consuls; and the latter brought the siege of Asculum to a triumphant issue;§ an event which was peculiarly welcome to the Romans, as that town had set the first example of revolt, and had accompanied it with the massacre of two Roman officers, and a number of Roman citizens. Cn. Pompeius gained also a victory over the Marsi, and reduced that people, together with the Vestini, Peligni, and Marrucini to make a separate peace. Possibly some intimation was given them, that the object for which they were contending would be granted them on their submission; for we find that the states which first withdrew from the Confederacy were rewarded by receiving the right of citizenship immediately. The seat of government of the Italians was now removed from Corfinium to Æsconia,‖ in the country of the Samnites; that bold people resolving to continue the struggle as obstinately as their ancestors had done in the days of Pontius and Papirius Cursor. But they had to contend with one of the most formidable of the Roman Generals, in the person of Sylla; whose exploits in this second campaign had raised him to the highest distinction. The forces under his command were increased early in the season,* by a mutiny which took place among the troops of A. Postumius Albinus, another of the Consul's lieutenants. That officer, being suspected of treason, was murdered by his own soldiers, who then joined themselves to the army of Sylla; nor did he scruple to receive them, but observed, "that they would only fight the better, in order to atone for their crime." Thus strengthened, he took and destroyed the town of Stabiæ,† in Campania, defeated a large army with immense loss near Nola, reduced the Hirpini to subjection, and then, invading Samnium, defeated the Samnite General, Papius Mutilius, with severe loss in the field, drove him into Æsconia, and attacked and took the town of Bovianum. These successes encouraged him to offer himself as a candidate for the Consulship; for which purpose, towards the end of the campaign, he returned to Rome.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

Mithridates refuses to assist the Italians.

A circumstance, which is mentioned by Diodorus Siculus,‡ served, in all probability, as a powerful inducement to the Romans to reward the submission of the Italians as early as possible with the privileges which they so earnestly desired. It appears that the confederates had applied for aid to Mithridates, King of Pontus, whose power and ambition were now disposing him to enter into a contest with the Romans. Either his pride or his want of sufficient information dictated to him his most ill-judged answer, and led him to commit a fault in policy which the ability and vigour of all his after life could never repair. He told the Italians that he would lead his armies into Italy as soon as he had secured the dominion of Asia Minor. But the fortune of his intended allies could brook no delay; and a bare suspicion of so formidable an accession to their enemy's force, would dispose the Romans to hasten their measures of conciliation. Accordingly the Italian war vanishes almost instantaneously from our notice; one state after another submitted, and received in return the gift of Roman citizenship; and after the close of the second year of the contest we only find some faint sparks remaining of the vast conflagration which had so lately involved all Italy. Nola still refused to yield,§ and the relics of the Samnites and Lucanians were yet in arms, either in their own country or in the extremity of Bruttium, almost in the same quarter where Hannibal had so long maintained himself under circumstances nearly similar.

End of the Italian war.

Its connection with subsequent events should be observed.

The war which we now have been recording was undertaken for a definite and intelligible object, and naturally ended when that object was attained. But as it had sprung out of the internal dissensions of Rome, so it was lost in them again, and the different interests which had been engaged in it, although no longer the leading points in the civil wars that followed, yet became easily connected with the respective parties, and served to prolong and exasperate their quarrel. It is here that we again deeply feel the want of a contemporary or a sensible historian to

* Appian, c. 49. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii.
† Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 46. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxiii. lxxiv.
‡ Ibid. c. 49. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxiv.
§ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxv. lxxvi.
‖ Diodorus Siculus, *Eclog.* lib. xxxvii.

* Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxv. Plutarch, in *Sylla*, c. 6.
† Pliny, *Historia Natural.* lib. iii. c. 5. Appian, lib. i. c. 50, 51.
‡ *Eclog.* lib. xxxvii.
§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. Diodorus Siculus, *Eclog.* lib. xxxvii.

Biography. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

guide our researches. Reduced to connect, as well as we can, the facts incidentally mentioned by the writers whom we are obliged to follow; and forced to supply, often by conjectures, the chasms in their most unsatisfactory narratives, we can only hope at best to present our readers with an imperfect picture, and may be forgiven if it be in some respects even an erroneous one. The name of Marius has scarcely occurred to our notice in the second campaign of the Italian war; whereas the services of Sylla were most eminent. We have seen that Sylla went to Rome to stand for the Consulship, and the prospect of his attaining that dignity was most galling to the jealousy of Marius; especially as a war with Mithridates now appeared certain, and if a General of Sylla's reputation filled the office of Consul, his claims to the command of the army employed in the contest would prevail over all others. C. Julius Cæsar and Q. Pompeius were the two other candidates; the former of whom could not legally offer himself,* as he had never gone through the previous office of Prætor, and on this account his election was vigorously opposed by P. Antistius and P. Sulpicius, Tribunes of the people. Sulpicius was one of the ablest orators of his time,† and had lived in habits of familiarity with L. Crassus, with M. Antonius, and particularly with the late Tribune, M. Drusus. He is introduced by Cicero as one of the speakers in the dialogue "*de Oratore*," and is said to have been regarded by the elder part of the nobility as a man likely to be one of the best supporters of the aristocratical cause. One of his first public acts was the accusation of C. Norbanus,‡ for a riot and sedition in his Tribuneship, and this was considered as a favourable omen of his future attachment to the laws and to good order. His opposition to the illegal pretensions of C. Cæsar gained him great popularity,§ without any prejudice to his character in the opinions of the nobility; but it appears that the favour with the multitude, which he had thus honourably gained, accompanied perhaps with an excessive confidence in his own talents as a speaker, excited in his mind a fatal ambition, and led him to tread in the steps of the Gracchi, of Saturninus, and of his friend Drusus, in assuming the character of a popular Tribune. Other circumstances may have contributed also to the same effect: he had a violent personal quarrel with Q. Pompeius,‖ who, together with Sylla, proved the successful candidate in the Consular election; and he had perhaps already formed that connection with Marius, which his subsequent conduct so clearly discovered. The measure which he principally endeavoured to carry seems to have been a favourite one with all the popular leaders since the days of Tiberius Gracchus; and Sulpicius, in the course of his intimacy with Drusus, probably learned to regard it with peculiar attachment. This was an unlimited communication of the right of citizenship to all the inhabitants of Italy: a project essentially popular in its principle, as it tended to render the government less exclusive; and which, though abhorred by the aristocracy, and viewed with jealousy by a large portion of the people at large, possessed notwithstanding great attractions for the very lowest class of citizens,* as well as for the turbulent and enthusiastic of all classes; for not only was it recommended by being of a spirit entirely democratical, but it was obvious that the indiscriminate admission of all the Italians to the privilege of voting at Rome would greatly lessen the influence of the richer class of Roman citizens, and by rendering the assembly of the people so immoderately numerous, would in fact reduce it to little better than a mere mob, the ready tool of an eloquent and ambitious leader. Nor had the late grant of citizenship to the allies entirely satisfied their wishes; for in order to prevent them from exercising a power in the Comitia proportionate to their numbers, they had been all admitted into eight only of the thirty-five tribes;† and as all questions were decided by a majority of tribes, and not of individual votes, their weight in the assembly was still much less than they thought themselves entitled to claim. Accordingly Sulpicius now professed himself the advocate of their complete equality with the natives of Rome; and proposed that they should be admitted into all the tribes without distinction. Finding his project resisted by the aristocratical party, he became only more violent in his proceedings; he knew that if it became a question of physical force, his partisans were likely to prevail, provided only that he could give them organization as well as numbers, to prevent them from being seized with a panic in the time of danger, and leaving him personally exposed to the fate of the Gracchi and of Saturninus. He prepared therefore a body of three thousand gladiators,‡ whom he kept always about him; and he is said besides to have been attended by six hundred young men of the equestrian order, whom he called his Anti-Senate. While we start at such a systematic defiance of the forms of regular government, we should remember that acts of outrage and violence were not confined to the popular party; for only two years before this time a riot had been excited by a class of men necessarily removed far above the mere rabble,§ those who had large debts due to them; who had assaulted and murdered A. Sempronius Asellio, one of the Prætors, in open day, because, in his judicial capacity, he had issued some decrees for the protection of insolvent debtors. In the mean time news arrived that Mithridates had actually attacked and overrun the Roman dominions in Asia Minor. War was therefore declared against him at Rome, and Asia and Italy being named as the pro-

Sylla a candidate for the Consulship.

Consulship of L. Sylla and Q. Pompeius. A. U. C. 665.

Use, character, and proceedings of the Tribune Sulpicius.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

* Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 62.
† Ibid. c. 49. 55. *De Oratore*, lib. i. c. 7. 21.
‡ Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 21. 49.
§ Ibid. *de Haruspic. Respons.* c. 20.
‖ Ibid. *de Amicitiâ*, c. 1.

* The history of the Catholic question in our own times will greatly illustrate the account given in the text. The cause of the Catholics has been espoused by the popular party, because the principle of abolishing laws of exclusion, and rendering all men equally eligible to a share in the government, is in itself a popular one. Yet considerations of danger or loss to themselves from the consequences of the measure, have often strongly influenced the multitude to oppose it, and to inveigh against its supporters; although, after the ferment was over, they have not liked their leaders the less for continuing to be its advocates. Thus Drusus may be said to have fallen a sacrifice to something like the outcry of "No Popery;" yet Sulpicius, only two years afterwards, could tread in his steps, not only without forfeiting the affections of the people, but as if the side of the question which he espoused, were the one which a popular leader would naturally adopt.
† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii.
‡ Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 35. *in Sylâ*, c. 8.
§ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxiv. Appian, lib. i. c. 54.

Biography. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

vinces of the Consuls, the latter fell to the lot of Q. Pompeius,* and the former to that of Sylla. The army which Sylla was to command was at this time employed near Nola, as that city still refused to submit to the Romans: but he himself remained in the city with his colleague, endeavouring to baffle the projects of Sulpicius, by proclaiming frequent holydays, and ordering consequently a suspension of public business. But Sulpicius,† on one of these occasions, attacked the Consuls with his armed force, calling upon them to repeal their proclamation for the festival; and on their refusal a riot ensued, in which Q. Pompeius escaped with difficulty to a place of concealment, his son was killed, and Sylla finding himself in the power of his enemies, complied with their demands, and annulled his late edict. Then, unwilling to expose himself to similar insults, he instantly left Rome to join the army. Sulpicius carried his favourite measure, and the Italian allies were placed by law on a footing of perfect equality with the Romans in the right of voting.

Sulpicius procures the command of the army, destined to act against Mithridates, to be transferred from Sylla to Marius.

Sylla had already shown that he possessed none of the virtuous courage of Metellus, who had preferred banishment to a compliance with the illegal demands of the popular party in the time of Saturninus. It was soon to appear that he resembled that excellent citizen as little in the readiness with which he had sacrificed his own interests and dignity, rather than endanger the peace of his country. Marius was now to reap the advantage which he had proposed to himself from his connection with Sulpicius, and from the late triumph of the Italian allies. It should be recollected that he had supported the interests of the Italians in the Tribuneship of Saturninus, and that he in return relied upon their devotion to him in promoting his views of ambition. His own low birth, his want of education, and the inherent coarseness of his character had prevented him from ever blending cordially with the aristocracy; he was besides himself a native of a country town, Arpinum; and could have no invincible prejudices in favour of the exclusive possession of power by the inhabitants of Rome. Accordingly, soon after the admission of the Italians into all the tribes, a law was passed in the Comitia, by which the people transferred the command of the army, destined to act against Mithridates, from Sylla to Marius;‡ and two military Tribunes were sent to notify this change to Sylla. His soldiers are said to have been as indignant as himself at this decree: they had been fighting for two campaigns against the revolted Italians; and now the enemy whom they had vanquished in the field had acquired an ascendency in the councils of the state, and would probably deprive them, as well as their General, of the spoils and honours which all anticipated from an Asiatic war. The violence of the Comitia was imitated in the camp; the two military Tribunes were murdered,§ and the army, consisting of six legions, immediately broke up from its quarters, and began to move towards Rome. But it is said,‖ that almost all the superior officers, unwilling to fight against their country, resigned their commands, and hastened to escape into the city.

Sylla marches towards Rome.

* Appian, c. 55.
† Ibid. *de Bello Civili*, lib. i. c. 56. Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 8.
‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. Appian, c. 56.
§ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 9.
‖ Appian, c. 57.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

In retaliation for the murder of the two military Tribunes, several of Sylla's friends were murdered by the popular party at Rome. The Senate was completely overawed, and none of the many illustrious persons whom it contained, are recorded as making any attempt to mediate between the parties, or to prevent the violence that was impending. Sylla was joined meantime by his colleague Q. Pompeius, and the two Consuls continued to advance, disregarding the repeated deputations that were sent to stay their march. At last, when they were already in the neighbourhood of Rome, they received a final address, entreating them, in the name of the Senate, not to approach within four miles of the Capital.* Sylla pretended to comply, and gave the usual orders to measure out the ground for his camp on the spot on which the deputation had met him. But while his antagonists were thus thrown off their guard, he sent off a detachment to follow close after the returning deputies,† and to occupy one of the gates of the city. This was effected, and he and his colleague putting themselves instantly in motion with the main army, and stationing troops on several quarters of the town, proceeded to force their way into the streets. Marius and Sulpicius, having in vain tried to strengthen their cause by inviting the slaves to join them with a promise of freedom, attempted for a time to resist with such a force as they had been able to raise and arm, and with the aid of many of the inhabitants, who annoyed the assailants with stones and arrows from their houses. But Sylla without scruple ordered his men to set fire to the quarters from whence they were thus annoyed; and at the same time prepared to assail the city in an opposite direction, at once to distract the plans of the defenders, and to menace them with cutting off their retreat. Then it was that Marius, Sulpicius, and their principal friends, gave up the contest, and consulted for their safety by flight; whilst the conquerors, halting in the Sacred Way, took instant measures for securing their victory, punished severely some of their soldiers‡ who were beginning to plunder, stationed guards in the most important positions, and were on the alert the whole night to prevent any new disorders, or any further hostile attempts on either side.

Assaults and takes the city.

On the following morning the Romans, for the first time since the invasion of the Gauls, awoke to the sight of a victorious enemy in possession of their city. Sylla proceeded to assemble the Senate, and proposed that Marius,§ Sulpicius, and their adherents should be declared public enemies, and a price set on their heads. A decree was passed accordingly to that effect; and Sulpicius being betrayed by one of his slaves, was put to death by the Consul's orders, and his head exposed upon the Rostra. Marius, after a series of romantic adventures, succeeded in escaping from his pursuers, and sought a refuge for the present in Africa; so that the popular party, deprived of its leaders, and controlled by the presence of a military force, submitted without resistance to the storm. What measures were taken by Sylla to secure the power of the aristocracy for the future, it is difficult to decide;‖ nor is it

Marius and Sulpicius are declared traitors.

* Appian, c. 57. Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 9.
† Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 9. Appian, c. 58.
‡ Appian, lib. i. c. 59.
§ Ibid. c. 60. Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 45.
‖ Appian says, that he restored the old custom of voting by centuries instead of tribes; that he revived the practice that

Biography. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666. — A. C. 88.

material, for they were all reversed in the counter revolution that immediately followed. The laws of Sulpicius were, as might be expected, declared invalid; and the Italians were thus again debarred admission into more than eight of the tribes. But the *Epitomizer* of Livy tells us,* that Sylla at this time planted several colonies, in order as we may suppose to reconcile some of the poorer citizens to his party; and he so abstained from interfering in the elections, that L. Cornelius Cinna, a man notoriously devoted to the popular interest, was chosen Consul for the following year, together with Cn. Octavius, a partisan of the aristocracy. It is said that he bound Cinna† by the most solemn oaths not to disturb the order of things which he had established; a precaution so little likely to be of any avail, that we may almost wonder that Sylla should have adopted it. In fact, no sooner did Cinna come into office, than he began to declare his real sentiments; and induced one of the Tribunes to threaten Sylla with a prosecution for his late violent assault on the city, and usurpation of the government.‡ It is probable that Sylla now saw too late how incomplete and short-lived was the victory that he had gained; still, secure of the attachment of his army, he trusted that the Senate might be able to maintain their own cause till he should return in triumph from Asia; and to prevent all chance of again being deprived of his command, he at once left Rome, rejoined his soldiers whom he had some time before sent back to Campania, and then proceeded without delay to sail with them into Greece, there to check, if possible, the alarming career of Mithridates.

Election of Cinna and Octavius to the Consulship.

Sylla sails with his army to Greece.

His colleague in the Consulship, Q. Pompeius,* had been also confirmed by the Senate in his appointment to the command of the army which was still kept on foot to oppose the remnants of the Italian Confederacy. He accordingly set out for the quarters of the troops, which were at this time in the country of the Marsi. But Cn. Pompeius, the General whom he was going to supersede, considered the possession of an army too valuable to be easily relinquished; and the soldiers, at his instigation, as is stated in all our accounts of these times, murdered their intended commander as soon as he arrived among them. Cn. Pompeius thus retaining his station, aspired perhaps to act the part of Sylla, and to become like him the defender of the Senate against the enemies who were preparing to assault it: but it was not decreed that his crime should be so successful; and the author of an act, unexampled till now in the Roman history, was not permitted even to reap that poor renown which attends on prosperous wickedness.

We here suspend our narrative of the domestic transactions of Rome, in order to trace the fortunes of Mithridates, against whom Sylla now directed his arms.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 616. — A. C. 138. to U. C. 666 — A. C. 88.

Q. Pompeius is murdered by his soldiers.

nothing should be submitted to the decision of the people, unless it had first passed the Senate; and that the Senate itself was swelled by the nomination of three hundred new members from the different orders of the state to be placed on its rolls. But the reality of such important changes must not be admitted on the sole authority of such a writer as Appian.

* *Epitome*, lib. lxxvii.

† Plutarch, *in Syllâ*, c. 10.

‡ Ibid. *in Syllâ*, c. 10. Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 48.

* Appian, c. 63. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxvii.

MITHRIDATES.

FROM U. C. 631. A. C. 123. TO U. C. 691. A. C. 63.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

THE kingdom of Pontus, originally tributary to the crown of Persia, but, after its recovery from the successors of Alexander, an independent sovereignty, descended, at the death of Mithridates the Sixth, who had been the steady ally of Rome,* to his son of the same name, a child then only eleven years of age. The family traced their origin to Artabazes,† one of the seven noble Persians who conspired to destroy the usurper Smerdis, and who received from Darius the government of Cappadocia and Pontus,‡ to be held as a fief of the empire.

Character and talents of Mithridates.

To the extraordinary abilities and endowments of the young Mithridates, distinguished by the surname of Eupator,§ and usually called "the great," the Roman historians bear ample testimony; nor could they do otherwise without reflecting discredit upon the arms and councils of Rome, so often defeated and so long baffled by his courage and policy:* but if justice has been done to his talents, his enemies have laboured to compensate for this admission, by holding him up to the detestation of posterity as a monster of cruelty and treachery. A careful comparison of the slight sources from which the common notions respecting this accomplished prince have been drawn, will lead us to suspect that, according to the moral opinions of his time, he was as much distinguished for virtue and for his amiable and generous temper, as for wonderful powers and acquirements both of body and mind.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

Birth and accession of Mithridates VII.

His birth, if we may believe the authority of Justin,† and his accession to the throne were indicated to the world by the appearance of a comet of prodigious magnitude and brilliancy. But if any such pheno-

* Polyb. *Excerpt.* cxxxv.

† Ibid. v. 43. Appian, *de Bell. Mithrid. Gryph.* p. 1082.

‡ Diod. Sic. xix. 45. Xen. Anab. Florus, iii. 5.

§ And Dionysius, Appian, *in loco cit.*

* See Prideaux's *Connect.* part ii. book 5.

† Justin, xxxvii. 2. *et seq.*

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

menon occurred at those periods, it was not regarded by the guardians of the youthful prince as an unequivocal declaration of the peculiar favour and protection of heaven; for his early years were passed in continual danger from their machinations against his life. Of the precise object of these treasonable practices, history affords us little intimation; but if his mother followed the example of his grandmother Laodice,* who is said to have destroyed five of her six children, in order to perpetuate her own power, it would account for the fact mentioned by Appian,† that he caused both his mother and brother to be put to death; if indeed any credit is to be attached to the assertion of the historian who, in the same book, states that he came to the throne after the decease of both his parents.

Conspiracy against his life during his minority.

But whoever was the instigator of the various plots devised against the young prince, they appear to have been carried on with great cunning and perseverance, and to have been frustrated entirely by his own prudence and intrepidity. And this is all that can with any certainty be inferred, from the loose and contradictory accounts handed down to us of his early life. It is indeed related‡ that, with a view to his destruction, the guardians of his minority encouraged him to make use of dangerous weapons, mounted upon a high mettled and unbroken steed, but that in consequence of his extraordinary activity and skill in horsemanship, the plot miscarried. Such a report is likely enough to have arisen from the bold and enterprising temper of Mithridates, who, according to Appian,§ was particularly addicted to equestrian exercises, and excelled all other men in strength and agility: he could ride a hundred and twenty-five miles in one day on horseback, and drive sixteen horses in his chariot, even when age had somewhat impaired his vigour; and in the use of all the warlike weapons of his time, but especially in throwing the javelin, he was singularly expert.‖ Having failed in these indirect practices, the conspirators attempted, it is said, to take him off by poison; but the prince, suspecting the danger, had invented a celebrated antidote, or, as Pliny affirms,¶ a variety of antidotes, which he was in the daily habit of taking, and afterwards of swallowing active poisons, till his constitution became inured to the operation of the most violent drugs. The antidote, called from him Mithridate, was in great repute in the days of Pliny,** and is mentioned by writers of all ages down to the present time. It has for some time been excluded from the Pharmacopœia, as being a needless compound of a great variety of botanic extracts, and is said, by the highest medical authorities, to have been incapable of producing the effects attributed to it, which are altogether beyond the powers of medicine.

Early proficiency in arts and arms

The early life of Mithridates was spent in the assiduous cultivation of those talents and habits which rendered him, in the words of Pliny,†† the greatest prince of his time, or, in the stronger language of Cicero,‡‡ the greatest monarch that ever reigned. He accustomed himself at all seasons to lie in the open air, and to depend upon his success in the chase for a precarious meal. He exposed himself to dangerous conflicts with the larger and fiercer wild animals, and exercised his speed and dexterity in pursuit of the smaller.* He studied profoundly the Physics and Philosophy of the age, and made himself master of all the languages, or more properly perhaps of the dialects, spoken by the nations with whom he was likely to have any intercourse in peace or war, so that he could receive ambassadors, and issue despatches without the intervention of an interpreter.† The language of Pontus, in his time, had become a corrupt mixture of Greek and Getic; and it is probable that different modifications of the same jargon formed the dialects of most of the neighbouring states: but though the vernacular tongue was thus barbarous, a purer Greek appears to have been the language of the court; for the coins of Mithridates bear Greek inscriptions, and his *Treatise on Botany* was composed in Greek.‡

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

Having spent seven years in these exercises, and having attained a growth much exceeding the common stature of man,§ he assumed the government of his dominions in his eighteenth year,‖ and immediately devoted his whole attention to improve and extend the interests of his country. It is difficult, in the dearth of accurate histories, to trace the progress of his conquests, or even to define his patrimonial dominions; and still more so to vindicate his character from the improbable calumnies heaped upon him by the Romans. Eutropius and Orosius¶ speak of him as reigning over Armenia Minor, (now Aladulia) the kingdom of his son-in-law Tigranes, and the whole tract of country bounded by the Euxine sea and the Bosphorus. His complete subjugation of the Scythians, who had baffled the attempts of so many mighty monarchs, is noticed by Justin** as having enabled him to secure himself in the possession of "Pontus and Cappadocia," (the former of which he inherited from his father,) and it was probably therefore his first exploit. By what means he overcame the ferocity, and maintained the fidelity of that wild people, is left wholly to conjecture; but we may conclude that he derived no small advantage from his own hardy habits and personal prowess in gaining the affections of the savage tribes of the north.

Mithridates comes to the throne

We shortly afterwards find him engaged in the reduction of Sinope,†† in which attempt he gave repeated proofs of his great talents, both as a diplomatist and as an engineer. The success of the siege was for a time prevented by succours supplied from Rhodes, and Mithridates in vain endeavoured to gain the Rhodians to his party by presents and promises;‡‡ but the able disposition of his artillery finally prevailed, and Sinope,§§ reduced to obedience, became the principal residence of the King.

It must have been about the same period that, according to the custom of many Oriental nations, he

Marries his sister Laodice

---

* Justin, *loc. cit.*
‡ Justin, *loc. cit.*
‖ Polyb. *Excerpt.*
** *Loc. cit.*
†† *Loc. cit.*
‡‡ *Lucullus, sive Acad. Quæst.* ii.
† *De rebus Mithridaticis.*
§ *Reb. Mith.*
¶ Lib. xxv. 2.

* Justin, xxxvii. 2.
† Pliny, vii. 24. *Mithridates duarum et viginti gentium rex, totidem linguis jura dixit, pro concione singulas sine interprete affatus.*
‡ Pliny, xxv. 2.
‖ Justin, xxxvii. 3.
** Lib. xxxvii. 3.
‡‡ Polyb. v. 90.
§ Appian, *Reb. Mith.*
¶ Lib. v. Orosius, vi. 1.
†† Polyb. iv. 56.
§§ Sinope was first added to the kingdom of Pontus by Pharnaces. B. C. 183. See Strabo, lib. xii.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

married his sister Laodice,* a name common to the females of his family; but he did not long remain at home to enjoy the scanty dominion so little suited to his bold and aspiring genius. Disguising himself as a private person, he made the tour of Asia Minor, and returned through Bithynia, noting carefully, in every state, the means of defence which it possessed, and the facilities which were open for exciting disaffection towards the predominating power of Rome. He was met, on his arrival in his own country, with the welcome news that his wife had in his absence given birth to an heir; but the festivities, with which he celebrated this completion of his wishes, were interrupted by the timely discovery of a plot to poison him, in which his Queen and several of the principal officers of his household were implicated. It appeared, by the testimony of a faithful domestic, that Laodice, affecting to conclude from his prolonged absence that he was no longer alive, had been guilty of infidelities so numerous and so notorious, as to leave her little hope of concealment; and to prevent the consequences of discovery upon his return, the guilty parties had resolved on the death of the King. Their guilt being fully proved, the Queen and her associates were put to death.†

The King now devoted his whole attention to politics, and endeavoured to form an alliance with every description of power which could be rendered available against Rome; so that there was no kingdom, no republic, scarcely a band of robbers or pirates, from Pontus to the columns of Hercules, hostile to the Romans, which was not more or less connected with him.‡ In the celebrated Social war, the progress of which we have just traced, the Marsians, as we have seen, sent ambassadors to treat with the King of Pontus, and to solicit a reinforcement of ships and men. The wary monarch received them in the most gracious manner, and assured them of his cordial good wishes; but observed that "it could not consist with his safety to attack the Romans in Italy, till he should first have driven them out of Asia;"§ and that he should best consult the interests of the allies, as well as his own, by creating a powerful diversion in the east.

Restores his nephew to his kingdom. B. C. 92.

Ariarathes, King of Cappadocia, who had married Laodice, another sister of Mithridates, died, not without suspicion of having been poisoned by his prime minister and illegitimate brother Gordius; and Justin, with strange inconsistency, imputes the contrivance of this murder to Mithridates; who, as he relates the story,‖ employed the same wicked instrument to destroy the heirs to the throne, his own nephews; although he admits that the sole object of the war which ensued with Nicomedes King of Bithynia, who had married the widow and seized the vacant kingdom, was to assert the claim of the young Ariarathes to the dominions of his father. The truth appears to be, that Laodice, like her sister of the same name, was an unprincipled woman, and entered readily into the proposal of Nicomedes to unite the kingdoms of Cappadocia and Bithynia to the exclusion of her own sons. Mithridates, shocked at such unnatural injustice, and desirous that Cappadocia should not pass out of his family, (for the late King was his cousin, and inherited the kingdom from their common ancestors,) raised a powerful army, and seizing all the strong places on the frontier, soon placed Ariarathes the Eighth in peaceable possession of his paternal rights. The cause of the quarrel which ensued between the uncle and nephew, is involved in great obscurity. By Justin it is attributed to the arbitrary tone assumed by Mithridates in a negociation for the pardon and restoration of Gordius, whose guilt was never proved, and whose experience and sagacity might have proved highly valuable to the youthful King. But Ariarathes, suspicious of his uncle's views, resisted his wishes, and a war was the consequence, in which he was defeated and slain.* The throne thus again vacant, descended rightfully to the family of Mithridates, who gave it to his own son, now eight years of age, with the surname of Ariarathes, and appointed Gordius Regent during the minority. But the Cappadocians, attached to their own branch of the royal family, revolted from the bastard Gordius, and proclaimed another Ariarathes the Ninth, (the brother of the late King) whose title they defended with great obstinacy, but with little success. The King of Pontus dispersed the forces of the insurgents, and the young Pretender died, shortly afterwards, of a broken heart.†

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

Nicomedes brings forward a pseudo-Ariarathes.

Nicomedes, meanwhile, alarmed at the increasing power of his rival, prevailed upon his Queen to forge a tale of a third son of her late husband, whom, for certain reasons of state, she had kept in concealment till the death of his two brothers; but whose claim to the throne they now thought it their duty to lay before the Senate of Rome: for which purpose Laodice in person accompanied the ambassadors, and boldly declared the pseudo-Ariarathes to be her own son, and the legitimate heir of Cappadocia. Mithridates, unwilling to be drawn prematurely into hostilities with Rome, sent Gordius thither to defend the cause of his son, and to remind the Senate that "he was the descendant of that Ariarathes who fell in battle defending the Romans against Aristonicus:" but aware that money would prevail among the Senators more than gratitude or justice, he directed his envoy to make magnificent presents to all the leading men in the city.‡

It is probable that Nicomedes had not neglected the same precaution; for the decree of the Senate deprived Mithridates, or rather his son, of the kingdom of Cappadocia; and, "to compensate for the loss,"§ took away Paphlagonia from Nicomedes, declaring both those countries free republics, and allies of Rome; in plain terms, usurping them to themselves. But the Cappadocians, unwilling to become dependent upon the caprices and subject to the extortion of Roman governors, refused to accept their

* Justin, xxxvii. 3.

† Justin imputes this act of justice to Mithridates as an atrocious crime. *Loco cit.*

‡ Appian, *Reb. Mith.*

§ Diodorus Siculus, xxxvii. 1.

‖ Lib. xxxviii. 1.

* It is scarcely worth while to notice the preposterous and indecent story mentioned by Justin, in which Mithridates is made to assassinate his nephew. xxxviii. 1.

† Justin, xxxviii. 2. These are the same two princes, whom Justin states to have been before murdered by Gordius.

‡ Diodorus Siculus, *Excerpt.* xxxiv.

§ Justin, *loco citato.*

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

freedom, and bluntly declared that no nation could properly be said to exist without a King: upon which the Senate, hoping to retain their influence in the country by means of a creature of their own, appointed Ariobarzanes to be King.*

Mithridates refuses to obey the Senate. B. C. 90.

But Mithridates was far from acquiescing in a decree which tended so completely to disappoint his hopes of acquiring the empire of the east. He had long cultivated a close alliance with Tigranes, Satrap of Armenia, who was equally with himself hostile to the insolent pretensions of Rome; and he now induced him, by the offer of giving him his daughter Cleopatra in marriage, to make war upon the sluggish and cowardly monarch whom, for their own purposes, the Senate had given to Cappadocia.† Little resistance was made: Mithridates in person taking possession of the kingdom, mulcted the people in a heavy fine for their submission to Ariobarzanes; and, hearing that Nicomedes was dead, and that his son of the same name had succeeded to the throne of Bithynia, he advanced into that country, and expelling the young King, made himself master of all that part of Asia, and laid the towns under tribute.‡ The deposed Kings Ariobarzanes and Nicomedes immediately departed for Rome, and appeared in the form of suppliants before the Senate, who, proud of such illustrious suitors, and indignant that any monarch should presume to wage a war without their sanction, peremptorily decreed the restitution of the exiled princes, and sent Aquilius,§ and Manlius Maltinus|| to see their decree carried into effect.

War begun. B. C. 89.

The die was now cast. Mithridates, aware that he must either relinquish his acquisitions altogether, or boldly defend them against the Roman legates, received the Commissioners with great haughtiness, made an ostentatious display of his resources, and replied to their commands by complaints of the injustice and arbitrary proceedings of the Senate;¶ and though the two princes were formally restored to their dominions, he never suffered them to enjoy peaceable possession. Upon this the Roman officers in Asia, without waiting for further instructions from home, collected all the troops in the service of the republic throughout the provinces, and moved in three divisions to enforce obedience to their commands. The first division was commanded by L. Cassius, Proconsul of Pergamus; the second by Aquilius; and the third by Q. Oppius, Proconsul of Pamphylia.** Each division consisted of about forty thousand men; and a fleet of observation moved at the same time towards Pontus. With these forces they had to contend against a monarch, who, according to Appian,†† was then master of four hundred ships of war, fifty thousand cavalry, and two hundred and fifty thousand infantry,‡‡ all equipped in the most complete manner, and accompanied by formidable trains of artillery; and who had at his command the powerful army of Tigranes,§§ and reinforcements from several others of the independent Asiatic Princes.

* Plutarch, *Vit. Syllæ.*
† Justin, xxxviii. 3.
‡ Orosius, vi. 2.
§ Al. Acilius, et Attilius
|| Al. Altinus.
¶ Dion. Cassius, *Excerpt.* xxxii.
** Athenæus, v. Memnon, xxxiii. Florus, iii. 5. Diod. *Excerpt.*
†† *Reb. Mithrid.*
‡‡ He elsewhere says 200,000.
§§ Justin, xxxviii. 3.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

In the meantime Nicomedes, relying upon the assistance of the Roman army, boldly invaded Pontus, and laid waste the whole country as far as Amastris, by which he acquired an immense booty. Mithridates, hoping that the Senate might be induced by this aggression on the part of the Bithynians to withdraw its interference, retired before the enemy, and sent an envoy to the legates, desiring that they would at least permit him to repel the invasion of his own territory. The legates, as Appian * himself acknowledges, were ashamed to take part with Nicomedes; and they returned an evasive answer that "they neither wished Mithridates to be injured by Nicomedes, nor could they suffer Nicomedes to be overcome by Mithridates; since it was against the interests of Rome." Upon receiving this reply, the King no longer hesitated to send his son Ariarathes with a strong force to take possession of Cappadocia; at the same time, he once more despatched his envoy Pelopidas to excuse the necessity of this proceeding to the Romans. But they peremptorily refused to listen to his expostulations, and ordered him to quit the camp and return no more.† Hostilities were now inevitable; and a battle shortly afterwards took place near the river Amnias, in which Mithridates and Nicomedes commanded in person: the victory was for some time doubtful, the Bithynians being very superior in numbers; but the skill and courage of Mithridates finally prevailed, and a great booty, with a prodigious number of prisoners, most of whom were Romans, fell into his hands. The King, willing to set an example of a humane and generous mode of warfare, set all the captives at liberty, without ransom, and furnished them with provision for their journey home.‡

Nicomedes invades Pontus.

This decisive action was followed by a number of skirmishes, in all of which the Romans suffered severely; but, whenever they were taken prisoners, they were treated by the victor with the greatest liberality: the same conduct was observed towards the Bithynians and all the native Asiatics whom the fortune of war compelled to surrender themselves to the clemency of Mithridates; whose name became so popular, that, wherever he advanced, the cities hastened to throw open their gates, and begged to be taken under his protection. The Romans were universally detested in Asia for their avarice and cruelty; and so eager were the natives to escape from their oppressive exactions, that Mithridates, without further contest, became master of Phrygia, Mysia, Lycia, Pamphylia, and all the country as far as Ionia. The Laodiceans, rising upon the Proconsul Oppius, delivered him bound to the King of Pontus, and a similar fate soon afterwards befell Aquilius.

Conduct of Mithridates to the Roman Generals.

Mithridates would not refuse his new allies the pleasure of seeing their tyrants paraded through their cities in a kind of mock triumph; and the populace every where pursued them with threats and execrations, till, in cruel derision of their insatiable avarice, Aquilius was put to death by pouring melted gold down his throat, and Oppius shared his punishment. Nothing can justify such severity of vengeance; but Pliny and Velleius Paterculus, as well

* *Reb. Mithrid.*
† Ibid. *eod.*
‡ Ibid. *eod.* Diod. Sic. *Excerpt.* xxxvii.

From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

as other Roman writers,* admit that it was richly merited by the sufferers. *Hæc paulatim exarsit rabie quddam, non jam avaritia sed* FAMES *auri...nec jam Quiritium aliquo, sed universo nomine Romano infami, Rex Mithridates Aquilio duci capto aurum in os infudit.*†

Having established Satraps in the newly acquired provinces, the King advanced to Magnesia, Ephesus, and Mitylene, all of which joyfully submitted to him: the Ephesians, in testimony of their loyalty, broke down all the statues of the different Roman Generals in their city, for which offence, on the arrival of Sylla in Asia, a most barbarous revenge was inflicted upon them. Returning from Ionia, he took Stratonice, and laid the town under contribution: and here it was that he met with the beautiful and accomplished Hypsicratea ‡ whose romantic attachment to him induced her to undergo fatigues and perils so little suited to her age and sex. At the same time the Cyclades, with the islands of Delos, Lesbos, and Eubœa § were given up to his lieutenant, Neoptolemus; and Athens itself, by the treachery of the Athenian governor Ariston, ‖ fell into the hands of Archelaus, another of his generals, who shortly after contrived to draw over to his master's interest the greater part of Greece.

Banishes all Romans from Asia.

In the meanwhile Mithridates, perfectly aware that the Senate would speedily make a powerful effort to recover their dominions in Asia, saw the necessity of expelling from the countries now in his power that numerous body of Roman citizens who were at any moment ready to act under the orders of the republic.¶ A decree was accordingly framed, commanding all Romans immediately to depart from Asia under pain of death, and rendering it penal for any persons to harbour or to conceal them: a reward was also offered by proclamation to such as should give intelligence against offenders. The Asiatics, burning with hatred and revenge against Rome, eagerly took the opportunity thus afforded to avenge the wrongs they had suffered, and a vast number of Italians, (eighty thousand according to some authors,** and one hundred and fifty thousand if we believe Plutarch,††) perished in a few days. The Roman writers do not hesitate to impute this atrocious massacre to the express order of the King; but upon comparing the different accounts which they have given us of it, and considering that which the exigency of the case, the character of Mithridates, and the state of public feeling at that period combine to render probable, we are forcibly led to the conclusion, that his intention did not exceed the necessary precaution of excluding the subjects of Rome from his newly-acquired dominions.

Seizes a treasure at Coos.

Intelligence having been received that the Jews of Asia had remitted eight hundred talents,‡‡ (about £150,000.) to Coos, in the way to Jerusalem, for security, Mithridates sailed thither, and seized not only that sum, but a considerable treasure in money and jewels, the property of Alexander, grandson to Cleopatra Queen of Egypt; the young prince also fell into the hands of the conqueror, who with his accustomed generosity, treated his prisoner in a manner suitable to his rank, and bestowed on him an education truly royal.*

Siege of Rhodes.

While Mithridates was engaged at Coos, L. Cassius the Proconsul, with a considerable body of the Italians who were exiled from Asia, had thrown himself into Rhodes, and prepared to defend the city with great vigour. The suburbs were razed, artillery was mounted on the walls, and the fleet was manned under the orders of Demagoras, who attempted to engage the royal squadron, commanded by Mithridates in person, as it approached the harbour; but being nearly surrounded, by an able manœvure of the King, he retired into the port without loss, and in good order. A blockade was immediately formed; and the Rhodians, having obtained some advantage in a sally, were encouraged again to attempt a naval action, in which, though nothing of importance was effected, Demagoras gained great credit, and Mithridates became dissatisfied with his captains: so that a tempest shortly afterwards having destroyed part of his fleet, he resolved to press the siege of the city by land, and at the same time to attempt to force his way into the port. An enormous machine, called a *sambuca*, was erected upon two ships; deserters were engaged to conduct a party with scaling-ladders to a low and practicable part of the wall; and the two points were to be attacked simultaneously, upon a signal given from within by a few who were to ascend in silence with the deserters, and to display a light from the temple of Jupiter. But the Rhodians, having intimation of the design, counterfeited the signal; and the attack, being prematurely made, miscarried. The *sambuca*, however, proved a most formidable assailant; rising nearly to a level with the batteries, it discharged tremendous showers of darts and iron bolts, and having thus cleared the way of all opposition, it afforded a ready means for planting ladders and covering an escalade. The Rhodians, meanwhile, behaved with great gallantry, till, from the increased pressure, the huge machine at once gave way, and fell with a dreadful crash, burying hundreds in its ruins. The citizens attributed their deliverance to the miraculous intervention of Isis, who was said to have burnt the beams which supported the *sambuca*; and Mithridates, unwilling to consume more time and men on a conquest so little important, retired to Patara, and is said to have forgotten for a time the cares of war in the society of his bewitching Queen.†

Sylla arrives in Greece. B. C. 87.

Sylla being now appointed by the Senate to conduct the Mithridatic war, arrived in Greece with five complete legions, and several battalions and companies, amounting in the whole to about fifteen thousand foot,‡ and fifteen hundred horse, and he was joined by a considerable body of the Italian refugees from Asia; but with this rein-

---

* Appian, Diodorus, &c.

† Plin. xxxiii. 3. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 18.

‡ Valerius Maximus, lib. iv. c. 6. *de amore conjugali.*

§ Florus, iii. 5. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 18.

‖ Eutropius, v. Plutarch (*Sylla*) calls him Aristion.

¶ This is the only probable account of the transaction; and though the massacre is stated by most writers to have been expressly ordered by Mithridates, Appian, who gives a detailed history of it, acknowledges that it was occasioned by the hatred *of the Asiatics* to the Romans: *Clarè intueri licuit Asiam non tam metu Mithridatis quam odio in Romanos sic impiè crudeliterque desæviisse. Reb. Mith.*

** Appian, *loc. cit.* Velleius Paterculus, ii. 18.

†† Sylla.

‡‡ Josephus, xiv. 7. p. 165. vol. iii. of Whiston's translation.

* Prideaux's *Connection*, part ii.

† Appian, *Reb. Mith.* According to Plutarch (*Sylla*) he was at Pergamus.

‡ Prideaux, part ii.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

many; so that he thought proper to avoid an action, and await a more favourable opportunity.

It is impossible to reconcile the different accounts given by the several historians who have related the circumstances of the action which followed. Plutarch, who professes to write with the commentaries of Sylla before him, has evidently no other view than to magnify the great actions of the Roman General by exaggerating the difficulties which beset him, and the numbers opposed to him; and, from the character of Sylla himself, we have little reason to rely on the fidelity of the source from which the partial biographer professes to draw his materials. It is, however, admitted by all, that Archelaus exposed the Roman General to great difficulties by the skilful manner in which he drew him on through a country exhausted of all supplies; and that the Roman legions were so much intimidated by the martial appearance and by the numbers of the enemy, that they could not for some time be prevailed on to take the field. Sylla, who felt the necessity of coming to a battle, and was impatient to finish the campaign, and who saw, with vexation, that Archelaus commanded the country, and sacked the neighbouring towns, whilst he was confined to his trenches, used every effort to bring on an engagement; and his desire was but too well seconded by the rashness of the Generals who commanded under Archelaus.

Battle of Chæronea.

The action commenced with an attempt, on the part of the Romans, to seize an eminence which commanded the enemy's lines, and soon became general. It was fought with great obstinacy on both sides, and the Roman army was, for a time, thrown into disorder, and compelled to give ground; but Archelaus, having been deceived by the clouds of dust which arose, lost the opportunity of surrounding the broken legions, and gave Sylla time to rally his men, and to make a desperate and effective charge. Archelaus, who saw his men waver, hastily ordered the entrance to his camp to be closed, and calling out to them that "they had no safety but in victory," rushed furiously among the enemy. The fight was, for a time, renewed; but the steadiness of the Romans prevailed, and the royal army fled towards their trenches, where they were slain in great numbers. The General now opened the gates, and the broken remains of his army took refuge within their intrenchments. Muræna, meanwhile, who commanded on the left, was exposed to extreme danger by the distance to which Sylla pursued the main body of the enemy; and, had the right wing of the Asiatic army maintained its ground he must have been cut off, and completely destroyed; but, as has been before observed, the troops of the east depended almost entirely on the motions of their General in chief; and no sooner was the centre, under Archelaus, obliged to give way, than all the rest, though actually at that moment victorious, fled in confusion. In this battle, so bravely, and, for some hours, so doubtfully contested, the Roman writers have the hardihood to assert, that Sylla lost only twelve or fifteen men, whilst there fell of the barbarians a hundred and ten thousand.* If this statement, in any degree, resembled the truth, it would be worth while to inquire by what means Archelaus, with scarcely ten thousand men remaining, was enabled not only to embark in good order for Chalcis, in face of the victorious army of Sylla,* but, while he made his head-quarters in that city, to plunder all the islands near the coast, and to await, without any interruption from the Roman General, the arrival of a fresh army from Asia.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

The intelligence of this disaster produced immediately, among the cities of Asia Minor, accustomed to change their masters and their political principles with every variation in the tide of success, the usual consequences of insubordination and revolution. Mithridates, anxious to lose no time in fitting out a fresh army against Sylla, found himself surrounded on every side with defections and conspiracies: he steered through these difficult and embarrassing circumstances with his customary ability, and, even by the admission of his adversaries, at least with a politic shew of moderation and humanity. He first seized several Tetrarchs of Galatia,† who had revolted on the news of the defeat of Archelaus, and having punished them as traitors, he appointed a Satrap as Governor General over all their Tetrarchies; but this officer had scarcely time to remit the public treasures to the King, before a general insurrection drove him from the country, which remained devoted to the Roman interest. The Chians had laboured under a suspicion of disaffection ever since the naval action at Rhodes; in which, as if accidentally, they had run foul of the flag-ship, which carried Mithridates himself. It was only from the presence of mind and the powerful exertions of the King that she was saved from destruction. They were therefore, at the present juncture, to be watched with great caution; and the King was strongly advised to make a severe example of them, since it was ascertained that several of the principal citizens had repaired to the camp of Sylla, in Greece, and that some Roman officers had been seen at Chios.‡ But Mithridates, unwilling to act with precipitation, despatched Zenobius to take hostages for their fidelity, and to disarm all who were suspected of correspondence with the Romans. This being effected without opposition, and the hostages being sent to Erythræ,§ Zenobius proceeded to call an assembly of the citizens, in which he read a letter from Mithridates, addressed to the Chians, complaining of their treachery, and informing them that the privy council had passed on them sentence of death, which he was willing to commute for a fine of two thousand talents (about £387,500.) The fine being readily paid, the disaffected citizens were arrested, with their wives and children, put on board, under a strong escort, and conducted to the King, who sent them to colonize a fertile district on the shores of the Euxine.

Critical situation of Mithridates.

Zenobius put to death at Ephesus.

Zenobius, in the meantime, returned to Ephesus, with orders to institute a strict inquiry into the conduct of its citizens, who were strongly suspected of favouring the Roman cause; but the Ephesians, taking advantage of his urbanity, prevailed on him to enter the city without his guards, and instantly seizing him cast

* Appian, *in loco*. Plutarch, *in Sylla*. Eutropius, v.

* Appian.

† The Galatians, or Gallogræci, were a mixed race, descended from the Gauls, who sacked Rome under Brennus; and who afterwards, passing into Greece, and being there defeated by the Thracians, fled into Asia Minor, where they settled. Strabo, xii. Livy, xxxviii. 12. 40.

‡ Now Scio. § A city of Ionia. Pausanias, x. 12.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

him into prison, and put him to death. The gates were, at the same time, closed against his followers, and the citizens were induced to declare for Sylla. This example was quickly followed by several of the neighbouring towns; but Mithridates, having punished some of the principal agitators, put a stop, for the present, to the further progress of disaffection, by proclaiming independence to all the Greek cities in Asia; at the same time ordaining a general remission of debts (*novas tabulas*), and the admission of metics (resident foreigners) and of freedmen* to the privileges of citizens.

Order was scarcely restored among the dependencies when a greater danger arose to the King from a conspiracy among his own officers, the leaders in which were Minion, Neoptolemus, Clisthenes, and Asclepiodotus. The last of these, whether from the outset faithful to his master, or repenting of his treason, timely betrayed the plot to the King, and the traitors suffered the penalty due to their crime. Upon their trial circumstances appeared, which led to the detection of a very extensive confederacy; and a strict inquiry being instituted,† a great number of malecontents were executed. It deserves remark that Sylla afterwards seized all the persons within his reach who had given information against the conspirators, and put them to death in horrid tortures.

Dorylaus goes to Greece.

These affairs being despatched, the King hastened the departure of Dorylaus to join the shattered remains of his forces in Greece; and, according to the best authorities, the whole royal army, after the junction, amounted to about eighty thousand men, though others have stated it at more than double that number. Dorylaus‡ assumed a very high tone in speaking of the late engagement, and declared that his only wish was to meet with Sylla as soon as possible; but Archelaus, aware of the advantages which he possessed in the command of the sea, exerted himself to moderate the ardour of his colleague; until Sylla, having moved his camp to the plain of Orchomenus in Bœotia, a situation remarkably favourable for the cavalry, in which the Asiatic army was very superior to the Romans,§ the Generals agreed to encamp on the opposite side of the plain, and to fortify their intrenchments as strongly as possible. Whilst the armies lay thus, in sight of each other, the Roman soldiers were employed in cutting trenches across the plain, in order to interrupt and break the charge of the Asiatic cavalry. Archelaus made repeated sallies from his camp with small bodies of horse, and cut to pieces the parties employed in this work; and so great was the dread entertained by the Romans of the royal horse-guards,‖ that they could not be brought up to cover their own labourers. At length Sylla, enraged at his frequent losses, seized a standard, and springing forward towards the enemy as they were cutting down the unarmed workmen, he called out to his soldiers in a voice like thunder, "Go back, white-livered scoundrels, to Rome; and when you are asked, where you betrayed your General, reply, that you ran away, and left him among the enemy at Orchomenus." This artifice revived the spirit of honourable daring among the troops, and speedily brought on a general action. Both armies behaved with great gallantry, and suffered severely; a body of archers in the royal army, being charged so home by two Roman cohorts that they could not handle their bows, grasped their arrows in their hands, and using them like swords, forced the enemy to retire, leaving many of their number on the field.* Diogenes, the King's son, who commanded on the right, displayed a strength, courage, and address worthy of his father; and kept the whole left wing of the Roman army in check, till he fell covered with wounds: his fall proved the signal of retreat to the rest of the army, and they fled to their trenches with the loss, it is said, of twenty-five thousand men,† chiefly cavalry.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

Battle of Orchomenus.

It is probable that the loss of the Romans was likewise great; for the number of killed and wounded is nowhere mentioned, and Sylla did not think it expedient to attempt to force the lines, but retired to refresh his men. The next day, apprehensive lest Archelaus should retire again to Chalcis, he began to draw a trench round the enemy's camp as if to prevent his escape; the royal army immediately sallied to interrupt the work, and for several hours, as Appian acknowledges, "the noblest feats of valour were performed both by Romans and by barbarians." The latter were at length driven in, after great mutual slaughter, and the Romans, entering their lines at the same time, slew them in such multitudes, that the dykes and rivulets of the plain flowed with blood. Archelaus, firm and undaunted in the midst of the confusion, provided for the safety of the survivors with a quickness and dexterity which won the admiration even of Sylla; and, embarking them in transports, retired to Chalcis. The Roman General, seeing no further advantage to be gained till the arrival of a powerful fleet under Lucullus, having ravaged the whole of Bœotia, went into winter-quarters in Thessaly.

Flaccus goes into Asia.

In the meanwhile the faction at Rome, adverse to Sylla, sent Flaccus, who was Consul with Cinna, into Asia, at the head of two legions, and with a considerable fleet; but the ships having been driven ashore by a gale of wind, were burnt by some of the King's soldiers, and Flaccus, who was an indifferent officer, and of a haughty and capricious temper, lost all control over his men; some of whom went over to Sylla in Thessaly, and the rest submitted to the orders of Fimbria, a private senator, who, without any commission from Rome, assumed the command, and barbarously murdered Flaccus. But though a bad citizen, Fimbria was a good soldier, and having fallen in with the army under another son of Mithridates,‡ named after his father, he pursued him from place to place till he forced him into a defile, from which he with difficulty escaped by sea to Mytilene.§

B. C. 85.

* Appian and Plutarch call these persons "*slaves*;" but this must be understood as spoken invidiously of those who *had been* in slavery.

† Appian says, "sixteen hundred;" but this is wholly incredible. It is more likely that sixteen suffered death.

‡ Plutarch, *in Syllâ*. § Appian, *in loco*.

‖ This excessive terror could hardly have existed, unless the Romans had suffered very severely from the Asiatic cavalry at Chæronea.

* Plutarch, *in Syllâ*.

† Appian, *in loco*.

‡ Appian and Orosius relate, that it was the King himself who fled from Fimbria. Plutarch also speaks of a skirmish at sea between Neoptolemus and Lucullus, in which the former was worsted. (*Vita Luculli*.) Memnon. c. 36.

§ Appian, *in loco*.

Biography. From U. C. 681. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

These events disposed both parties to an accommodation. Mithridates, taught by experience to dread the Roman arms, sent instructions to Archelaus to treat for peace; and Sylla, jealous of the intentions of Fimbria, who was committing atrocious ravages in Asia, and still more alarmed by news from Rome, was glad of an opportunity to escape from the Mithridatic war. An interview accordingly was concerted, at which Sylla* proposed that Archelaus should place at his disposal, for the prosecution of the civil war which was impending, the army and navy under his command; and that in return for this service he should be declared King of Pontus and ally of Rome, in the room of his master, who was to be deposed and put to death. The brave Asiatic nobleman replied with becoming indignation, and bitterly reproached the Roman with his double baseness; but Sylla, hardened in guilt and treachery, only derided his scruples, and scoffed at the idea of fidelity to a barbarian and a King; and Plutarch, who relates the story, appears to think that Sylla had the best of the argument.

Sylla treats with Archelaus.

Terms proposed.

Archelaus, however, thought otherwise; and the Roman General was obliged to propose terms less inconsistent with honour and loyalty.† These were 1. That Mithridates should give up his fleet, consisting of seventy ships of the line, and all his prisoners. 2. That he should pay to Rome two thousand talents (£387,500.) for the expenses of the war. 3. That he should confine himself to his hereditary dominions, ceding Asia Minor and Paphlagonia to the Romans, Bithynia to Nicomedes, and Cappadocia to Ariobarzanes. 4. That he should be styled, as his father had been,‡ the friend and ally of Rome.§

Archelaus, unwilling to make such important concessions without consulting Mithridates, agreed to give up all the places which he held in Greece, and to conclude a truce till the pleasure of the King should be known. In the interval he scrupulously abstained from action of every kind; while Sylla employed himself in plunder and exaction both in Greece and in Asia. At length the couriers who had been despatched to the King returned with his answer, agreeing to all the conditions proposed except the cession of Paphlagonia; and stating that he could have made much better terms with Fimbria if he could have condescended to treat with so ambiguous a character. Sylla, upon this hint, took the alarm, and desired to have an interview with the King; which accordingly took place on a plain between Pergamus and Cyzellii, each party being accompanied by a few faithful followers.‖ After some altercation, during which Sylla is said to have behaved with great heat and insolence, Mithridates consented to all the conditions without reserve, and returned in peace to his narrowed dominions. The Roman General, on his return home, was allowed a magnificent triumph.¶

* Plutarch, *in Sylla.*

† Appian says, that Archelaus fell afterwards under suspicion of "Romanizing;" but his account of the matter is neither probable nor consistent. See also Plutarch.

‡ Polyb. *Excerpt.* CXXXV.

§ Plutarch, *in Sylla.* Appian, *in loco.*

‖ Appian, *in loco.* Plutarch says, that they met at Dardanus, and that Mithridates was followed by a splendid train and a great army, and Sylla by four cohorts and two hundred horse.

¶ Eutropius, v. *sub finem.*

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

It is judiciously observed by Florus,* that though Sylla formally concluded a peace with the King of Pontus, yet he left Asia under the influence of a conflagration smothered but not extinguished, and certain to break out afresh with increased violence. The renewal of hostilities is, by all the Roman historians, unblushingly imputed to the perfidy of Mithridates;† although it appears, from their own admissions, that he took up arms in self-defence, after remonstrance and negociation had failed, to repel the unprovoked and unauthorized aggressions of Muræna.

A rebellion having broken out among the natives of Colchis‡ and of the shores of the Bosphorus, Mithridates went in person to reduce them to order; and finding that their discontents arose, not from disaffection to his family, but from a national pride which disdained dependence on the King of another country, he made his own son Mithridates King of Colchis, to the entire satisfaction of all parties. This young Prince, however, forgetting the duty which he owed to his sovereign and his father, very soon began to aim at absolute independence; and the King was obliged to recall him, and to keep him under his own eye.§ The Colchians shewing a disposition to resent this interference, a powerful standing army became necessary to preserve those wild districts in subordination; and Muræna, affecting to consider this force as levied with a view to infringe the terms of the treaty with Rome, without any orders from the Consuls or the Senate, and prompted by the insatiable and shameless avarice, which was now the prevailing vice of the Roman character,‖ entered the territories of the King, and marching to Cumæ, a large trading seaport,¶ not only plundered it of an immense quantity of merchandise, but, having slaughtered the horse-guards who opposed his sacrilegious attempt, carried off the treasures deposited in the temple, which was one of the richest in Asia. Mithridates, unwilling to involve himself in a war, despatched ministers to Sylla and to the Senate, complaining of the violence of Muræna; who, in the spring, renewed his ravages, and crossing the Halys laid waste forty villages in the King's dominions, where no opposition was offered him, and returned loaded with booty into Galatia.

Renewal of the war with Rome.

Gordius sent against Muræna. B. C. 84.

The Senate, however, were not disposed to interfere with effect, and contented themselves with sending a message to the King that they regretted what had occurred, whilst they took no steps to restrain Muræna from continuing his depredations. Mithridates therefore had no alternative but to defend himself against this freebooter by force; and, hoping that the Senate would not consider his defensive operations as any breach of the treaty with Sylla, he despatched Gordius, with such forces as could immediately be spared, to protect the frontier, whilst he himself prepared to follow with fresh levies. The two Generals met at the river Halys, and encamped on each side of the stream; and Gordius, observing

* Florus, iii. v.

† Vide Appian, Florus, Orosius, Velleius Paterculus, &c. *in loco.*

‡ *Hodie* Mingrelia.

§ Appian relates, that the king chained his son with golden chains, and afterwards put him to death; but it appears that he was alive many years afterwards.

‖ See Velleius Paterculus, ii. 33.

¶ Strabo, xiii.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

that Muræna was occupied in fortifying his position, remained quiet till the King should come up to reinforce him. After the junction of the royal troops, Mithridates was still very inferior in numbers to the Romans,* whose line was formed in the most advantageous manner, having one flank defended by a broad and rapid river, and the other by a fortified eminence. But the King, perceiving that he could only hope for success from a *coup de main*, unexpectedly crossed the swollen stream with a chosen body of men and took Muræna in flank, while the main body of his army, under Gordius, fording at a shallow place above, advanced to charge in front. The Romans made a brave defence; but being thrown into confusion by the sudden attack of the royal guards, and by the extraordinary personal prowess of the King, which seemed to inspire his whole army, they were beaten from their intrenchments, and fled, with great loss, to the mountains, where many more perished amidst the trackless woods from cold and hunger. Muræna himself escaped, with difficulty, into Phrygia, and all his garrisons in Cappadocia fell into the hands of Mithridates; who, thankful for so complete and glorious a victory, offered a sacrifice to the gods on such a scale that it was impossible for some days to approach the pyre. The flame was seen by night at the distance of above a hundred miles.†

Suspension of hostilities.

In the meanwhile Sylla, who was envious of the plunder collected by Muræna, wrote to him to abstain from further hostilities, and sent Gabinius into Pontus to pacify the King. Mithridates received him with the most splendid and generous hospitality, accepted his apology, and readily laid down his arms, on a promise that Muræna should do the same. He had now leisure to turn his attention to the Colchians, who continued to demand a King of their own, though they were perfectly willing to be governed by a son of Mithridates. He accordingly sent his younger son, Machares, to take possession of the throne; and at the same time gave one of his children, a boy of four years old, as an hostage to Ariobarzanes, for the faithful performance of all the stipulations in the treaty: but that Prince, dissatisfied with what had been done for him, sent legates to Rome to poison the ears of the Senate with groundless jealousies and unfounded complaints against the King of Pontus. Mithridates, on his return from an expedition into the north, in which his army had sustained a severe loss from the effects of the climate, endeavoured to counteract the mischievous designs of his neighbour, by sending Gordius to Rome, to assure the Senate that he had no intentions contrary to his promises, or their will. But the ambassador easily discovered that, under fair professions, the Senate entertained a determination to crush the power of his master; and on his return he completely satisfied the King that no dependence could be placed upon the friendship or the justice of Rome. He resolved, therefore, at all hazards, to prepare for the worst, and to strengthen himself against the impending danger; and for this purpose he sent privately to his son-in-law, Tigranes, (who had recently assumed the diadem, and had named the metropolis of Armenia Tigranocerta, after himself,*) desiring that he would prepare for the invasion of Cappadocia. That Prince accordingly collected an immense† army from every part of his dominions. At the same time he made overtures to Sertorius, now openly at war with the government, who undertook to assist him in the recovery of Asia, Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, and Galatia,‡ and to confirm him in the sovereignty of all these kingdoms. The remainder of the summer, and the whole winter, were consumed in building ships, and in providing magazines of arms, stores, and provisions. Mercenary troops, to the amount of a hundred and forty thousand infantry,§ were engaged, not only in every part of Asia, but among several European nations.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

Mithridates conquers Bithynia.

Early in the ensuing spring, the King marched into Bithynia. Nicomedes was now dead; and his kingdom, being declared a Roman province, was governed by Cotta the Prætor; who, being unable to resist the forces led against him, fled to Chalcis, without striking a blow. Nudus, the Admiral, attempting to make some resistance, was defeated, with the loss of three thousand men, while scarce twenty of the royal army were slain.‖ The whole kingdom immediately submitted to Mithridates; Paphlagonia soon afterwards followed this example; and the whole province of Asia, wearied and exhausted by the exactions of the Roman usurers and publicans, revolted once more, and declared for the King.¶

Lucullus appointed to conduct the war. B. C. 75.

Lucullus, who had been severely censured in the former war for refusing to cooperate with Fimbria,** and thereby permitting the army of Mithridates to escape, when it might have been entirely destroyed, desirous of recovering his reputation, procured himself to be appointed to the conduct of the war, and arrived in Asia, with a powerful fleet and army, whilst Cotta was preparing to attack the King. This General, mortified at being superseded, and anxious to anticipate Lucullus in the glory of defeating the enemy, hastened his operations unadvisedly, and was defeated by Mithridates with the loss of four thousand Romans slain, and of nearly the whole of his fleet captured. The survivors escaped into Chalcedon, where they were closely besieged by the enemy; and, but for the timely arrival of Lucullus, must have fallen into their hands.

Siege of Cyzicus.

Mithridates immediately marched, with his whole army, to besiege Cyzicus, a city on the Propontis which formed the principal connection†† between Bithynia and the province of Asia, and the possession of which was consequently of the highest importance. It would be useless, and indeed impracticable, to enter into any calculation of the actual numbers of his army, or of the troops opposed to him under Lucullus; for Appian and Plutarch not only contradict each other, but, in their eagerness to amplify the honour of their hero, they perpetually convict them-

* Appian, *Reb. Mith.*

† Appian (*Reb. Mith.*) says, a thousand stadia, viz. 125 miles, at sea.

* He was at this time also King of Syria. Appian, *in Syriacis.* Justin. xl. 1, 2.

† Appian (*Reb. Mith.*) says three hundred thousand men.

‡ Ibid. *eod.*

§ Ibid. Plutarch says a hundred and twenty thousand. (*Vita Luculli.*)

‖ Appian, *in loco.*

¶ Appian. Plutarch, *in Lucullo.* *Epitome Livii*, lib. xciii.

** Plutarch, *in Lucullo.* Orosius, vi. 2.

†† Strabo, xii. Florus, iii. 5.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

selves of exaggeration; and there is no other existing history upon which we can rely for information. The probability seems to be, that both armies were numerous and well appointed; and that there was no great disparity in any respect.

The siege of Cyzicus was regularly formed, and the harbour was blockaded, when Lucullus arrived; and so completely was the surrounding country occupied by the enemy, that the Roman General could find no means of conveying the intelligence of his arrival to the citizens; who, alarmed by the numbers of the besiegers, and by the effect of their artillery, after a few ineffectual efforts to dislodge the engines from the batteries and to burn the fleet, were ready to surrender their town. At length a person was found who undertook to swim upon bladders * by night into the harbour, with letters to Pisistratus, the Governor, and the Cyzicenes were induced to hold out, in the hope of being shortly relieved. In the mean time, the arms of the King were every where crowned with success: Manius, or Marius,† who had been sent to his succour, by Sertorius, gained an advantage in a rencontre with Lucullus; and Eumachus, his lieutenant in Phrygia, defeated the Romans with great slaughter, and drove them out of the country, while he daily extended, on every side, the alliances and the resources of his master.

Mithridates raises the siege.

But Lucullus, aware of the difficulty which must arise to Mithridates in providing for so vast an army in a narrow territory, studiously protracted the operations of the campaign till scarcity and its constant attendant, pestilence, began to be felt in the royal camp. The surrounding marshes also, exhaling unwholesome vapours, spread disease among the soldiers, and the necessity of changing quarters became every day more apparent. The King, disappointed by the obstinate resistance of the town, resolved to make one bold effort to storm the place before he would quit it; but the garrison, having notice of his design, contrived to set fire to the principal battery upon Mount Dindymus, which commanded the fortifications; and he was obliged to draw off his forces by night. This, however, was not effected without considerable loss: the Romans hung upon his rear, and severely galled his troops, already disheartened and exhausted, so that great numbers were slain, many were made prisoners, and most of the baggage and materiel was taken. The King, embarking for Parium, another town on the Propontis, sent his army over land to Lampsacus, whence he soon afterwards removed it, together with the inhabitants of the city, by sea, whilst he manned his fleet, under the command of Alexander and Dionysius, with twenty thousand picked men, sent him by Sertorius.‡

Disasters of Mithridates.

But fortune had once more changed sides, and nothing but disasters ensued. News arrived that Deiotarus, King, or rather Tetrarch of Galatia, had attacked and defeated the several detachments of the royal army posted in his dominions:§ the fleet, which had sailed for Lemnos, was pursued thither by Lucullus, and, in two naval actions, was completely broken; the two admirals and Manius were taken prisoners in a cave on the shore; Dionysius swallowed poison, Manius was put to death as a traitor, and Alexander was reserved to grace the triumph of the Roman General.* The King himself, in attempting to take advantage of the absence of Lucullus to withdraw his fleet and army into Pontus, was overtaken by a violent storm, in which most of his ships were lost or damaged. The flag-ship,† a vessel of unusual burden, became unmanageable, and, not answering her helm, was in great danger of foundering at sea; and Mithridates was obliged to hail a privateer, which was fortunately in sight, and to intrust his person to the fidelity of a pirate; by whose assistance, after undergoing almost incredible dangers and hardships, he was landed at Heraclea, and thence made his way to Amisus, and subsequently to Sinope.‡

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

His activity and exertions. B. C. 72.

But the spirit of Mithridates seemed even greater in adversity than in the midst of success.§ He scarcely gave himself a moment to recover from his fatigues before he commenced the reparation of his losses. He sent immediately to Tigranes and to Machares, to levy all the troops they could command, and to march to his assistance; at the same time he despatched ambassadors to the Parthians and to the Scythians, requiring reinforcements. Diocles, who was charged with a large sum of money, as a subsidy to the former nation, and with some hostages, whom the King now thought it expedient to restore to them, converted the gold to his own use; and, deserting to Lucullus, put the hostages into his hands. The levies meanwhile proceeded, and troops were continually arriving at head-quarters; so that in a short time the King once again had a formidable army‖ under his command, and was in a condition to offer battle to the Roman General. Lucullus, however, was anxious to protract the war; and though his encomiast, Plutarch, endeavours to make out a case in his favour, and represents him as defending his conduct in a Council of war, with considerable ingenuity, we may gather, from several hints dropped by Appian¶ and other writers, that he was not exempt from the reigning vice of his country, and was in this instance sacrificing the real interests of Rome to his own love of plunder. Accordingly he marched his army into the richest districts, and besieged the most opulent towns; nor would he suffer any of the cities to be taken by storm, lest the plunder should be destroyed or secreted by the soldiers.

During this period, Amisus and Eupatoria (which latter place Mithridates had recently built, and had named after himself, intending to transfer thither the seat of empire) were rather watched than regularly beleaguered by the main body of the army under Lucullus; and Themiscyra, an important town on the river Thermodon, was surrounded by a detachment commanded by Muræna, who pushed his operations with more vigour, though the workmen employed in throwing up the trenches were continually annoyed by wild beasts, let loose among them from

* Orosius, *loc. cit.* † Al. Varius.

‡ Appian, *loc. cit.* Prideaux, we know not on what authority, says *ten* thousand. Part ii. lib. vii.

§ Orosius, vii. 2.

* Appian, *in loco.* Eutropius, vi.

† Ibid. *eod.* Plutarch, *in Lucullo.* Orosius makes the number of ships lost, eighty. Appian, sixty.

‡ Orosius, *loc. cit.* § Florus, iii. 5. Appian, *passim.*

‖ It is idle to inquire respecting numbers among conflicting authorities; each so continually contradicts the others and itself, that one makes the King lose three times as many men in a retreat as he is stated to have led into the field. Appian, Plutarch, *in Lucullo*, &c.

¶ De *Reb. Mith.* Vide *Memnon*, cap. 45, 46, 47.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

the town, as well as by hives of bees flung over from the walls.*

Battles between Lucullus and Mithridates. B. C. 71.

Early in the spring, Lucullus, alarmed at the growing discontents of his soldiers, advanced to meet Mithridates, who lay encamped behind the mountains. An attempt, on the part of the Romans, to gain possession of the heights which command the passes through these wooded steeps, occasioned an action, in which Lucullus was defeated with great loss, and Pomponius, his master of the horse, was wounded and taken prisoner, while his troops fled with precipitation. This brave officer, being brought before the King, was asked "upon what terms he would serve Mithridates?"—"On condition that *he* serves Rome," replied the undaunted patriot. Some of the courtiers were disposed to resent this boldness; but the King nobly observed, "Integrity is rendered more respectable by adversity," and instantly ordered him to be set at liberty. Lucullus, upon this defeat, retired beyond the mountains; but, being distressed for want of provisions, he sent a strong escort, by a circuitous route, to convoy supplies from Cappadocia. The party, on its return, was descried by the King, who sent a troop to intercept it; but the Romans, making a more vigorous defence than was expected, repelled the assailants, and put them to flight. Mithridates immediately rushed from the eminence on which he was posted, and with loud shouts compelled his men to rally, and renew the charge; and such it is said was the terror inspired by his tremendous voice, and the fierceness of his onset, that the Romans fled in all directions, and the whole convoy remained in the hands of the victors. The Roman camp was now severely pressed by scarcity, as well as disheartened by defeat, and the men murmured loudly against their General, for having given the barbarians time to collect and organize a force which could no longer be opposed; while Mithridates, on the other hand, began to conceive hopes, by cutting off the supplies of the enemy, to oblige him to retreat, without hazarding a battle; a measure which would inevitably have led to the destruction of his army, amid the wilds of the country into which he had advanced.†

Total rout of the royal army.

But in this expectation he was deceived by an unfortunate accident. A troop of horse, which had been detached to intercept some provisions going to the Roman camp, was through mismanagement engaged in a narrow defile, in which it had not room to act, and was completely routed; in consequence of this disaster, the right wing of the royal army became exposed to an attack in flank, and the King was obliged to order a hasty retreat. The army, imagining that the Romans were upon them, fled in the greatest confusion, without their baggage, and without waiting for orders of any kind; so that the King, with a few of his principal officers, vainly attempting to rally them, was left behind on foot, and Dorylaus was killed by the crowd, which he could neither stop nor reduce to order. Lucullus, astonished to see the enemy in full retreat, when no one thought even of a serious skirmish, hastily pursued; and the King would have been taken prisoner, had he not, with admirable presence of mind, driven back amongst the foremost of his pursuers a mule, laden with gold and silver, and scattered all the money and jewels he had about him on the road. While the soldiers were gathering up these treasures, and fighting with each other for the greatest share, he had time to recover his horse, and to escape beyond their reach.*

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

But the defeat, comparatively bloodless, was nevertheless completely ruinous to the affairs of the King; who now saw no resource but to collect his cavalry and light troops, and to retire, with all possible speed, into the dominions of his son-in-law Tigranes. Previously to his departure, he sent Bacchides,† the chief of his eunuchs, to inform the unfortunate ladies of his family of what had happened, and to recommend that they should rather die than fall into the hands of the enemy. One is said to have repined at this recommendation; but the rest, thanking the eunuch for his courtesy, and the King for his kind care of their honour, died by their own hands: Hipsicratea alone mounted her horse, and by means of most wonderful exertions overtook the King, and accompanied him in his flight.

Noble resolution of the princesses.

Successes of Lucullus.

Lucullus now took Cabira, in which he found abundance of treasure, and advancing through Paphlagonia into Pontus, he received the submission of the whole kingdom, except Amisus, which still held out for the King, under the command of the faithful and experienced general Callimachus; till, after a siege of nearly two years, the town was surprised by a stratagem while the garrison were at dinner. Callimachus, in order to make good his retreat by sea, set fire to the houses, and embarking in haste escaped with all his men. The Roman General, mortified to have occasioned the destruction of so fine a city, ordered his soldiers to extinguish the flames; but they, in their eagerness to fly upon the spoil, paid no regard to the word of command; and although he tried, by threats, promises, and even bribes, to gain their attention, they were so occupied in securing their plunder, that Amisus was reduced to a heap of ashes.‡

Baseness of Machares.

Lucullus being thus undisputed master of all the dominions of Mithridates, Machares, who had been made King of the Bosphorians by his indulgent father, provided for his own safety by purchasing a separate peace,§ and was declared, as his grandfather had been, the friend and ally of Rome.‖ The Roman General, unable immediately to prosecute a war with Tigranes, at that time the most powerful monarch in Asia, sent an ambassador¶ to demand that he should deliver up the King of Pontus, on pain of being deemed an enemy to the Roman state. Tigranes, who was engaged at the siege of Ptolemais,** in Palestine, on receiving this message, hastened to conclude a treaty with Queen Alexandra, on terms more favourable than she had any reason to hope, in order that he might be at liberty to return to the defence of his own dominions; and he replied to the

* Appian, *in loco*.

† No notice is necessary of an absurd story related in this place by Appian and Plutarch, (one of whom has manifestly borrowed it from the other,) respecting an attempt made by Mithridates to assassinate Lucullus.

* In this place, Appian, after saying that the King lost *nearly all* his cavalry, makes him retreat into Armenia with the same number of horse which he had when he first took the field.

† Al. Bacchus.

‡ This city, and Sinope, which shared a similar fate, were afterwards rebuilt and restored by Lucullus. Vid. Appian, *Mith.*

§ Appian, *in loco*. ‖ Plutarch, *in Lucullo*.

¶ Appius Clodius. ** Josephus, xii. 24.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

proposal of Lucullus with becoming indignation. His conduct on this, as on other occasions, sufficiently confutes the childish story related by Plutarch,* and retailed by the learned, but somewhat credulous, Prideaux,† that Mithridates met with a very cold reception in Armenia, and through the insolent pride of his son-in-law was not admitted to the presence for several months.

Lucullus marches into Armenia. B. C. 70.

The Roman General, meanwhile, having settled to his satisfaction the embarrassed affairs of the province of Asia Minor, and having also amassed vast wealth, collected all the troops he could muster in the east, and moved towards Armenia, leaving Sornatius with a strong division to keep Pontus quiet, and to watch Machares,‡ whose treachery to his father and benefactor precluded all reliance on his fidelity to his new engagements. Lucullus advancing to the Euphrates passed it in the midst of the rainy season, and plundering all the country between that river and the Tigris, crossed the latter stream without opposition, nearly opposite to the royal city Tigranocerta.§ Tigranes, informed at length of the arrival of the enemy so near his metropolis, despatched Metrobarzanes to observe his motions, and to prevent his laying waste the country; but this brave and faithful statesman was an unskilful General; and Lucullus soon found an opportunity to surprise and cut him off with the greater part of his army. The King was so much alarmed by his miscarriage, that he hastily quitted the Capital, and took refuge in the strongholds of Mount Taurus, leaving Mazeus to defend the palace and the city. The former, however, could not be maintained against the artillery of the Romans, directed by Sextilius, and Mazeus was obliged to abandon it to be plundered, after having conveyed the Princesses and the ladies of the court into the citadel, in which he was closely besieged. Lucullus did not think fit to march in pursuit of the two Kings, with so considerable a force in his rear;‖ and he therefore awaited the reduction of Tigranocerta.

Extraordinary gallantry of a small body of Armenians.

In the mean time the King felt great uneasiness respecting the situation of the Princesses; and he sent a chosen body of only six thousand of his guards, who advanced fearlessly to the gates of the city, took the ladies under their protection, fought their way back through the whole Roman army without material loss, and rejoined the royal camp in triumph. The siege continued to be closely pressed, it being the object of Lucullus to draw Tigranes to attack him on the plain, to which his anxiety for the safety of the city, and his natural impatience strongly inclined him. For a time he was restrained by the prudent advice of Mithridates, (who was now again recruiting in Pontus, and who entreated him, in every letter which he wrote, on no account to hazard a battle,) as well as by the representations of Taxiles lately arrived at head-quarters with some reinforcements; but as his strength was daily augmented by the arrival of fresh troops to his assistance, and his anger was provoked by the harassing attacks of Murœna, who hung on his rear, and cut off his convoys, he resolved to raise his standard, and march at once to the relief of Mazeus and the garrison.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

According to the despatch sent to the Senate by Lucullus, the King of Armenia brought into the field a hundred and fifty thousand infantry, seventeen thousand heavy cavalry, thirty-eight thousand light horse, and twenty thousand archers and slingers, besides an uncounted multitude of pioneers, artillerymen, and labourers. The Roman General not intimidated by the sight of so vast an army, left six thousand men under Murœna, to maintain the blockade of the city, and advanced to meet the enemy with about ten thousand heavy-armed troops, and a thousand light infantry. Observing that Tigranes came on without precaution, he detached a troop of horse by a circuitous route to occupy an eminence* in the rear of the royal army; and when, after a furious charge, the Romans gave way and fled before the enemy's heavy horse, upon a concerted signal, the Roman cavalry rushed from their post, and, attacking the victorious troops in the rear, occasioned so sudden a panic† that nothing was thought of but hasty flight; and Lucullus pursued them till nightfall with prodigious slaughter.‡ Tigranes himself escaped with difficulty, and his royal diadem, with a great quantity of rich plunder, fell into the hands of the conquerors. The Grecian mercenaries in the city, perceiving what had happened, mutinied; and, notwithstanding the exertions of Mazeus to disarm them, they overcame the native garrison, and opened the gates to the Romans.§ The treasures found in Tigranocerta exceeded all the former spoils won by Lucullus, and in coined specie alone he is said to have taken eight thousand talents, nearly two millions sterling.‖ The soldiers revelling in every kind of luxury became corrupted and enervated; and discipline was so little regarded, that they openly censured the measures of the General, and refused to obey such orders as did not meet their approbation.

Defeat of Tigranes, and capture of Tigranocerta.

Mithridates joins the army.

A few days only after this brilliant and decisive victory, Mithridates joined his son-in-law with the forces which he had been able to collect in his own dominions, where his levies had been greatly facilitated by the insubordination prevailing among the troops under Sornatius, who were even more refractory than the main army. Tigranes, now fully convinced of the soundness of the advice which he had before disregarded, committed the whole conduct of the war to Mithridates, and made him commander-in-chief of the forces. The King of Pontus immediately prepared to recruit the army by reinforcements drawn from every quarter in which the court of Armenia retained any influence; but his principal anxiety was to engage in his cause Arsaces, King of Parthia,¶ who had formerly been defeated and rendered tributary by Tigranes. That wily monarch, whilst he flattered the Armenians with fair promises, made overtures at the same time to Lucullus, intending to afford assistance to neither, but to profit by their mutual hostility.**

Mutiny in the Roman army.

The Roman General, however, saw through his duplicity; and aware that the neutrality of Arsaces might eventually prove more dangerous than his

* *In Lucullo.* † Part ii. book vi. ‡ Appian, ibid.

§ Tigranocerta was built on the east side of the Tigris, about two days' journey above the site of ancient Nineveh: it was prodigiously strong, and erected with all that attention to splendid luxury which characterised the despots of the east.

‖ Dion. Cassius, lib. xxxv.

* Appian, *loc. cit.* † Plutarch, *in Lucullo.*

‡ Memnon, 58, 59. *Epitome Livii*, 98.

§ Dion. xxxv. Appian, *in loco.* ‖ Plutarch, *in Lucullo.*

¶ Sallust, *Fragmenta*, lib. iv. ** Dion, xxxv.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

enmity, resolved to suspend, for the present, his operations against Mithridates, and to march into Parthia. With this design he sent orders to Sornatius to evacuate Pontus, and to join him with all the forces under his command; but the soldiers there, insisting that the chastisement of the Parthian King was only a pretext for protracting the war, mutinied, and openly declared that they would return to Rome; and the same disorder extending itself to head-quarters also, the General was compelled to forego his Parthian expedition.

Exertions and prudence of Mithridates.

The delay occasioned by these events enabled Mithridates to collect an army of seventy thousand chosen men, whom he daily exercised in the Roman manner of fighting, and trained to the most exact discipline; so that, by the middle of the summer he was enabled to harass Lucullus with frequent skirmishes, and to cut off his foraging parties, whilst he carefully avoided a general action. The Roman commander, finding that he could not force him to a battle, made a demonstration upon Artaxata, where the Princesses and the ladies of the court resided; and the impatience of Tigranes once more prompted him to disregard the prudent suggestions of his father-in-law, and to march out with his whole army to their relief; but when he came up with the enemy near the river Arsamia, his cavalry fell short of his expectations, and the Romans obtained a decisive advantage. The three Asiatic sovereigns fled from the field;* and, if Plutarch may be believed, Mithridates himself evinced symptoms of cowardice little consistent with his accustomed fierceness and dauntless intrepidity. Lucullus, encouraged by this success, advanced in pursuit of the fugitives, who led him into the wild and bleak districts on the north of Armenia, in which, as the autumn advanced, his men suffered severely from the climate, as well as from the hostility of the natives;† till at length they unanimously refused to advance farther.‡ Upon this he turned back, and, marching southward, passed Mount Taurus, and entered into Mesopotamia, where he sat down before Nisibis, one of the strongest fortifications in Asia, at that time well-garrisoned, and commanded by a brother of Tigranes.§ The city held out against all the efforts of the Romans for several months, but was at last taken by assault, during the darkness of a winter night, and rewarded the captors not only with abundance of prize-money, but with the comfort of excellent winter-quarters.

B. C. 68.

Successes of Mithridates.

Whilst Lucullus was thus occupied, Tigranes not only recovered the greater part of his hereditary dominions, but ventured also to make incursions into Cappadocia; and Mithridates, having obtained from him four thousand of his own best soldiers, fell upon the Roman garrisons wherever he could find them, and put them to the sword almost without resistance. So great was the terror inspired by the rapidity of his movements and the suddenness of his attacks, that he laid waste a considerable portion of the Greater Armenia,‖ and recovered most of the strong places which had been taken by the Romans. But being at length wounded in the knee by a stone from a sling, and by an arrow under the eye,* he was obliged to abstain from active exertion; and he took the opportunity which offered of returning into his own country, where his subjects received him with the most enthusiastic joy.† His wounds soon healed under the skilful treatment of an Agarian surgeon; and he again eagerly took the field against the Roman Generals commanding in Pontus. He had before defeated Fabius with considerable loss; and he now so distressed Sornatius and Triarius, that they sent to Lucullus earnestly entreating him to come to their assistance.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

Defeat of Triarius. B. C. 87.

The spring was now approaching, and the refractory army in Nisibis being with great difficulty prevailed on to quit their quarters, were so dilatory in their movements that they arrived too late to be of any service to their comrades: for Mithridates having driven Triarius into a defile, attacked him at advantage, and would have cut off his whole corps in a marsh, had not a Roman soldier, assuming the dress of a native who had fallen, approached the King, and whilst he pretended to give him some private information, stabbed him in the groin.‡ The wound so unexpectedly inflicted occasioned him to faint, and the army, alarmed for the safety of their King, suffered the enemy to escape. When Mithridates came to himself, he expressed his displeasure in strong terms against his officers;§ and, notwithstanding his wound and his age, he prepared to renew the combat at daybreak the next morning. The contest was long and obstinate; but the courage and military skill of Mithridates prevailed, and Triarius was completely defeated, with the loss of seven thousand men slain on the field of battle, of whom a hundred and fifty were Centurions, and twenty-four Military Tribunes.‖ This was the most fatal overthrow which the forces of the Republic had sustained for many years; and it succeeded, for the present, in putting an end to the war, and in securing Mithridates in the triumphant possession of his kingdom: for when Lucullus arrived soon afterwards, and neglected to bury the slain,¶ he lost even the shadow of authority over his army, which became so entirely disorganized, that nothing more was attempted during that year.**

In the meanwhile the allies of the King were employed in expelling the Roman garrisons from their several kingdoms; and Mithridates the Mede,†† son-in-law to Tigranes, having fallen in with a large detachment marching towards Pontus, routed it with great slaughter. The whole of Asia was now rapidly returning to the state in which Lucullus found it; and the effect of his long campaigns appeared only in his enormous wealth, the splendid library‡‡ which he had collected, and in the improvements which Mithridates had introduced into his own tactics and the discipline of his troops from frequent observation of the Roman military system. The affectionate loyalty with which this great Prince was regarded throughout his dominions, enabled him to repair with

* Tigranes, Mithridates, and Darius, King of Media.(a) Prideaux, ii. 6.
† Dion, xxxv. 3. Appian, *Mith.*
‡ Plutarch, *in Lucullo.* Orosius, vi. 3. § Dion, *loc. cit.*
‖ *Hodie* Turcomania.

(a) But Dion mentions Mithridates Prince of Media, lib. xxxv.

* Appian, *in loco.* † Dion, xxxv.
‡ Appian, *loc. cit.* § Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.*
‖ Appian, *in loco.* ¶ Plutarch, *in Pompeio.*
** Dion, *loc. cit.* †† See Dion Cassius, lib. xxxv.
‡‡ Isidor. *Orig.* vi. 3.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

unusual despatch the losses which he had sustained; and when Pompey arrived in Galatia, to supersede Lucullus in the command, the kingdom was not only completely reduced to order, but the treasury was replenished, and the King had taken the field at the head of an army, if not so numerous,* yet better calculated to meet the Roman legions than any which he had before opposed to them.

Arrival of Pompey in Asia. B. C. 66.

Phraates, having succeeded Arsaces in the kingdom of Parthia, renewed his ancient friendship with Mithridates, and offered to contract an alliance offensive and defensive with him. But no sooner did he learn that Pompey had taken the command of the Roman army, than his courage failed him; and he sent privately to assure the General that he would in all things obey the will of the Senate. Mithridates, not aware of his perfidy, felt himself in a condition to refuse the humiliating terms proposed to him by Pompey; but soon afterwards, having received intelligence of all that had passed, he despatched ambassadors to the camp, and desired to treat for peace. The conditions, however, insisted upon were such as he could not submit to either with honour or safety; for he was required, as a preliminary step, to disband his forces, and to deliver up all those persons in his camp who had ever sided with Rome; whom Pompey designated by the term "deserters," sufficiently implying the fate which would await them in in his hands.†

Renewal of the Mithridatic war.

Negociation having thus failed, the King intrenched himself in a commanding situation, where it was not practicable to attack him, and endeavoured to draw out the time in harassing skirmishes with the foraging parties. By these Pompey was so much distressed ‡ that he was obliged to withdraw his troops out of Pontus and Cappadocia into the Lesser Armenia for the convenience of supplies. Mithridates, in great hope of driving him into the provinces by pursuing the same mode of warfare, followed the camp at a distance, till he found an eminence on which he could securely establish his head-quarters, and whence he might advantageously annoy the enemy. He was unable long to maintain this post from the scarcity of water, and he retired to a greater distance; upon which the Roman General immediately occupied the deserted encampment, and, availing himself of the superior science of his country, sunk wells within his trenches, and procured an abundant supply.§ But the royal troops still continued to infest the outposts, and provisions were obtained with difficulty; till at length Pompey, weary of such continual provocations and ashamed of his inaction, resolved to venture upon a general engagement. With this view he advanced towards the King's camp, who remained quietly behind his trenches, and suffered the Romans to besiege him above six weeks without attempting a sally; and when at last his provisions were exhausted, he succeeded in withdrawing through the enemy's lines by night without loss or interruption,* and pitched his camp on the western bank of the Euphrates. When Pompey discovered that the army had escaped, he hastily followed, and encamped in front of their lines; and being now severely pressed by famine, and afraid of being drawn on further into an exhausted country, if Mithridates should cross the river, he made an attempt to surprise him by night.† In this he was prevented by the vigilance of the sentinels, who gave timely notice that the Romans were in motion; and the King, with his usual rapidity, had armed himself, and drawn up his men in order of battle, when the vanguard of the enemy approached the intrenchments. It was now too late to retreat, and Pompey unwillingly gave the word to charge.‡ As the Romans advanced, the archers and slingers of the royal army discharged clouds of light missiles, and when they came still nearer, the light infantry hurled their thonged javelins; but the moon, which was near her setting, shone directly in the eyes of the King's troops, and so lengthened the shadows of the enemy, that they entirely miscalculated their distance, and their weapons fell without effect. The heavy-armed legions of the Romans thus appeared as if invulnerable; and the Asiatic troops, seeing not one man fallen amid so many missiles, were seized with a panic and fled; but being intercepted by the river, most of them were either slain or drowned in attempting to escape. Mithridates himself, after performing astonishing feats of strength and valour, and having in vain used every endeavour to save his army, broke through the Roman legions at the head of his body-guard of eight hundred chosen warriors, and handled all who opposed him so severely that no one dared to pursue him. Among this valiant corps was the Queen Hipsicratea, armed like a man, and mounted on a Persian charger of extraordinary beauty. This faithful lady, not only fought by the side of the King in his greatest danger, but when he had lost all his servants, she attended, like a groom, upon his person, and even bestowed her care upon his horse, which she fed and rubbed down at night, and accoutred in the morning. Her attachment was ardently returned by Mithridates, who made her the partner of his inmost counsels, and often declared that whilst he continued to possess *Hypsicrates*, (for so he playfully called her from her masculine courage,) he should never cease to be a King.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

Defeat of Mithridates.

Escape of the King and Queen

Meanwhile the Roman General pursued him so closely§ that he was compelled to dismiss the few troops which had escaped with him; and, accompanied only by the Queen and two faithful officers of his court, he reached the strong castle of Sinoria,|| which he had erected between the Greater and Lesser Armenia,¶ and in which a considerable treasure was

* Appian (*Mith.*) says, *thirty-three* thousand men. Plutarch (*in Pompeio*) says, that he lost *ten* thousand in the battle which followed; when, according to all the authorities, he was left nearly destitute of troops. This is only one among a thousand examples of the inaccuracy and inconsistency of these historians. Florus, iii. 5.

† Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvi.

‡ Eutrop. vi. Florus, iii. 5. *Epitome Livii*, lib. c.

§ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*. Appian, *in Mithridaticis*.

* Plutarch (*eod.*) accuses the King of having ordered all his sick to be slain. But at that season there could not have been many sick in six weeks; nor was the retreat effected with such haste and trepidation as to render a few invalids any considerable impediment. Plutarch's enmity to Kings is the sole foundation of the story.

† Plutarch here gives us, according to his custom, a marvellous dream and a portent.

‡ Appian, *eod.* Dion, xxxvi.

§ Orosius, vi. 4.

|| Plutarch calls this fortress Inora, and Appian Sinorega; but Strabo, (who in lib. xii. gives an account of all the fortresses built by Mithridates upon this boundary,) names it Sinoria.

¶ *Hodie* Turcomania and Aladulia.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

deposited. Hence taking with him six hundred talents, (about £120,000,) he hastened onward to the source of the Euphrates,* and directed his flight through Colchis towards the Bosporus. But fresh embarrassments awaited him: his son Machares, King of the Bosporians, was a zealous supporter of the Roman interests,† and shewed no inclination to be involved in his father's danger; whilst Tigranes, profiting by past experience, not only refused to embroil himself with Pompey, but is even said to have proclaimed a reward for the capture of Mithridates.

Conduct of Tigranes and his son.

It happened that the King of Armenia was, at this time, at war with his own son (also named Tigranes,) the grandson of Mithridates. This prince, being conquered by his father, fled for protection to his grandfather, who was then encamped between the rivers Euphrates and Araxes on the spot where Pompey defeated him;‡ but learning on the road the event of that action, he threw himself upon the mercy of the Roman General. His father, alarmed lest Pompey should take part with him, sacrificed the cause of Mithridates to his fears, and hastened to lay his diadem in abject submission at the feet of the conqueror, making a merit of his unnatural conduct in offering a hundred talents (nearly £20,000) for the head of his father-in-law. Pompey effected a temporary reconciliation between the rival suppliants; but the young Tigranes proved as refractory to his new master, as he was undutiful to his father, and he was shortly afterwards arrested, and sent to Rome to be reserved for the day of triumph.

Hardships endured by Mithridates.

The King of Pontus, thus deserted by all upon whom he had been accustomed to rely, continued his flight§ northwards, among the fierce nations who inhabited the countries near the Palus Mæotis, whom he found warmly attached to his cause, and ready to make every exertion that might impede the pursuit of Pompey. The Romans, passing near the great Caucasian range, arrived among the Albanians, whose King, Oræses,‖ availing himself of the Roman Saturnalia,¶ crossed the river Cyrus** with a powerful army to attack the camp in the midst of the disorders occasioned by that disgusting festival. But a Roman army under the great Pompey was not to be thus surprised by a barbarian chieftain; and Oræses found a reception so different from his expectations, that he was glad to sue for peace, and to offer the Romans the best winter-quarters his dominions would afford, with abundance of all kinds of provisions.

B. C. 65.

In the spring Pompey advanced against the Iberians, a warlike independent tribe, who boasted that they had never submitted to any foreign yoke, not even to Alexander of Macedon. These were zealously attached to the cause of Mithridates, or rather were excessively jealous of the encroaching power of Rome; but, after some inconsiderable skirmishes, and frequent manœuvring on both sides, they were defeated in a great battle, in which they lost nine thousand killed, and ten thousand prisoners.†† No sooner was this difficulty overcome than intelligence was received of the revolt of the Albanians; and Pompey not considering it prudent to advance any further with so powerful an enemy in his rear, marched back to reduce them. But Cosis, the King's brother, who commanded in chief, guarded the banks of the Cyrus with so much vigilance, that he had great difficulty in crossing the river; and his army suffered very much, in the wide desert which lies between the Cyrus and the Abas,* from the want of water. Having at length come up with the numerous but ill-disciplined and worse-armed horde led by Cosis,† a furious action ensued, in the course of which the Albanian chieftain had nearly concluded the war by a desperate blow aimed at Pompey with a javelin, which pierced the folds of his breastplate. But the Roman General, recovering his seat in the saddle, thrust the barbarian through the body with his spear, and laid him dead at his feet. The Albanians fled, and their King was glad to purchase peace by submission, and by the payment of a heavy fine. But the difficulties to which Pompey was exposed were not yet exhausted. In an attempt to reach Hyrcania, by the shores of the Caspian, his army was so annoyed by venomous reptiles, that he changed his purpose, and advanced into the kingdom of Tigranes, where circumstances occurred which detained him several months at a distance from Mithridates.

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

Difficulties encountered by Pompey.

It may here be worth while to notice the statement of Plutarch,‡ respecting the private papers of Mithridates, said to have been found in the castle of Cænon, which contained a catalogue of the detestable yet childish enormities of his life. That any man should have preserved such useless witnesses of his own secret crimes is, in itself, sufficiently improbable; and that a great warlike prince, who was also a philosopher and an author, should have amused himself with transcribing his own licentious love-letters, is at least equally difficult to be believed. But the biographer himself heedlessly flings discredit upon the whole account, in his zeal to defend Rutilius, who, according to Theophanes, was implicated, by the evidence of one of these letters, in the pretended massacre of the Romans in Asia Minor: for he alleges that this particular letter was probably an invention of Theophanes, if not of Pompey himself: a hint sufficiently explaining the origin of this absurd tale, which is only mentioned to shew on what slight foundations the popular notions have been raised respecting the conduct and character of a prince who, whatever might be his faults, was not stained with the avarice, the treachery, the cruelty, and falsehood which so disgracefully characterise his enemies.

Whilst Pompey was led into the south, in pursuit of the schemes which he had undertaken for the conquest of Arabia and Judæa, Mithridates continued his progress towards the Cimmerian Bosporus,§ an object of respect and admiration even to his enemies, and of enthusiastic attachment to those who still adhered to him, and who daily witnessed the wonderful

* Plutarch, *in Pompeio*. Prideaux, *loco citato*; but Appian says, *ad ostia Euphratis*.
† Dion Cassius, xxxvi. Appian. ‡ Orosius, ibid.
§ Appian, *in loco*. ‖ Dion Cassius, xxxvi. *al.* Orodes.
¶ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*.
** Strabo and Pliny write it Cyrus. Plutarch and Dion, Cyrnus.
†† Plutarch, *in Pompeio*.

* This is the same stream called by Ptolemy the Albanus.
† Dion tells this story very differently. He makes Artoces, not Cosis, King of a different tribe of Albanians, and says not a word respecting the monomachy with Pompey, which is likely enough to be a fiction of Plutarch.
‡ *In Pompeio*. § *Hodie* Crim Tartary.

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

exertions of a spirit which fortune could not break, and of a frame which seemed proof against the infirmities of age. He had wintered at Dioscurias,* a town on the Euxine sea, and had employed himself actively in raising recruits; and, early in the next spring, he made his way through all the wild hordes of Scythians, which inhabited the country between that place and his son's dominions, partly by force and partly by persuasion. Machares, alarmed at his approach, sent ambassadors to entreat his pardon, and to represent that he had sided with Rome from necessity and not from choice; but the King, despising his falsehood, and indignant at his unnatural rebellion, vouchsafed him no reply; and the unhappy Prince, finding his escape by sea precluded by his father's fleet, which blockaded all his ports, goaded by conscience and distracted by fear, put an end to his own life.†

Gigantic schemes of Mithridates.

B. C. 65.

Mithridates, taking possession of the kingdom with all its treasure and resources, and finding his standard joined by large bodies of the warlike Scythians, formed the bold plan of marching through Thrace and Macedonia, by way of Pannonia, over the Trentine Alps, in order to carry the war into Italy itself, and extend the terror of his name to the gates of Rome, while the Romans were engaged in reducing the fortresses which still held out for him in Pontus, and in taking or destroying the younger branches of his family.‡ Had he been enabled to execute this design, in the distracted and defenceless situation of Italy at that time, he might probably have proved a more formidable invader than Hannibal himself. But

Treason of the Prince Pharnaces.

all his measures were broken by the cowardice and treachery of his son Pharnaces, the heir to the crown, who had neither talents to appreciate his father's policy, nor energy of character to support him in difficulties. He therefore tampered with the soldiers, and represented to them, in glowing language, the dangers of a march over such a vast extent of unknown country, intersected by deep and rapid rivers, to attack a people at home, whose power extended to the limits of the habitable world, and the least of whose Generals was a match for the greatest of the Asiatic sovereigns.§ Actuated by such representations as these, some of the principal officers formed a plot to depose the King, and to proclaim Pharnaces in his room. The conspiracy was, however, speedily detected, and its authors were put to death; but Mithridates, grieved by the loss of so many of his children, hesitated to condemn the Prince, and, upon his submission, restored him to favour.‖

This amiable weakness proved the source of his ruin. Pharnaces, apprehensive that he had lost his father's confidence, and had become an object of suspicion to the court, felt uneasy in his presence, and resolved to free himself from apprehensions by plunging deeper into guilt. But, taking his measures with greater precaution, he first secured the Roman deserters, who dreaded nothing so much as a return to their own country; and then going privately by night among other parties in the camp, he brought over to his faction a large majority of the army, who, assembling at sunrise, proclaimed, with loud shouts, "Pharnaces is King!"* Mithridates, roused from sleep by the unwonted clamour, sent an officer to inquire the cause of it, and received for answer, that "it was time the youthful son should take the sceptre from the hands of an aged father, whose rashness and violence threatened to involve them all in ruin." The undaunted King, mounting his horse, rode out to address the mutineers; but his detestable son, pointing him out to his adherents, desired them to seize him. This, however, was attempted in vain; and the King, with a few loyal attendants, spurred up the side of a hill, from whence he beheld the great body of the army crowning Pharnaces with acclamations of joy. Perceiving the hopelessness of resistance, he despatched a messenger to the rebels with a request that he might be permitted to depart in safety; but Pharnaces would not suffer the bearer of the message to return: several more officers were sent in succession with the same petition, who were all, in like manner, detained; and some of them, who were known to be the King's particular friends, were put to death in his sight. Mithridates now perceived that his hour was come; and having resolved never to fall into the hands of his enemies alive, he drew from his scabbard a deadly poison, which he always carried about with him against such an emergency. A very touching scene followed. The two Princesses, Mithridatia and Nissa, begged that they might first partake of the drug, in order that they might not look upon the death of their father. After some mutual entreaties, the King so far yielded to their tears that they all took the poison together. Its effect upon the tender constitutions of the youthful Princesses was immediate, and they expired with scarce a struggle; but the robust habit of Mithridates resisted its operation, and he continued to walk backward and forward by the bodies of his daughters, in vain expectation of being released from his sufferings beside them. At last, impatient of delay, he desired Bititius, a loyal Celt, to put an end to his existence; and that brave officer, choked with weeping, averted his face, and presented his sword.†

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691 — A. C 63

Death of Mithridates. B. C. 64 or 63.

Thus died Mithridates the Great, in the sixty-eighth year of his age, and the fifty-seventh of his reign; and with him ended the Mithridatic war, after it had continued, from the first commencement of hostilities, between six and seven and twenty years.‡ Pharnaces made haste to send in his sub-

* Dioscurias was built upon the furthest part of the isthmus between the Euxine and Caspian seas. Strabo, xi. Pliny, vi. 28.

† Appian, *eod.* Dion, *eod.* Orosius, vi. 5.

‡ Appian, *in loco.* Pompey carried five sons and two daughters of Mithridates to Rome to grace his triumph.

§ They must have marched above two thousand miles through all those countries which are now called Tartaria Crimæa, Podolia, Moldavia, Wallachia, Transilvania, Hungaria, Stiria, Carinthia, Tyrol, and Lumbardy; and over the three great rivers of the Boristhenes, the Danube, and the Po. Prideaux, part ii. book 6.

‖ Appian, ibid. It is here related by Appian that the King had cruelly put to death his son Xiphares, who was innocent of any offence against him, merely to vex his mother. *Credat Judæus.*

* Appian, ibid. † Ibid. *in Mithridaticis.*

‡ "The continuance of the war, according to Justin. (xxxvii. 1.) was forty-six years; according to Appian, (*Mith.*) forty-two; according to L. Florus (iii. 5.) and Eutropius, (vi.) forty; and according to Pliny, (vii. 26.) thirty; but, according to the exact truth of the matter, it is no more than twenty-seven years."—Prideaux, ii. 6.—Orosius reckons it thirty or forty years, lib. v. c. 19. Lemprière's *Chronological Table* makes it twenty-six years. Prideaux himself places the accession of Mithridates in the year B. C. 124, the commencement of the war in B. C. 89, and the death of the King in B. C. 64, which would make the interval only twenty-five years. But if Mithridates came to the throne

Biography. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

mission to Pompey,* and to declare that he held his hereditary dominions only at the pleasure of the Senate. This base servility was well received by the Roman General, who probably thought, like the rest of his countrymen, that there was a merit in "*Romanizing*," sufficient to atone for all the crimes and treacheries of which mankind could be guilty.†

In this slight sketch of the life and actions of one of the greatest Princes of antiquity, it has been attempted to shew how little reliance can be placed upon the opinions of the Roman historians respecting his character, or even upon their representations in matters of fact. His great qualities have been universally acknowledged even by his enemies; and the mention of his imputed crimes and vices is attended with so much Republican cant and puerile violence, as lead the reader to suspect that, among the many inaccuracies and false statements abounding in the history of this war, these accusations are perhaps the least entitled to credit.‡ Appian, who records numerous instances of the kind, concludes his account of Mithridates with a singular declaration that he had no fault but an excessive love of women. That the King, like other Oriental Princes of every age, indulged in a plurality of wives, there can be no doubt; and he was sufficiently punished for this failing in its obvious consequences, the infidelity of two Queens,* and the unnatural rebellion of several of his sons. The necessary punishment of these miscreants, so nearly allied to him, carries with it something of horror; nevertheless it may be gathered even from the prejudiced narratives, to which alone we have access, that Mithridates was generally indulgent and affectionate in domestic life, beloved by his faithful wives, revered by his household, and cherished by his subjects with devoted loyalty. His talents, his energy, and his courage, rendered him formidable to his adversaries; and the fear of base spirits is ever malignant. But, through all the vindictive calumnies with which he has been assailed,† a feeling of awe and respect involuntarily breaks out, and throws a grand, though an indistinct, light upon the noble features of his character, which may be summed up in the lively language of Paterculus: "He was a man neither to be mentioned nor passed over without caution; most valiant in war, distinguished at one time by success, at all times by greatness of mind; a consummate General, an invincible soldier, and to the end persevering and consistent in his opposition to Rome."

Mithridates. From U. C. 631. — A. C. 123. to U. C. 691. — A. C. 63.

B. C. 124, and reigned fifty-seven years, he must have died B. C. 67, which reduces the period of the war to twenty-two years. Such is the uncertainty of the chronology of this portion of history!

* Appian states, in addition, that this monster sent his father's body to Pompey.

† See, for example, the observations of Appian and Plutarch on the conduct and character of Machares and Pharnaces. (*Mith.*) (*Pomp.*)

‡ Appian, *in Mithridaticis.*

* Laodice and Stratonice.

† *Quamquam fugiens et victus, venerabilis adhuc et tremebundis videbatur.* Appian. *Mith. Gryph.* 1069. *Mithridates Ponticus Rex, vir neque silendus neque dicendus sine curâ, bello acerrimus, virtute eximius, aliquando fortunâ, semper animo maximus, consiliis dux, miles manu, odio in Romanos Hannibal.* Vell. Paterc. lib. ii. c. 18.

LUCIUS CORNELIUS SYLLA.

PART II.

FROM U. C. 666. A. C. 88. TO U. C. 677. A. C. 77.

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

THE former triumphs of the Aristocratical party, over the Gracchi, and over Saturninus, had been followed by some years of comparative calm. But the popular cause had now gained an accession of strength, more fatally, indeed, to its adversaries than beneficially to itself, in the support of ambitious and powerful men, who hoped to turn its successes to the advancement of their own greatness. Besides this, the Italian war, while it had filled Italy with armies, had degraded the quality of the soldiery: for, in the distress of the state, the Romans had enlisted freedmen into the legions; and this, combining with the example already set by Marius of admitting men to serve without any qualification of property, had rendered the troops readier instruments of the personal schemes of their generals. The Italians also, by coalescing with one of the great divisions of the Roman commonwealth, might hope for more complete success than when they had struggled against the united force of the Senate and the people. Added to all this, the late violence of Sylla, although professing to be no more than a necessary retaliation of preceding outrages, yet furnished those who had suffered from it with abundant excuses for a new reaction on their part: while the proscription of Marius, after the signal services he had rendered to his country, exasperated not only his own numerous friends, but a large body of independent citizens, who forgot the associate of Sulpicius, and remembered only the conqueror of the Cimbri.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

Causes which led to a renewal of disturbances.

Immediately, therefore, on the departure of Sylla from Italy, L. Cinna again brought forward the law of Sulpicius,* which admitted the Italians into all the thirty-five tribes without distinction. Those whom this law was intended to benefit crowded to Rome in great numbers; to support its author by their swords, rather than by their votes. If we may believe Appian,† hardly a shadow of any Constitutional form of proceeding was observed; and no sooner had some of the Tribunes of the Aristocratical party interposed

Cinna proposes to renew the law of Sulpicius, admitting the Italians into all the tribes.

* Velleius Paterc. lib. ii. c. 43.

† *De Bellis Civilibus*, lib. i. c. 64.

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

their negative to stop the passing of the law, than a violent riot broke out, and the lives of the Tribunes were threatened. Upon this, Cn. Octavius, the other Consul, broke into the forum with an armed force, and drove out the rioters; great numbers of whom were killed by his followers in their flight, but, as we are told, without his orders. Thus far the scene resembles the seditions of the Gracchi: but Octavius was of a mild and scrupulous temper, and had left the principal offender untouched; and Cinna, being fully prepared for the last extremities of civil discord, began to summon the slaves to his standard, in the hope of maintaining his ground in the Capital. But finding himself disappointed, he fled from the city with his chief partisans; and the Senate, by an act of authority hitherto unprecedented, declared that he had forfeited the Consulship;* and the people being called on to proceed to a new election, L. Cornelius Merula, the Flamen of Jupiter, was appointed Consul in his room.

He is driven fromRome, and deprived of the Consulship.

Is assisted by the Italians, and gains over a Roman army.

The Italian towns, regarding the cause of Cinna as their own, received him with the utmost cordiality;† and encouraged by their support, and assisted by their supplies of money, he presented himself at the camp of the army, which still, it seems, was employed in the neighbourhood of Nola. Here, by bribes and promises, he persuaded the soldiers to acknowledge him as their lawful Consul, and to take the military oath of obedience to him; and having thus secured a rallying point for his partisans, he was soon joined by many individuals of the popular party from Rome. But his most powerful auxiliaries were the different cities of Italy;‡ who, thinking that now they had a fair opportunity of resuming the contest with Rome under happier auspices, exerted every nerve in the cause, and not only furnished Cinna with money, but took up arms with such spirit and unanimity to join him, that he was able in a very short time to form an army of thirty legions, amounting at the least to a hundred and fifty thousand men. Already, too, Cinna had invited Marius and the other exiles of the popular party to return to their country;§ and Q. Sertorius and Cn. Carbo were actually holding commands in his army. Hoping therefore to imitate the example of Sylla, he moved immediately with his forces towards Rome.

The Senate apply to Cn. Pompeius for aid.

The Senate had no hopes of withstanding this assault by the mere efforts of the citizens of the capital. They required the support of a regular army,‖ and implored Cn. Pompeius, who, as we have seen, still retained his command in Umbria, to employ his soldiers in their defence. But he, more anxious to make the troubles of his country an occasion of his own advancement, remained for some time in suspense, as if waiting to see which party would purchase his services at the highest price; and thus allowed Cinna and his faction to consolidate their force beyond the possibility of successful resistance. Marius in the mean while landed in Tuscany with a small body of adherents;¶ and studiously retaining all the outward marks of wretchedness and poverty in his person and dress, he appealed to the compassion of the people

Marius lands in Italy and joins Cinna.

by contrasting his present miserable condition with his former triumphs and dignities. He is said to have raised by these arts a body of about six thousand men, and to have effected his junction with Cinna, so that their combined forces were capable of being divided into four distinct armies;* with two of which Cinna and Carbo took up their positions on both sides of Rome; while Sertorius, with a third, stationed himself so as to command the navigation of the Tiber above the city; and Marius, with a fourth, was master of the course of the river below, between Rome and the sea.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

In this state of things Cn. Pompeius at last resolved to espouse the cause of the Senate, and marched towards Rome. A battle was fought between his army and that of Cinna, immediately under the walls of the Capital;† but though the slaughter was great, the event seems to have been indecisive; and soon afterwards Cn. Pompeius was killed by lightning in his own camp. Both parties were suffering severely from the attacks of sickness; and this, probably, suspended their operations; while Marius was employed in destroying several of the towns in the neighbourhood of Rome,‡ from whence the city might have been supplied with provisions; and a detachment occupied Ariminum to intercept the reinforcements which the Senate hoped to receive from Cisalpine Gaul. One hope still remained to the Aristocracy. Metellus Pius, the son of that Metellus Numidicus, whose name, combined as it is with the recollection of his virtues, is a beautiful contrast to those which we must now so often mention, was at the head of an army in Samnium; and was still carrying on hostilities against the people of that country, who, with hereditary obstinacy, even now kept alive the last sparks of the Italian war. He was desired by the Senate to make the best terms in his power with the Samnites,§ and to hasten to the relief of his country. But either some difficulties occurred in the negociation, or the conditions which he granted were not so favourable as to prevent the popular leaders from turning his retreat out of Samnium to their own advantage. Marius promised to give the Samnites every thing which they required; and accordingly they instantly joined his cause, defeated a Roman officer whom Metellus had left behind him to watch their movements, and added their whole strength to that already overpowering confederacy by which the Aristocracy of Rome was assaulted.

Progress of the civil war.

The defenders of the old Constitution, under the command of Octavius the Consul, and Metellus,‖ had established themselves on the hill of Alba; and still presented a force which might have encountered any one of the enemy's armies with a fair hope of victory. But the Generals dreaded to expose the whole nobility of the commonwealth, with their wives and children, to the consequences of a decisive defeat; besides this, their soldiers could not be fully depended on; for many of them preferred Metellus to Octavius,¶ and entreated him to take the supreme command; and when he refused and desired them to submit to the Consul, who was their lawful General,

* Velleius Patercul. lib. ii. c. 43. † Appian, c. 65.
‡ Appian, c. 66. Patercul. c. 43.
§ Paterculus, c. 44. Plutarch, *in Sertorio*, c. 5.
‖ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxix. Appian, lib. i. c. 66. Patercul. c. 44.
¶ Appian, c. 67. Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 41.

* Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxix. Appian, c. 67.
† Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 44. Appian, c. 68.
‡ Appian, c. 67, 68. § Ibid. c. 68. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxx.
‖ Appian, c. 69. ¶ Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 42.

they went over in crowds to the enemy. The very uprightness indeed of the Aristocratical leaders contributed to the present success of their adversaries. Whilst Cinna was seducing the slaves to join him by promising them their liberty, Octavius refused to follow the example; declaring that he would not imitate that conduct which he had himself denounced in his antagonist as treasonable. Thus the Consular army was continually diminishing by desertion, without being able to repair its losses; and the enemy had now established so strict a blockade, that the mass of the people were alarmed at the prospect of a famine, and impatient of a longer continuance of this hopeless struggle.

Cinna and Marius enter Rome. U. C. 668. — A. C. 86.

Deputies were accordingly sent to Cinna by the Senate to treat of peace.* But he insisted on knowing whether they were going to treat with him as Consul, or as a private individual; and this difficulty broke off the negociation for the moment. But the desertion from the city to the besieging army daily increasing, the Senate were obliged to yield; they consented to acknowledge Cinna as Consul, and only requested him to swear that he would shed no blood after his victory. He received the deputies with all the state of a Consul,† and refusing to take any oath, merely promised that he would not willingly be the author of any executions. But what little comfort the deputies might have derived from this assurance, was destroyed by the sight of Marius, who stood silently beside the Consul's chair, and whose savage glances, rendered more fearful by the assumed wildness of his face, and the meanness of his attire, betokened nothing but executions and massacres. Metellus had in the mean time withdrawn from Alba, and retired towards the north of Italy;‡ but Octavius, partly actuated by a courageous sense of duty, partly trusting to the solemn assurances of safety which he received from Cinna and Marius, and partly led away by his prophets and soothsayers, who foretold that he should suffer no injury, and to whose predictions he was habitually too ready to listen, refused to quit his station, and still continued to wear the ensigns of his office, and to shew himself in public in the city. Cinna had already entered the walls, and disguise being no longer needful, he sent a party of soldiers to murder his colleague. Octavius quietly waited their approach, refusing either to fly or to conceal himself; the assassins executed their task, and the head of this blameless Consul was, by Cinna's orders, suspended over the rostra, as the first victim to his vengeance.

Rome, with every thing that was most noble and most distinguished within its walls, now lay at the mercy of the popular leaders. But Marius professed that as he had been declared an exile by the people,§ he could not enter the city till his sentence should be regularly repealed: and the tribes were summoned in mockery, that their votes might enable their conqueror to avail himself of his own victory. His thirst of blood however could not brook the delay, which he had devised to enhance the delight of his Triumph; and when two or three of the tribes had voted, he took possession of one of the gates, and entered the town at the head of a band peculiarly attached to his own person, and which consisted chiefly of the peasants or fugitive slaves who had joined him on his first landing in Tuscany. With these instruments he proceeded at once to the work of murder. The principal nobility were selected as his victims. Some fell by their own hands to anticipate the stroke of their assassins; some were betrayed, and dragged from their places of concealment to death; some were discovered and slain in the houses where they had sought refuge; and others were butchered in the open streets, and gratified Marius with the sight of their agony. In the midst of this carnage, the wretches who were employed in it added to its horrors by all varieties of unauthorized crimes of their own devising. Fugitive slaves availed themselves of the opportunity to murder their masters,* to plunder their houses, and to commit the worst outrages on their families. The wife and children of Sylla were happy enough to escape this fate,† though they were especially sought after; they were concealed by some of their friends until means were found to convey them out of the city. That their property should have been confiscated, that all Sylla's laws should have been repealed, and himself declared, in his turn, a public enemy, seemed only the natural retaliation of a party which had so lately suffered at his hands a similar treatment. But the general scene of lawless rapine and murder which was every where exhibited, as it far exceeded any thing which Rome had hitherto witnessed, so it was far too dreadful to be palliated by any plea of former provocations, and has deservedly procured for those who were its actors, the unmitigated abhorrence of all posterity.

Massacres in Rome by order of Marius.

In this massacre there perished by the orders of Cinna and Marius, L. Julius Cæsar,‡ who had been Consul during the Italian war, and had distinguished himself by a splendid victory over the Samnites; together with his brother C. Julius Cæsar, whose ill-advised competition for the Consulship had first provoked Sulpicius to enter on his career as a demagogue, and was now visited with death by the unforgiving jealousy of Marius. The heads of both these victims were exposed over the rostra; and near them was seen the head of M. Antonius, § the most eloquent citizen in the commonwealth, who had filled the offices of Consul and Censor, and who was respected as the able defender of all who applied for his aid in the courts of justice. His place of concealment was betrayed to Marius,|| who, although he was then at supper, was on the point of starting up from the table, to be himself a witness of his death: but being restrained by his friends, he sent a party of soldiers instantly to destroy him, and bring back his head with them. P. Crassus,¶ the father of M. Crassus the Triumvir, who had also, like M. Antonius, been both Censor and Consul, being now marked out for destruction, and having seen one of his sons murdered, killed himself. C. Numitorius and M. Bæbius,**

* Appian, c. 69.
† Ibid. c. 70. Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 43.
‡ Ibid. c. 80. Ibid. c. 42.
§ Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 43.

* Appian, c. 74.
† Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 22. Appian, c. 73.
‡ Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. iii. c. 3. *Tusculan. Disputat.* lib. v. c. 19.
§ Ibid. *de Oratore*, lib. iii. c. 3. || Appian, c. 72.
¶ Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. iii. c. 3. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxx. Florus, lib. iii. c. 21. ** Florus, lib. iii. c. 21.

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

both apparently men of some consideration, and the latter a name that occurs frequently in earlier periods of the Roman history, were murdered, and their bodies ignominiously dragged through the forum by the common executioners. These, with many others, were sacrificed by mere military execution to the first fury of the victorious leaders. But against L. Cornelius Merula, who had been appointed Consul when Cinna was driven from Rome, and against Q. Lutatius Catulus, the colleague of Marius in his fourth Consulship, and his companion in his great victory over the Cimbri, it was resolved to proceed with something of the forms of justice. Their condemnation they well knew was the necessary consequence of their trial: Merula, therefore, preferring to die by his own hands, opened his veins;* and as his blood flowed upon the altar of Jupiter, he, in his character of Flamen, imprecated the vengeance of his God upon the head of his murderers. Catulus, it appears, had actually cooperated with Sylla in procuring the expulsion of Marius and Sulpicius,† and causing them to be declared public enemies. For this, Marius was bent upon his death, and answered every solicitation in his behalf by saying, "He must die:"‡ upon which Catulus, like Merula, to avoid falling by the executioner, shut himself up in a close room, and suffocated himself by burning charcoal.

Often as the leaders of a popular party have made the interests of their followers subservient to their own ambition, yet never was this more shamelessly exemplified than in the behaviour of Cinna and Marius. After having plunged their country into a civil war, under pretence of supporting the just claims of the Italians to an equal share in the right of suffrage, the chiefs of the victorious party would not, or could not, rely on the gratitude of those whose cause they had upheld; nor would they allow the people to exercise the form of an election, even when they could have so certainly commanded the result. Cinna and Marius, by their own authority, declared themselves Consuls for the ensuing year:§ and it is mentioned of the latter, that on the very day on which he entered upon his usurped office, he ordered a Senator, of the name of Sextus Licinius, to be thrown from the Tarpeian rock. The atrocities, indeed, which Marius was daily committing, and the excesses in which his band of fugitive slaves indulged themselves without remorse, at last awakened the shame or the jealousy of his associates. Cinna, instigated, as it is said, by Sertorius,|| who beheld with indignation the crimes with which his party had disgraced themselves, finding all attempts to repress these disorders fruitless, assembled a body of his Gaulish auxiliary troops, and attacking Marius's band in their quarters by night, put the whole of them to the sword. Such an act was likely to have exasperated Marius against his colleague, had he been capable of revenging the affront; but his career was fast drawing to a close: he was now in his seventieth year, and plunging deeply into the utmost intemperance in his manner of living,¶ he contracted a pleurisy, of which he died after a short illness, having enjoyed his seventh Consulship for only seventeen days. It was reported that he became delirious before his death, and imagined himself to be commanding the army against Mithridates, which had so long been the object of his ambition, often shouting aloud, and expressing by the most violent gestures the liveliness of the impression which occupied his mind. But whatever were the scenes which accompanied his last hours, they could scarcely add any thing to the certain horror of a sudden death thus cutting him off amidst the perpetration of so many and such dreadful crimes; nor are any stories of his late remorse and agony of mind required to aggravate our abhorrence of a life which, in the course of seventy years, presents an unvaried picture of evil passions, darkening more and more as he advanced in age, and growing to the deepest intensity of blackness as he approached the latest period of his earthly existence.

U. C. 667. — A. C. 87.

Sickness and death of Marius. U. C. 668. — A. C. 86.

L. Cornelii Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77

It is mentioned by Cicero,* that during the celebration of the funeral of Marius, C. Fimbria, a man whose ungoverned violence in speaking and in acting amounted sometimes almost to insanity, caused an attempt to be made on the life of Q. Mucius Scævola, one of the most virtuous citizens of his time. The assassin only wounded his intended victim; and Fimbria, when he heard that Scævola had escaped, declared that he would bring him to trial before the people. He was asked, what charge he could possibly invent against a character so pure as Mucius; to which he replied, "I shall accuse him for not having given my dagger a more hearty welcome." Such were the wretches whose crimes were now enjoying a full impunity in the triumph of the professed champions of the cause of liberty.

Cinna remains master of the Government.

After the death of Marius, L. Cornelius Cinna remained in fact the sovereign of Rome. His power was little less absolute than that afterwards held by Sylla or Cæsar: and it is somewhat remarkable that his usurpation should have been so little noticed by posterity, and that he himself should be so little known, that not a single trait of character, and scarcely a single personal anecdote of him, is to be found on record. His first step was to supply the vacancy in the Consulship occasioned by the death of Marius; and for this purpose he fixed on L. Valerius Flaccus,† who had been the colleague of Marius in his sixth Consulship, about fourteen years before. The massacres had now, for the most part, ceased; and it was intended that the usual forms of the Constitution should still be observed. Nothing indeed appeared to dispute the power of the victorious leaders: many of the nobility had left Italy,‡ and sought a refuge in the camp of Sylla; some had retired to their estates in the country, and some still remained in Rome, anxious above all things to avoid participating themselves in a civil war, and hoping that they might still possess influence enough to prevent the return of such a calamity altogether. In this last class we find the names of Q. Mucius Scævola,§ of another L. Valerius Flaccus, and of L. Philippus, the famous antagonist of Drusus, and notorious, during his Consulship, for his opposition

* Velleius Patercul. lib. ii. c. 45. † Appian, c. 74.
‡ Cicero, *Tuscul. Disputat.* lib. v. c. 19.
§ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxx.
|| Plutarch, *in Sertorio*, c. 5. Appian, c. 74.
¶ Plutarch, *in Mario*, c. 45, 46.

* *Orat. pro Roscio Amerino*, c. 12.
† Appian, c. 75. Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 46.
‡ Patercul. c. 46. Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 6.
§ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. viii. epist. iii.

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

to the interests of the Senate. But the usual freedom of speech allowed in the forum and in the courts of justice was so much abridged, that Cicero describes the three years which followed the victory of Cinna, as a period in which the Republic was without laws and without dignity.* He himself remained during all this time at Rome,† and was employing himself in the study of eloquence and philosophy; attending the lectures of Philo, then a refugee from Athens, and of Molo of Rhodes, and preparing himself at leisure, during this cessation of opportunities for actual practice, for the splendid career which the subsequent triumph of the Aristocracy laid open to him.

The scanty reports of these times which remain to us, will assist but little in ascertaining the state of the people at large under the dominion of Cinna. An immense military force was kept on foot throughout Italy; so that even if the Romans were exempted from all share in its support, the burthen must still have pressed heavily on the Italians, in addition to the numerous excesses which troops, so little subject to discipline, would naturally commit in the districts in which they were quartered. In Rome itself there was a large proportion of debtors among the lower orders, who were insolvent either through poverty or dishonesty. To relieve them was judged a measure becoming a party professedly popular; and L. Flaccus the Consul brought in a law,‡ allowing a debtor to avoid all further claims upon him, on payment of a fourth part of his debt. It is one of the most difficult problems in legislation, to observe a just balance between severity to unavoidable distress and indulgence to wilful extravagance or fraud; but at Rome, in this case as in so many others, the scale vibrated from one extreme of injustice to the other; and the monied interest, who a short time before had murdered a lawful magistrate, because he had defended the poor against their oppressions, now saw their just rights sacrificed in return, because the Government wished to conciliate the needy and the desperate.

Sylla refuses to acknowledge the Government at Rome.

Meanwhile the several provinces of the Empire submitted, as far as appears, without opposition to the party which prevailed in the Capital. Sylla alone remained an object of fear and jealousy. Far from seeking to disarm his enemies by concession, he is said continually to have avowed his intention of punishing them,§ so soon as he should have finished the war with Mithridates; and his confidence in his army was so well grounded, that he had no fears of their allowing any other General than himself to be appointed to command them. L. Flaccus indeed was sent into Greece with a new army,‖ as the officer intrusted by the people with the conduct of the war; but he, not venturing to interfere with Sylla, who was at this time wintering in Thessaly, moved through Macedonia, and from thence crossed over into the northern parts of Asia Minor, to attack Mithridates in his own country. Here, however, he was soon assassinated by C. Fimbria, who had accompanied him from Rome as his lieutenant, and whose daring wickedness gladly caught at this opportunity of advancing himself. On the death of Flaccus he succeeded to the command, and carried on hostilities against Mithridates with some success: but when Sylla, having recovered the whole of Greece, crossed over himself into Asia, and there soon concluded a peace with the enemy, Fimbria was summoned to surrender the authority which he had unlawfully acquired;* and finding his soldiers yielding to the ascendency of Sylla's reputation, and inclined to desert him, he, to avoid the punishment which he deserved, killed himself.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

The death of Fimbria, however, did not take place till after the period at which we are now arrived. To resume then the regular course of our narrative, we must go back to the conclusion of the year 667, when the time was arrived for the appointment of Consuls for the year following. Cinna again reelected himself by his own authority,† and chose as his colleague Cn. Papirius Carbo, a man whose very name was ominous of evil: for of the two individuals of his family who had hitherto been most conspicuous, one had, through his perfidy, embroiled the Republic in a quarrel with the Cimbri, and had sustained from them a severe defeat in Illyria; and the other was deeply involved in the mischievous plans of the Gracchi, and when brought to trial, as has been already mentioned, by L. Crassus the orator, poisoned himself through fear of the sentence of his Judges. The Consuls, thus self-appointed, began to prepare themselves for the approaching contest with Sylla: they endeavoured to conciliate the rich by shewing them unwonted attentions; they appealed especially to the Italian states, of whose interests they always professed themselves the advocates; and endeavoured to secure the coasts of Italy against the expected invasion, by collecting a considerable fleet from the different ports of Italy and Sicily.

Cinna associates Carbo with himself in the Consulship, and prepares for war.

In this interval of suspense, a motion was made and carried in the Senate, by L. Valerius Flaccus,‡ that deputies should be sent to Sylla, to prevent if possible the evils of war; and Cinna and Carbo were desired to suspend their military preparations till the answer to this embassy should be received. The Consuls promised compliance, and the deputies were sent over into Greece to treat with Sylla; but Cinna could not consent thus easily to relinquish the sovereignty he had gained, nor to treat on equal terms with an enemy whom he had injured beyond all hope of reconciliation. Once more therefore he reappointed himself and Carbo to the Consulship;§ and both leaders then left Rome, and began themselves to press the levies of soldiers; intending no longer to remain on the defensive, but to cross the Adriatic in person, and to anticipate Sylla in beginning hostilities. But it seems that they had not a fleet sufficient to transport at one passage a force strong enough to maintain itself against the enemy. They resolved, therefore, to send over their troops in successive detachments from the neighbourhood of Ancona, to the opposite coast of Liburnia; a spot so distant from the intended scene of operations, that the whole army might be safely landed before Sylla could arrive to

U. C. 669. — A. C. 85.

* Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 62.
† *De Claris Oratoribus*, c. 89.
‡ Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 46.
§ Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 48.
‖ Appian, *de Bell. Mithridatico*, c. 51, 52. Patercul. lib. ii. c. 47.

* Appian, *de Bell. Mithridat.* c. 60.
† Ibid. *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 75, 76. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxiii.
‡ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxiii. Appian. c. 77.
§ Appian, c. 77, 78. Paterculus, c. 48. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. 83. *Auctor de Viris illustribus, in Vitâ Cinnæ.*

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

attack it. But the high reputation of the General against whom they were to act, rendered the soldiers very averse to the expedition: one detachment, after it had set sail, was driven back by a storm; and no sooner did the men find themselves again on Italian ground, than they deserted their standards, and returned to their several homes. This example decided the rest of the army, and they all refused to embark. Cinna called them together, and endeavoured to enforce obedience. They crowded round him with minds prepared for the last extremities, and when one of his lictors struck a soldier, in order to clear the way, the blow was returned by the man's comrade: Cinna called out to seize the offender; a general mutiny broke out at the word, stones were cast at him, and the soldiers who were nearest, drawing their swords, immediately stabbed and killed him. Carbo at once saw that the project of crossing the Adriatic was hopeless; he recalled the few men who had already effected their passage, and resolved to confine his care to the defence of Italy. The death of Cinna, however, and the avowed disposition of the soldiers, encouraged the ordinary magistrates of the commonwealth to resume somewhat of their lawful authority. Carbo was summoned by the Tribunes to return to Rome, and to hold the Comitia for the election of a Consul in the room of Cinna.* He obeyed, but on the first day that the Comitia were held, the auspices were unfavourable; and on the next, the meeting was broken off by a thunder storm; so that the Augurs forbade the election to take place till after the Summer Solstice, and Carbo thus remained sole Consul.

Mutiny of the soldiers, in which Cinna is killed.

Carbo remains sole Consul.

About this time the answer of Sylla to the deputation of the Senate was received in Rome.† It stated that he would lay aside his purpose of invading Italy, if all those citizens, whom Cinna had outlawed, were restored to their country and their honours. The Senate, we are told, was disposed to accept these conditions; but the influence of Carbo and his party procured their rejection, and war now appeared inevitable. Some months, however, intervened before Sylla commenced his expedition to Italy; and this delay was occasioned in part by an illness which attacked him,‡ and which obliged him to go to Ædepsus, in Eubœa, to try the effect of the warm baths, for which that place was celebrated. Here he passed a considerable time, amusing himself with the society of actors,§ and of those persons, then so common in Greece, who lived upon their several talents of disputation, of eloquence, of wit, or of buffoonery. But he might console himself for this interruption to his plans, by reflecting that the party of his antagonists was by no means rising in the public opinion, and that his own friends on the contrary were daily becoming more numerous; while the fate of Cinna sufficiently shewed, that he was in no danger of being anticipated in his schemes of invasion, and of finding himself obliged to act on the defensive in the country which he now occupied.

In the mean time Q. Metellus Pius,‖ who, in conjunction with Octavius, had unsuccessfully opposed Cinna and Marius in their attack upon Rome, and who, since their victory, had been living in one of the provinces in obscurity, now endeavoured to raise again the standard of the Aristocratical party, and to obtain possession of the province of Africa. His attempt, however, was unfortunate: he was repulsed by C. Fabius the Prætor; and from thence retired to Liguria, there to wait for a better opportunity of renewing the contest. The Senate, though greatly overawed, was yet not entirely subservient to Carbo; for it is said that he was prevented by them from demanding hostages of all the towns and colonies of Italy,* as a security against their supporting Sylla. But in other points the interest of the popular leaders visibly prevailed. The right of voting was solemnly conferred, by a decree of the Senate, on all newly admitted citizens, of whom the late war had given birth to a considerable number; not consisting of the inhabitants of the states of Italy, but of enfranchised slaves or foreign soldiers, who had flocked to the standard of Cinna and Marius, and had contributed to their triumph. These had not only the right of voting now given to them,† (whereas before they only enjoyed the personal liberties of Roman citizens,) but they were moreover allowed to be enrolled indiscriminately in all the tribes; that important point which, in the case of the Italians, had been so warmly contested, and which, in fact, had furnished Cinna with his first pretext for disturbing the public peace. In addition to these acts, a decree of the Senate was also passed, commanding all military officers in every part of the Empire to disband their forces. That Sylla should obey this order was scarcely to be expected; but Carbo probably hoped, by its apparent fairness, to throw upon him the odium of being the chief obstacle to peace, and of disobeying that body whose authority he professed to respect so highly.

L. Cornel. Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

The year of Carbo's Consulship now drew to an end, and as he could not or would not procure his own reappointment, two new Consuls were chosen, C. Norbanus and L. Cornelius Scipio. We are not informed what circumstances could have connected the latter, a member of one of the noblest families in Rome, with the party of Carbo; or whether indeed he may not have been chosen by the most moderate citizens, as a man who might temper the violences of the times; and have been tolerated by the popular party on account of his want of the vigour and ability which might have made him dangerous to them. But C. Norbanus was a Consul such as Carbo might have most desired. We have already noticed his seditious Tribuneship, during which, at his instigation, a riot broke out at the trial of Q. Cæpio, and the condemnation of the prisoner was procured, by actual force. For this crime he was accused by P. Sulpicius,‡ who was destined at no remote period to tread in his footsteps; and was defended by M. Antonius, whose murder, some years afterwards, might have been justified by the very arguments which he himself on this occasion taught the people to approve. It was against these Consuls that Sylla now led his army from Greece. All his preparations were completed, his health was fully reestablished and the devotion of his troops had been just proved, by their taking an

Consulship of Scipio and Norbanus. U. C. 670.

* Appian, c. 78. Paterculus, c. 48.
† Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxiv.
‡ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 26. Strabo, lib. i. p. 56, *et* lib. ix. p. 487, edit. Xyland.
§ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 26.
‖ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxiv. Appian, c. 80.

* Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxiv. † Ibid.
‡ Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 49.

oath to abide by him when they should be landed in Italy,* and by their offering to raise among themselves a supply of money for his use. With soldiers so attached to him, and inured as they were to war, his force was far stronger than the proportion of his numbers seemed to promise; and though it is said that he landed in Italy with no more than forty thousand men,† while more than two hundred thousand were in arms against him, he might yet fairly calculate on meeting his enemies with at least an equal chance of victory.

Sylla lands in Italy.

The expedition set sail from Patræ in Achæa,‡ and arrived in safety at Brundusium. The inhabitants of that town received Sylla without opposition, and he immediately began to move forwards. On his march through Calabria and Apulia,§ his army observed the strictest discipline; and his conduct thus confirmed his professions, that he was ever ready to listen to fair conditions of peace. It is said, that he sent deputies to the camp of Norbanus, to propose a negociation,‖ and that it was not till they had been insulted and outraged that he commenced his military operations. He fell upon Norbanus, who was encamped in the neighbourhood of Capua, and defeated him with considerable loss. Over the other Consul, L. Scipio, he obtained a still more decisive advantage. With him too he offered to treat, and commissioners from the two armies actually met to deliberate on the terms to be agreed upon.¶ Of the particulars which followed, contradictory accounts are given by different writers, none of whom are of sufficient authority to be confidently followed. The result, however, admits of no dispute; the soldiers of the Consular army were corrupted by those of Sylla,** and at last leaving L. Scipio and his son alone in the General's tent, they went over in a body to the enemy. Sylla then attempted to open a communication with the army of Norbanus; but finding that his design was suspected, and that no answer was returned to his proposals, he continued to advance towards Rome, and then for the first time began to lay waste the country through which he passed. He was not, however, yet in a condition to approach the Capital; where Carbo's influence prevailed so far as to procure a decree of the people,†† declaring all those who had joined Sylla to be public enemies. This denunciation was not issued on light grounds; for the Nobility were flocking on all sides to the camp of the invader; and Q. Metellus had joined him with such troops as still adhered to him, and was zealously cooperating with him in the conduct of the war.

Is joined by Pompey.

It was at this time that Cn. Pompeius, the son of the late Proconsul of that name, first made his appearance as a public character. After the death of his father, and the establishment of Cinna's power at Rome, he had retired into Picenum,‡‡ where he possessed some property, and where his father's memory, hated as it was by the Romans, was regarded with respect and affection. To account for this we must suppose, that during the long period of his military command in that neighbourhood he had prevented his soldiers from being burdensome to the people, and had found means of obliging or gratifying some of the principal inhabitants. Be this as it may, his son possessed so much influence in Picenum, partly hereditary and partly personal, that he prevailed on the people to drive away the officers sent among them by Carbo to enlist soldiers for the support of his cause; and succeeded himself in raising an army of three legions, or about sixteen or seventeen thousand men. With this force, having obtained also the necessary supplies for its maintenance from the zeal of the Picentes, he set out to join Sylla. He was at this time only twenty-three years of age, and had never filled any office in the state; but his appearance at the head of an army so collected, announced him as a young man of more than ordinary promise; and Sylla, as we are told, received him with the most flattering marks of distinction.

Whilst both parties were endeavouring to strengthen their forces, the season for action gradually passed away, and the armies mutually went into winter quarters. So imperfect are our accounts of this famous war, that we cannot tell how far Sylla had penetrated, nor what positions were occupied by him during the winter. His progress, however, had been such as to fill his antagonists with alarm: Carbo, therefore, caused himself to be appointed Consul for the following year,* and selected, as his colleague, C. Marius the younger, the nephew and adopted son of the famous Marius, and who already, at the early age of twenty, seemed to have inherited all his father's wickedness.

Consulship of Carbo and the younger Marius.

The winter was long and severe, and detained the armies on both sides for a considerable time in a state of inaction. Carbo meanwhile chose Cisalpine Gaul as his province,† and thus reserved the country to the north of Rome for the scene of his operations; while Marius lay between the Capital and the main army of Sylla, on the confines perhaps of Latium and Campania. It was about this time that Sylla, to quiet the suspicions of the Italian allies,‡ who were afraid that he would rescind the concessions made to them during the ascendency of Cinna, issued a declaration that he would respect all the privileges which they actually enjoyed; and on these terms concluded, as we are told, a treaty with them. But whether the Samnites were not among those to whom his promise extended, or whether they distrusted his sincerity, and thought they might do better by adhering to their old cause, it is plain that they were amongst his most determined enemies, and as we shall see presently, did more than any of their confederates to render his victory doubtful. On the part of Sylla, Q. Metellus was opposed to Carbo on the side of Tuscany,§ and after having gained an advantage over one of his lieutenants, was so hard pressed by the Consul himself, that Cn. Pompeius, or as his celebrity has caused his name to be anglicized, Pompey, was sent to support him; and these two commanders together kept the fortune of the war in suspense. To the south of Rome, Sylla first took the town of Setia;‖ and Marius retreating before him in the

* Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 27.
† Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 48. Appian, c. 79.
‡ Appian, c. 79. § Paterculus, c. 49.
‖ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxv. ¶ Cicero, *Philippic.* 12. c. 11.
** Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 28. Appian, c. 85. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxv.
†† Appian, c. 86.
‡‡ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 6. Patercul. c. 53. Appian, c. 80.

* Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxvi. Appian, c. 87.
† Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 13. ‡ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxvi.
§ Appian, c. 87. Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 8.
‖ Appian, c. 87.

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

attack it. But the high reputation of the General against whom they were to act, rendered the soldiers very averse to the expedition: one detachment, after it had set sail, was driven back by a storm; and no sooner did the men find themselves again on Italian ground, than they deserted their standards, and returned to their several homes. This example decided the rest of the army, and they all refused to embark. Cinna called them together, and endeavoured to enforce obedience. They crowded round him with minds prepared for the last extremities, and when one of his lictors struck a soldier, in order to clear the way, the blow was returned by the man's comrade: Cinna called out to seize the offender; a general mutiny broke out at the word, stones were cast at him, and the soldiers who were nearest, drawing their swords, immediately stabbed and killed him. Carbo at once saw that the project of crossing the Adriatic was hopeless; he recalled the few men who had already effected their passage, and resolved to confine his care to the defence of Italy. The death of Cinna, however, and the avowed disposition of the soldiers, encouraged the ordinary magistrates of the commonwealth to resume somewhat of their lawful authority. Carbo was summoned by the Tribunes to return to Rome, and to hold the Comitia for the election of a Consul in the room of Cinna.* He obeyed, but on the first day that the Comitia were held, the auspices were unfavourable; and on the next, the meeting was broken off by a thunder storm; so that the Augurs forbade the election to take place till after the Summer Solstice, and Carbo thus remained sole Consul.

Mutiny of the soldiers, in which Cinna is killed.

Carbo remains sole Consul.

About this time the answer of Sylla to the deputation of the Senate was received in Rome.† It stated that he would lay aside his purpose of invading Italy, if all those citizens, whom Cinna had outlawed, were restored to their country and their honours. The Senate, we are told, was disposed to accept these conditions; but the influence of Carbo and his party procured their rejection, and war now appeared inevitable. Some months, however, intervened before Sylla commenced his expedition to Italy; and this delay was occasioned in part by an illness which attacked him,‡ and which obliged him to go to Ædepsus, in Eubœa, to try the effect of the warm baths, for which that place was celebrated. Here he passed a considerable time, amusing himself with the society of actors,§ and of those persons, then so common in Greece, who lived upon their several talents of disputation, of eloquence, of wit, or of buffoonery. But he might console himself for this interruption to his plans, by reflecting that the party of his antagonists was by no means rising in the public opinion, and that his own friends on the contrary were daily becoming more numerous; while the fate of Cinna sufficiently shewed, that he was in no danger of being anticipated in his schemes of invasion, and of finding himself obliged to act on the defensive in the country which he now occupied.

In the mean time Q. Metellus Pius,‖ who, in conjunction with Octavius, had unsuccessfully opposed Cinna and Marius in their attack upon Rome, and who, since their victory, had been living in one of the provinces in obscurity, now endeavoured to raise again the standard of the Aristocratical party, and to obtain possession of the province of Africa. His attempt, however, was unfortunate: he was repulsed by C. Fabius the Prætor; and from thence retired to Liguria, there to wait for a better opportunity of renewing the contest. The Senate, though greatly overawed, was yet not entirely subservient to Carbo; for it is said that he was prevented by them from demanding hostages of all the towns and colonies of Italy,* as a security against their supporting Sylla. But in other points the interest of the popular leaders visibly prevailed. The right of voting was solemnly conferred, by a decree of the Senate, on all newly admitted citizens, of whom the late war had given birth to a considerable number; not consisting of the inhabitants of the states of Italy, but of enfranchised slaves or foreign soldiers, who had flocked to the standard of Cinna and Marius, and had contributed to their triumph. These had not only the right of voting now given to them,† (whereas before they only enjoyed the personal liberties of Roman citizens,) but they were moreover allowed to be enrolled indiscriminately in all the tribes; that important point which, in the case of the Italians, had been so warmly contested, and which, in fact, had furnished Cinna with his first pretext for disturbing the public peace. In addition to these acts, a decree of the Senate was also passed, commanding all military officers in every part of the Empire to disband their forces. That Sylla should obey this order was scarcely to be expected; but Carbo probably hoped, by its apparent fairness, to throw upon him the odium of being the chief obstacle to peace, and of disobeying that body whose authority he professed to respect so highly.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

The year of Carbo's Consulship now drew to an end, and as he could not or would not procure his own reappointment, two new Consuls were chosen, C. Norbanus and L. Cornelius Scipio. We are not informed what circumstances could have connected the latter, a member of one of the noblest families in Rome, with the party of Carbo; or whether indeed he may not have been chosen by the most moderate citizens, as a man who might temper the violences of the times; and have been tolerated by the popular party on account of his want of the vigour and ability which might have made him dangerous to them. But C. Norbanus was a Consul such as Carbo might have most desired. We have already noticed his seditious Tribuneship, during which, at his instigation, a riot broke out at the trial of Q. Cæpio, and the condemnation of the prisoner was procured by actual force. For this crime he was accused by P. Sulpicius,‡ who was destined at no remote period to tread in his footsteps; and was defended by M. Antonius, whose murder, some years afterwards, might have been justified by the very arguments which he himself on this occasion taught the people to approve. It was against these Consuls that Sylla now led his army from Greece. All his preparations were completed, his health was fully reestablished and the devotion of his troops had been just proved, by their taking an

Consulship of Scipio and Norbanus. U. C. 670.

* Appian, c. 78. Paterculus, c. 48.
† Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxiv.
‡ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 26. Strabo, lib. i. p. 56, *et* lib. ix. p. 487, edit. Xyland.
§ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 26.
‖ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxiv. Appian, c. 80.

* Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxiv. † Ibid.
‡ Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 49.

oath to abide by him when they should be landed in Italy,* and by their offering to raise among themselves a supply of money for his use. With soldiers so attached to him, and inured as they were to war, his force was far stronger than the proportion of his numbers seemed to promise; and though it is said that he landed in Italy with no more than forty thousand men,† while more than two hundred thousand were in arms against him, he might yet fairly calculate on meeting his enemies with at least an equal chance of victory.

Sylla lands in Italy.

The expedition set sail from Patræ in Achæa,‡ and arrived in safety at Brundusium. The inhabitants of that town received Sylla without opposition, and he immediately began to move forwards. On his march through Calabria and Apulia,§ his army observed the strictest discipline; and his conduct thus confirmed his professions, that he was ever ready to listen to fair conditions of peace. It is said, that he sent deputies to the camp of Norbanus, to propose a negociation,‖ and that it was not till they had been insulted and outraged that he commenced his military operations. He fell upon Norbanus, who was encamped in the neighbourhood of Capua, and defeated him with considerable loss. Over the other Consul, L. Scipio, he obtained a still more decisive advantage. With him too he offered to treat, and commissioners from the two armies actually met to deliberate on the terms to be agreed upon.¶ Of the particulars which followed, contradictory accounts are given by different writers, none of whom are of sufficient authority to be confidently followed. The result, however, admits of no dispute; the soldiers of the Consular army were corrupted by those of Sylla,** and at last leaving L. Scipio and his son alone in the General's tent, they went over in a body to the enemy. Sylla then attempted to open a communication with the army of Norbanus; but finding that his design was suspected, and that no answer was returned to his proposals, he continued to advance towards Rome, and then for the first time began to lay waste the country through which he passed. He was not, however, yet in a condition to approach the Capital; where Carbo's influence prevailed so far as to procure a decree of the people,†† declaring all those who had joined Sylla to be public enemies. This denunciation was not issued on light grounds; for the Nobility were flocking on all sides to the camp of the invader; and Q. Metellus had joined him with such troops as still adhered to him, and was zealously cooperating with him in the conduct of the war.

Is joined by Pompey.

It was at this time that Cn. Pompeius, the son of the late Proconsul of that name, first made his appearance as a public character. After the death of his father, and the establishment of Cinna's power at Rome, he had retired into Picenum,‡‡ where he possessed some property, and where his father's memory, hated as it was by the Romans, was regarded with respect and affection. To account for this we must suppose, that during the long period of his military command in that neighbourhood he had prevented his soldiers from being burdensome to the people, and had found means of obliging or gratifying some of the principal inhabitants. Be this as it may, his son possessed so much influence in Picenum, partly hereditary and partly personal, that he prevailed on the people to drive away the officers sent among them by Carbo to enlist soldiers for the support of his cause; and succeeded himself in raising an army of three legions, or about sixteen or seventeen thousand men. With this force, having obtained also the necessary supplies for its maintenance from the zeal of the Picentes, he set out to join Sylla. He was at this time only twenty-three years of age, and had never filled any office in the state; but his appearance at the head of an army so collected, announced him as a young man of more than ordinary promise; and Sylla, as we are told, received him with the most flattering marks of distinction.

Whilst both parties were endeavouring to strengthen their forces, the season for action gradually passed away, and the armies mutually went into winter quarters. So imperfect are our accounts of this famous war, that we cannot tell how far Sylla had penetrated, nor what positions were occupied by him during the winter. His progress, however, had been such as to fill his antagonists with alarm: Carbo, therefore, caused himself to be appointed Consul for the following year,* and selected, as his colleague, C. Marius the younger, the nephew and adopted son of the famous Marius, and who already, at the early age of twenty, seemed to have inherited all his father's wickedness.

Consulship of Carbo and the younger Marius.

The winter was long and severe, and detained the armies on both sides for a considerable time in a state of inaction. Carbo meanwhile chose Cisalpine Gaul as his province,† and thus reserved the country to the north of Rome for the scene of his operations; while Marius lay between the Capital and the main army of Sylla, on the confines perhaps of Latium and Campania. It was about this time that Sylla, to quiet the suspicions of the Italian allies,‡ who were afraid that he would rescind the concessions made to them during the ascendency of Cinna, issued a declaration that he would respect all the privileges which they actually enjoyed; and on these terms concluded, as we are told, a treaty with them. But whether the Samnites were not among those to whom his promise extended, or whether they distrusted his sincerity, and thought they might do better by adhering to their old cause, it is plain that they were amongst his most determined enemies, and as we shall see presently, did more than any of their confederates to render his victory doubtful. On the part of Sylla, Q. Metellus was opposed to Carbo on the side of Tuscany,§ and after having gained an advantage over one of his lieutenants, was so hard pressed by the Consul himself, that Cn. Pompeius, or as his celebrity has caused his name to be anglicized, Pompey, was sent to support him; and these two commanders together kept the fortune of the war in suspense. To the south of Rome, Sylla first took the town of Setia;‖ and Marius retreating before him in the

* Plutarch, *in Sylld*, c. 27.
† Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 48. Appian, c. 79.
‡ Appian, c. 79. § Paterculus, c. 49.
‖ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxv. ¶ Cicero, *Philippic.* 12. c. 11.
** Plutarch, *in Sylld*, c. 28. Appian, c. 85. Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxv.
†† Appian, c. 86.
‡‡ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 6. Patercul. c. 53. Appian, c. 80.

* Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxvi. Appian, c. 87.
† Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 13. ‡ Livy, *Epitom.* lib. lxxxvi.
§ Appian, c. 87. Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 8.
‖ Appian, c. 87.

direction of Præneste, halted at a place called Sacriportum, situated apparently between Præneste and Setia, and there drew out his army in order of battle. Sylla instantly proceeded to attack him, encouraged, as it is said, by a dream,* which had visited him in the preceding night, and which had named the ensuing day as fatal to the family of Marius. The enemy had broken up the roads, and raised such obstacles to his march, that his soldiers, in their exertions to remove them, were worn down with fatigue, and many of them threw themselves on the ground, with their heads resting on their shields, to seek relief in sleep. It was in vain to persist in forcing them to action under these circumstances: and Sylla, however reluctant to contradict his dream, issued the order to halt, and to begin the usual works for the formation of a camp. But whilst his men were busied in digging the trench, the enemy's cavalry rode up, and began to annoy them; till, irritated into an entire forgetfulness of their fatigues, they at once left their work, and rushed on sword in hand to revenge the insults that had been offered to them. Their vehemence, however, might have proved fatal to themselves, had the soldiers of Marius done their duty: but on the first impression made by the assailants on the adverse line, five cohorts of infantry and two troops of cavalry deserted their standards,† and joined the hostile army; and this act of treachery presently decided the fate of the battle. The whole Marian army fled, and was pursued with great slaughter: the fugitives sought a shelter in Præneste; but the victors followed them so closely, that it became necessary to shut the gates in haste, and to exclude the greatest number of them, and even Marius himself was drawn up by ropes thrown down to him from the top of the wall.‡ Thus exposed to the swords of their conquerors, twenty thousand of them were said by Sylla, to have been slain, and eight thousand made prisoners;§ while he acknowledged on his own side no greater loss than that of twenty-three men.

Battle of Sacriportum, in which Marius the younger is defeated by Sylla.

U. C. 672. — A. C. 82.

It was only a short time before the battle of Sacriportum, that the heads of the popular party added their last and most horrible act to the numerous provocations, which were soon to be so mercilessly repaid. At the commencement of the campaign, Marius had fixed on Præneste as the place of support to his operations,‖ and as the intended refuge and bulwark of his partisans, in case they should be defeated in the field. The situation of the town was naturally strong, as it was built on the side of a projecting eminence,¶ connected only by one narrow ridge with that chain of hills, which rises immediately from the Campagna or great plain of Rome, at the distance of about twenty miles from the Capital. Standing on the edge of this plain, Præneste is a conspicuous object from the walls of the eternal city; and a strong army occupying this position might greatly impede or endanger the approach of an enemy towards the Capital from the side of Campania. Marius, therefore, had strengthened the place to the utmost, by the assistance of art; and had carried thither the treasure of all the temples in Rome,** to be converted into money for the payment of his soldiers. But the advance of Sylla still gave him considerable alarm; and fearing that the Aristocratical party in the Capital might yet be able to exert itself with effect, should Sylla continue his progress, he sent instructions to L. Damasippus,* at that time Prætor, to assemble the Senate in the Curia Hostilia. When the members were met together, the avenues leading to the spot were secured by armed men, and the individuals most obnoxious to the popular leaders were then marked out to be massacred. Publius Antistius, the father-in-law of Pompey,† and C. Papirius Carbo, a relation of the Consul, and the son of that Carbo who had shared in the proceedings of the Gracchi,‡ were murdered in the Senate house. L. Domitius was killed in endeavouring to escape; of him little else is known, but that his name and noble family were likely to render him an object of suspicion to the enemies of the Aristocracy. But the most distinguished victim was Q. Mucius Scævola, the Pontifex Maximus; who had earned the purest and the rarest glory of any of his contemporaries, by his virtuous administration of his province of Asia. Having brought home with him a character of spotless integrity and benevolence, he stained it by no subsequent acts of infamy; his name is charged with no participation in the crimes of either party; but he continued to reside at Rome, and to make himself generally useful to all who asked his advice, by his unrivalled knowledge of the Civil Law. Though bound by birth, and station, and connections, to the cause of the Aristocracy, and although the attempt made on his life by Fimbria, at the funeral of the elder Marius, might have warned him of the danger to which his virtues exposed him under the sway of the most profligate of mankind, he yet had refused to quit Rome, or to choose any part in the civil war, declaring that he would rather die than take up arms against his countrymen. Marius, however, was bent upon his destruction; and the soldiers of Damasippus advancing to murder him, he fled to the temple of Vesta,§ and was overtaken and butchered even within the sacred ground. His body, together with those of Domitius, Carbo, and Antistius, was thrown into the Tiber; and by this murder of the most virtuous of citizens, it was hoped that the ascendency of the Marii, the Carbones, and the Norbani might yet be maintained.

Massacre committed at Rome by order of the younger Marius.

But the issue of the battle of Sacriportum rendered this massacre as fruitless as it was detestable. Marius, the author of it, was now blocked up in Præneste; and the road to the Capital being left open, Sylla advanced towards it with one part of his army, while the other part, under the command of Lucretius Ofella,‖ was pressing the siege of Præneste. Rome received her new master without a struggle; and he who had so lately been regarded as an outlawed rebel, being now in possession of the seat of government, was in a condition to retort the charge of rebellion on his antagonists. He immediately ordered their property to be confiscated; and having then left the city to the care of some of his partisans, he again took the field,

Sylla recovers Rome, and obliges Carbo and Norbanus to fly from Italy.

* Plutarch, *in Sylld*, c. 28. † Appian, c. 87.
‡ Appian, c. 87. § As quoted by Plutarch, *in Sylld*, c. 28.
‖ Paterculus, c. 50. ¶ Strabo, lib. v. p. 261.
** Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. xxxiii. c. 1.

* Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxvi. Paterculus, c. 50.
† Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 9.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. ix. epist. 21. *de Claris Orator.* c. 60.
§ Ibid. *de Naturâ Deorum*, lib. iii. c. 32.
‖ Appian, c. 88.

and hastened to Clusium, in order to superintend the operations of the war in Tuscany and the north of Italy.* His arms were attended with equal success in every quarter: his lieutenants, Metellus Pius, Pompey, M. Crassus, M. Lucullus, and others, signalized themselves by several victories over Carbo and his adherents; and in proportion as the Marian party seemed declining, it suffered more and more from the treachery of its own members. Not only did the common soldiers often desert in large bodies to the enemy, but Albinovanus,† an officer of considerable rank, purchased his pardon from Sylla, by contriving the assassination of several of his colleagues in command; and Verres, on whom the eloquence of Cicero has bestowed such an infamous celebrity, and who was at this time Quæstor in Carbo's army, abandoned his General,‡ and carried off with him a considerable portion of the money committed to his charge for the maintenance of the Consul's forces. Attempts had been made in vain to raise the blockade of Præneste: and in this state of their affairs, Norbanus, being left almost alone at Ariminum by the desertion of his troops,§ escaped by sea to Rhodes; while Carbo gave up the command of the army which he still possessed in Tuscany, and withdrew with some of his friends into Africa, hoping there to be able to renew the contest, and to obtain the assistance of Hiarbas the King of Mauritania.

The Samnites, with the remains of the Marian party, attack Rome.

At this late period of the war, when the victory of the Aristocratical party seemed decided, one desperate effort was made to wrest it from them, which had well nigh altered the history of the world. The Samnites and Lucanians, alone of all the people of Italy, had not forgotten their own national grounds of hostility towards the Roman government; and whilst they supported the party of Marius against Sylla, they intended to make their assistance subservient to their own views, rather than to sink into the mere adherents of one of the factions of Rome. During the advance of Sylla, their armies rested securely amid their own mountains, and had seen the defeat of Marius at Sacriportum, and the blockade of the remnant of his forces in Præneste, without exerting their main strength in his behalf. Possibly they beheld without regret every field of battle covered with Roman dead; and may have rejoiced in the hope, that, when both parties were exhausted by mutual slaughter, they might themselves arise to wrest from their weakened hands the prize for which they were contending. But now, when the rapid victories of Sylla threatened them with a speedy termination of the civil war, their Generals, Pontius Telesinus and M. Lamponius, saw that it was necessary for them to take a decisive part; and before Carbo and Norbanus had left Italy, the Samnites and Lucanians had endeavoured to relieve Præneste,‖ but were unable to force the strong positions occupied by the blockading army. Still they lingered in the neighbourhood, hoping that some opportunity might arise to facilitate the execution of their object. Meantime Carbo had retired to Africa, and the army which he had forsaken had sustained a bloody defeat at Clusium from Pompey; so that the remaining Generals of the popular party, Carinas, Marcius, and L. Damasippus, the agent in the late massacre at Rome, resolved, as their last hope, to effect a junction with the Samnites and Lucanians, and then to attempt once more to deliver Marius and his garrison. The armies were united, and the attempt was made, but still in vain; when the confederate Generals conceived the plan of falling suddenly upon Rome, which they thought to find stripped of troops, and utterly unprovided with means to withstand their assault. At this very time they were threatened at once by two armies, that of Sylla on one side, and that of Pompey on the other; yet hoping to win the Capital before their purpose could be discovered, they broke up from their camp in the night, hastened towards Rome, and halted till morning* at the distance of little more than a mile from the Colline gate. Day dawned, and discovered to the Romans the unlooked for sight of the Samnite and Lucanian army. Some parties of cavalry, consisting of the flower of the youth of the city, immediately sallied to observe and to check the enemy; but they were routed and driven back within their walls with severe loss. The panic then rose to the greatest height, when L. Balbus arrived with an advanced guard of seven hundred cavalry from Sylla's army; and hardly allowing his horses a moment's respite, he led them at once into action. Sylla himself followed soon after; he was well aware of the urgency of the danger, and had hurried with the utmost speed in pursuit of the Samnites, as soon as he learnt their object. His men were greatly fatigued and his officers pressed him to postpone the action, for it was now late in the afternoon of a November day; but he refused to listen to them, and having ordered his men to eat their dinners as fast as they arrived from their march, he sent them to engage the enemy successively. Telesinus, on his part, forgetting his character as a partisan of Marius, and feeling only as a Samnite General, rode along the ranks repeatedly exclaiming,† that this was the last day of the Roman Empire; and calling to his soldiers to pull down, to destroy the city, for that those wolves, who had so long ravaged Italy, could only be extirpated by rooting up the wood which used to shelter them. At length M. Crassus, who commanded the right wing of Sylla's army, routed the left of the enemy,‡ and pursued them as far as Antemnæ; but the wing which was led by Sylla in person, in spite of all the efforts of its General, was driven back under the walls of Rome, and was pursued even to the gates of the city. The gates were hastily closed to prevent the Samnites from entering together with the fugitives; and the Romans, thus obliged to defend themselves, continued the action till some time after it was dark, although with little hope of resisting effectually. Nay, so great was the general panic, that some of Sylla's soldiers flying from the field arrived at the lines before Præneste, and urged Lucretius Ofella, who commanded the blockading army, to raise the siege, and hasten to the rescue of his General and his country. Night at last stopped the engagement, and the Romans believed themselves completely defeated; when, about

Battle at the Colline gate.

Victory of Sylla, at the Porta Collina, Nov. 1. U. C. 672. — A. C. 82.

* Appian, c. 89. † Ibid. c. 91.
‡ Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 13, *et seq.*
§ Appian, c. 91, 92. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxviii.
‖ Appian, c. 90, 92.

* Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 29. † Velleius Paterculus, c. 51.
‡ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 29, 30.

an hour after the close of the action, an officer arrived from M. Crassus, with the tidings of his success, and requiring supplies of provisions to be sent to him at Antemnæ. It then appeared that the enemy's loss had been even greater than that of Sylla; and the morning displayed more fully the real issue of the contest. Telesinus had fallen, and his soldiers, discouraged by his death and by the terrible slaughter of the battle, had abandoned the field, and had begun to retreat in all directions. Sylla then, to lose no time in improving his victory, set out at an early hour, and immediately joined Crassus at Antemnæ.

Sylla commences his massacres.

The Roman writers, whose accounts of these times remain to us, after following Sylla thus far in his career, and sympathizing in his victories over the popular party, all concur in turning away with unmingled abhorrence from his conduct after the decision of the struggle. One act of cruelty indeed follows another so rapidly in this part of his life, that a complete picture of his character cannot be drawn without satiating the reader with details of spoliation, and outrage, and massacre. On his arrival at Antemnæ, three thousand of the enemy sent to implore his mercy,* which he promised them, if they would deserve it by helping him to execute vengeance on their associates. Thus encouraged, they fell upon another party of fugitives from their own army, and began to cut them to pieces; and then surrendered themselves to Sylla, to receive his promised pardon. But they, with all the other prisoners taken after the battle, amounting together to eight thousand men, were conveyed to Rome, and orders were issued by Sylla that they should all be put to the sword. The men, thus doomed to be slaughtered, were not the instruments of former massacres and proscriptions, wretches whose punishment, however shocking, might yet have worn the appearance of an awful retribution; but they were mostly Samnite soldiers,† who had fought fairly against the Romans in the field, and who were now to be sacrificed to the same atrocious policy, which, in former times, had murdered their heroic countryman C. Pontius; which had driven Hannibal, in old age and exile, to end his life by suicide; which had exercised every extremity of unmanly cruelty against the brave citizens of Numantia, and against the rival people of Carthage. In the mean time, while the massacre was perpetrating, Sylla, having returned to Rome, had assembled the Senate in the temple of Bellona,* and was beginning to address the members upon the state of the Republic. The cries of his victims mingled with his first words, and the Senators started with horror at the sound; but he, with an unmoved countenance, desired them to listen to him, and not to concern themselves with what was passing elsewhere; what they heard, was the correction bestowed by his orders on a few disturbers of the public peace. On the following day, Marcius and Carinas, two of the Roman officers who had joined the Samnite army previously to their attack on Rome, were taken in their flight, and, being brought before Sylla, were, by his orders, put to death, and their heads, with the head of Telesinus, were sent to Lucretius Ofella before Præneste,† with directions that they should be carried around the walls of the town, to inform the besieged of the fate of their expected deliverers.

One signal act of justice was performed by Sylla at this time, which was received with general satifaction. L. Damasippus,‡ the murderer of Mucius Scævola, had been taken after the late battle, and was instantly put to death. So great indeed were the crimes with which the chiefs of the Marian party were loaded, that men became reconciled to executions from the pleasure with which they regarded the fate of these flagrant offenders. But they soon were taught that the wickedness of the sufferer ought never to lessen our hatred of bloody and illegal acts of vengeance. Numerous victims were every day murdered; some by Sylla's own order; but many more were sacrificed to the rapaciousness or personal enmities of his adherents,§ whose excesses he took no pains to suppress. At last he was entreated to relieve the commonwealth from its present state of suspense, by assuring of their pardon those whom he did not intend to destroy; but one of his own retainers gave a different turn to this request,‖ by asking him only to name those whom he had marked out for punishment. Sylla answered, that he would do so; and immediately published his first list of proscriptions, containing the names of eighty individuals who were to be put to death: to this, on the following day, he added two hundred and twenty names more; and again, on the third day, the fatal list was increased by an equal number. "These," said Sylla to the people, "are all that I can at present remember; if I recollect any others who must be punished, I will proscribe their names hereafter." It soon appeared that he had good reason to stipulate thus for the further gratification of his vengeance. In proportion as he extended his massacres, reasons would arise, for perpetually adding new victims to the catalogue of the proscribed; and the more he became deserving of a future retaliation upon himself and his party, the

The proscription lists are published by Sylla.

* Plutarch, *in Syllâ*, c. 30.

† Ferguson has ventured to describe those who were thus murdered, as, "six or eight thousand of those who were supposed to have been the busiest instruments of the late usurpations and murders," who had been "taken prisoners in the war, or surprised in the city." It is not easy to say where Ferguson found his authority for this statement, as he appeals to no ancient writer to justify it; but it is a most blamable misrepresentation, to use the lightest term, as far as it labours to give a colour of retributive justice to a massacre dictated by mere policy and national hatred. In particular the words, "or surprised in the city," are inserted especially to palliate Sylla's conduct, in complete opposition to the truth. That the men who were murdered were soldiers, taken in battle, is the concurrent account of every writer whom we have been able to consult; and as it is a point of some importance, the references, by which any reader, who has means and inclination, may satisfy himself, are here subjoined.

Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxviii. *Auctor de Viris illustribus, in Syllâ.* Florus, lib. iii. c. 21. Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 2. Seneca, *de Beneficiis*, lib. v. c. 16.

All these writers agree in the fact, that the men who were massacred were soldiers, and soldiers who had surrendered themselves to the conqueror. Seneca's words are as follows: "*Legiones duas, quod crudele est, post victoriam; quod nefas, post fidem, in angulum congestas contrucidavit.*"

In addition to these testimonies, Strabo declares that the victims were mostly Samnites, lib. v. p. 271. edit. Xyland, and Appian agrees with him, lib. i. c. 93. as does also Plutarch, *in Syllâ*, c. 29, 30.

* Seneca, *de Clementiâ*, lib. i. c. 12.

† Appian, c. 93. Paterculus, c. 51.

‡ Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 51.

§ Plutarch, *in Syllâ*, c. 31. Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 51.

‖ Plutarch, *in Syllâ*, c. 31.

more anxious was he to rid himself of every person who might be likely to assist in effecting it. But it was the most dreadful part of this proscription, that, by establishing the reign of wild and unbridled violence, and by trampling under foot not only the laws of the commonwealth, but even the most lax of all the restraints which men under a low system of morals still imposed on themselves, it emboldened every meaner criminal to participate in the license of which the present master of the Republic set so large an example. The meanest office, in ordinary times, is obtained from a government by its retainers with less ease, than Sylla's followers could gain from their leader the gift of innocent blood. It is mentioned that one Q. Aurelius,* an inoffensive individual, who had never mingled in political quarrels, stopped one day in the forum to read the list of the proscribed, and found his own name among the number. "Wretch that I am," he exclaimed, "my Alban villa is my death;" and before he had gone far from the spot, he was followed, overtaken, and murdered. Nor were these scenes confined to the neighbourhood of Rome, but extended over the whole of Italy. All who had rendered any assistance to the Marian party,† who had carried arms in their cause, or had supplied them with money; nay, those who had held any communication even in the commonest civilities of life with the enemies of Sylla, were exposed to the vengeance of the conquerors. It is natural to suppose that subordinate officers, commanding in remote provinces, would exceed the wishes of their chief, and would gratify their cupidity or their cruelty with less scruple. We are told that M. Crassus, ‡ who was employed in Bruttium, proscribed a wealthy individual without Sylla's orders, in order to get possession of his fortune; and that Sylla, being informed of the fact, would never afterwards commit to Crassus any post of importance. But if this be so, Crassus might fairly complain of his ill fortune, for he had done no more than was practised by almost every one in similar circumstances; and these supernumerary crimes heightened still more the horrors of the original proscription. Murders, it is said, were sometimes perpetrated even in the presence of Sylla himself,§ when some of the victims, condemned by his proscription, endeavoured to save themselves by a direct appeal to his mercy, and were slain in his sight by their pursuers, who never found any interruption to their work from any touch of compunction in his nature. His doors were beset with the executioners of his orders, who flocked thither with the heads of those whom they had murdered, to claim from him the promised reward: and it is said, that this sight so awakened the indignation of M. Cato,‖ who being then a boy was taken by his tutor to visit Sylla, that he could not forbear asking for a sword, with which he might himself despatch the tyrant. Yet, on one memorable occasion, the remorseless nature of Sylla listened to the intercession of his friends, and spared a man, whom, if he could have looked into futurity, he would, above all others, have desired to destroy. C. Julius Cæsar,¶ then quite a young man, had married the daughter of Cinna, and, during the ascendency of his father-in-law, had been designed to fill the office of Flamen of Jupiter. He was further connected with the popular party through the marriage of Julia, his father's sister, with the elder Marius; yet, although thus doubly obnoxious to the victorious party, he refused to comply with the commands of Sylla to divorce his wife; and being exposed in consequence to his resentment, he fled from Rome, and baffled all attempts upon his life, partly by concealing himself, and partly by bribing the officer sent to kill him, till Sylla was prevailed upon, according to Suetonius, to spare him at the entreaty of some common friends. A story was afterwards common, that Sylla did not pardon him without great reluctance; and that he told those who sued in his behalf, that in Cæsar there were many Mariuses. Had he indeed thought so, his was not a temper to have yielded to any supplications to save him; nor would any considerations have induced him to exempt from destruction one from whom he had apprehended so great a danger.

Surrender of Prænestе, death of the younger Marius, and massacre of the Prænestines.

Soon after the defeat of the Samnites before Rome, the garrison of Prænestе surrendered. Marius attempted to escape from the town by a subterranean passage, communicating with the open country;* but his flight was intercepted, and he fell, either by the hands of the enemy's soldiers, or, according to the more common account, by the sword of his own slave, whom he requested to perform this last service. His head was brought to Rome, and presented to Sylla, who ordered it to be exposed in front of the rostra in the forum; and as if his triumph were now complete, he assumed to himself, from henceforward, the title of *Felix*, or the Fortunate. He might have justly claimed this title, says Paterculus, if his life had not been prolonged beyond the hour which thus crowned his victory. Immediately on the surrender of Prænestе, Lucretius Ofella put to death several Senators whom he found in the town,† and detained others in custody, to wait Sylla's decision on their fate. Sylla soon arrived, and having first ordered the execution of all whom Ofella had arrested, and selected from the whole number of his prisoners, some few whom he thought deserving of mercy, he divided all the rest into three parties, one consisting of Romans, another of Samnites, and a third of the citizens of Prænestе. To the first he said, that though they deserved death, he nevertheless gave them their lives; but the other two divisions were indiscriminately massacred, to the number, as is said, of twelve thousand persons. The women and children were then dismissed, with what prospect of future provision we know not; and the town was given up to plunder. In like manner the towns of Spoletum, Interamna, Fluentia, Sulmo, Norba, Arretium, and Ariminum were plundered,‡ and deprived of their privileges, and their inhabitants were either sold for slaves or massacred. But the Samnites felt the heaviest weight of the conqueror's vengeance: for not satisfied with the slaughter of so many thousands of them in cold blood, both at Rome and at Prænestе, he seemed bent on the utter extirpation

* Plutarch, *in Sylld*, c. 31.
† Appian, c. 96.
‡ Plutarch, *in Crasso*, c. 6.
§ Appian, c. 95.
‖ Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 3.
¶ Suetonius, *in C. J. Cæsar*, c. 1.

* Paterculus, c. 51. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxviii.
† Appian, c. 94.
‡ Florus, lib. iii. c. 21. Appian, c. 94. Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 14. *pro Cæcinâ*, c. 33.

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 86. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

of the whole people; and his subsequent proscriptions destroyed or compelled to emigrate so large a proportion of them, that in Strabo's time the ancient cities of Samnium had either been reduced entirely to ruins,* or were dwindled to the rank of mere villages.

Italy had been filled with murders and devastations from one end to the other, while the author of them was as yet uninvested with any legal authority. His partisans, however, were every where inflicting as summary vengeance upon his enemies, as if he had been the lawful sovereign of Rome. C. Norbanus, who had fled to Rhodes,† finding that he was proscribed, and fearing that he might be arrested by Sylla's order, even in this remote exile, killed himself. Carbo, after having abandoned Italy, had fled first to Africa;‡ but hearing that some attempts were making to rally his party in Sicily, he crossed over to that island, leaving the command in Africa to Cn. Domitius. But his hopes were blasted by the arrival of Pompey, who, having been despatched to Sicily by an order of the Senate, soon crushed the beginnings of resistance there, and obliged Carbo again to fly to the neighbouring island of Cossura. He was pursued, however, and taken, and brought as a prisoner to Lilybæum, where Pompey then was. It is said that his treatment was that of a common criminal; that he was brought before the tribunal where Pompey sat as judge, and, after undergoing a short examination, was ordered away to immediate execution. By his death, added to that of Marius, the Republic was left without Consuls; and the Senate accordingly appointed L. Valerius Flaccus to be Interrex,§ that he might hold the Comitia for the elections of the ensuing year. But the Interrex, having received instructions from Sylla, instead of proceeding to the election of Consuls, moved, that the office of Dictator, which had been disused almost since the time of Q. Fabius Maximus, should now be revived, and intrusted to the hands of Sylla; proposing besides, that it should be given him for an unlimited period, till he should have restored the affairs of the commonwealth to a state of tranquillity and security. Nor was L. Flaccus contented with investing Sylla with absolute power for the future; but he proposed further, that all his acts up to the present time should be ratified;|| thus giving the sanction of law to all his proscriptions and confiscations. The Senate and people, however, felt that resistance was hopeless, and agreeing to both the proposed laws, Sylla was named Dictator, and L. Flaccus was by him appointed his Master of the Horse. Having thus secured all real power to himself, Sylla was still willing that the year should be marked as usual by the names of two Consuls; and, accordingly, M. Tullius Decula and Cn. Cornelius Dolabella were selected to wear the titles of the Consular office.

Deaths of Carbo and Norbanus.

Sylla is appointed perpetual Dictator.

U. C. 672. — A. C 82.

In this manner the liberties of Rome were surrendered into the hands of a man, whose utter contempt of his fellow-creatures seemed to promise a dreadful exercise of that absolute power with which he was now in some sort legally invested. His dominion however did not extend over the whole space of the Roman empire. In Asia, the war with Mithridates, which had been imperfectly smothered by the treaty concluded just before Sylla's arrival in Italy, was now again breaking out; and in Africa the native force of Mauritania, always destined to assist the unsuccessful party in the civil wars of Rome, was supporting C. Domitius, and the last remains of the Marian fugitives from Italy, and was preparing to resist the arms of Pompey, to whom the task of establishing Sylla's authority was intrusted. But the most formidable enemy of the new government was to be found in Spain. Thither Q. Sertorius had retired after the first successes of Sylla over the Consuls Scipio and Norbanus; and there he had organized a force, insignificant indeed at present, in its actual strength, but which became, by the extraordinary abilities of its General, an invincible obstacle for many years to the complete triumph of the Aristocratical party. In Italy, however, the power of the Dictator was undisputed: there a series of battles, massacres, and proscriptions, had almost annihilated the popular cause; and the commonwealth lay subdued and exhausted, incapable of resisting any remedies which Sylla might think proper to administer, in order to correct the evils from which it had suffered, and to infuse into it a principle of future health and vigour.

L. Cornelii Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

It is a most certain truth that the leader of a victorious faction can never safely be intrusted with the task of reforming that which is faulty in the constitution of his country; and least of all when he has committed acts so violent as those of Sylla, in humbling the party of his opponents. The eyes of the Dictator were blind to all grievances, except those under which the interests of his own friends had suffered; while he attributed all the disorders of the commonwealth to the turbulence and inordinate authority of the popular assembly and the Tribunes. The great object of his measures accordingly was to strengthen the Senate and the Aristocracy, and to weaken the democratical part of the constitution. For this purpose he transferred the judicial power, which had been so often the subject of dispute,* from the hands of the Equestrian order to the Senate. He deprived the Tribunes of the right of proposing laws,† and made it illegal for any one, who had filled the office of Tribune, to be afterwards elected to any other magistracy. He increased the number of the Pontifices and Augurs,‡ and, repealing the law of Domitius which had left the appointment of them to the people, he restored to them their ancient right of filling up the vacancies in their own body. He selected the most distinguished individuals of the Equestrian order to recruit the numbers of the Senate,§ which had been greatly thinned by the civil wars and proscriptions; and he pretended to subject the persons, whom he thus named, to the approval or rejection of the assembly of the tribes. Added to these were a great variety

Laws of Sylla.

* Strabo, lib. v. p. 272. † Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxix ‡ Appian, lib. i. c. 95, 96. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxix. Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 10. § Appian, c. 98. || Cicero, *de Lege Agrariâ*, iii. c. 2.

* Vell. Paterc. lib. ii. † Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxix. Appian, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. i. c. 100. Cæsar, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. i. c. 4. 6. Cicero, *de Legibus*, lib. iii. c. 9. *Lepidi Oratio*, Sallust. ‡ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxix. Cicero, *Agrar. cont. Rull.* ii. c. 7. Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 46. edit. Leunclar. § Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxix. Appian, lib. i. c. 100.

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

of statutes, some amending and strengthening the code of criminal laws, others providing for the better administration of the provinces, and others again tending to promote the general regularity and security of the Government. In these points, where the interest of the Republic did not interfere with any personal or party views of the legislator, his wisdom and experience suggested to him regulations which were really excellent. Of his criminal laws, one was directed against forgeries of wills or any other instruments,* and against coining or adulterating money; and its object was partly, perhaps, to determine more carefully the penalty for such offences, and also, in the case of forgeries, to render them public crimes, for which any individual might lawfully prosecute. Another law, or rather another clause of the same law, denounced punishment against murders;† whether committed by poison or by actual violence; and a third clause rendered it criminal in any magistrate or Senator to have conspired or concurred in procuring the condemnation of a citizen in a court of justice.‡ When we find so many various provisions comprehended in one statute, and many of them relating to the first and most natural subjects of criminal legislation, we might be apt to wonder how such enactments could be needed when the commonwealth had subsisted nearly seven hundred years, and must have possessed sufficient laws on all such points for many generations before the time of Sylla. But it seems that in all half-civilized countries, and in Governments which have often been disturbed by seditions and acts of violence, the time at which a law is considered obsolete commences early, and it soon ceases to regulate the proceedings of the Courts of Justice, unless it be sanctioned and renewed at certain intervals by the authority of a more recent statute. In this manner we know that Magna Charta was confirmed often after its first enactment in several successive reigns; and thus, after such violent convulsions as the Republic had lately sustained, Sylla might deem it expedient to republish and confirm anew the existing laws, on all points which he considered of importance. With regard to the Provinces, Sylla limited the expenses allowed by the Provincial cities to their deputies,§ whom they were in the habit of sending to Rome at the end of every year to pronounce a compliment before the Senate on the conduct of their late Governor. He ordered also that every officer should leave his Province within thirty days after the arrival of his successor:‖ and for the better prevention of bribery, it was enacted, that if a magistrate, condemned for this crime,¶ should not have property sufficient to refund all that had been corruptly received, the deficiency might be recovered from any other person who had shared in his unjust gains, or to whom any portion of them had descended. The general security of the Government was consulted in some provisions of the law of treason, which also derive their origin from Sylla. By these, all Provincial Governors were forbidden to lead an army out of their Province,* to carry on any war by their own authority, or to enter any foreign country without the orders of the Senate and People, to endeavour to tamper with the soldiers of any other General, or to set at liberty any of the enemies of the Republic. The last of these, indeed, was an offence of which Sylla could not be accused; but he who had crossed over from his Province into Italy with his army, who had made war upon the existing Government of his country, and who had seduced the soldiers of the Consul Scipio to desert their leader, had good reason to fear lest his own example should in turn be employed to his own disadvantage, and wisely desired to prevent others from imitating that conduct by which he himself had acquired the Dictatorship.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

Such are the principal measures by which the new Sovereign of Rome proposed to reform the defects of the existing order of things. It now remains to notice the price which the people had to pay for the benefits of his Government. The property of all those whom he had proscribed was declared to be forfeited to the State,† and was ordered to be publicly sold before the Calends of June. All persons, even near relations, were forbidden to support or to assist any who had been proscribed; and the children of the proscribed were excluded during their lives from the enjoyment of any public office or magistracy. Nor was the forfeiture of property confined to those only whose names Sylla had actually inserted in the lists of proscription. A clause in his law *de proscriptis* was intended to provide for any omissions into which he might have fallen,‡ by including amongst those who were to be stripped of their fortunes, all who had at any time been killed in any of the ports, garrisons, or lines of the adversaries. Yet even this did not carry the evil to its full extent. Long after the proscription-lists had been closed;§ and the war had been generally ended, Sextus Roscius, a wealthy citizen of the town of Ameria, in Umbria, who had attached himself to the party of Sylla, was assassinated in the streets of Rome; his property was sold, and was bought at a price far below its value by L. Chrysogonus, Sylla's freedman. A deputation was sent by the magistrates of Ameria to acquaint Sylla with the merits of the case, and to intercede for the son of the murdered Roscius, who was thus deprived of his inheritance. But Chrysogonus, by his entreaties and assurances that he would satisfy their wishes, prevailed with them not to lay the affair before the Dictator; and he found also several persons among the Nobility, whom he persuaded to join with him in the same request and the same promises. The promises however were never fulfilled; and the fortunes of Roscius were divided between an individual of his own name, who was suspected of having procured his murder, and Chrysogonus, who was bribed with a share of the plunder to contrive and maintain the forfeiture. It is not likely that Sylla was ever aware of the particulars of this transaction; but his indifference to the sufferings of his fellow-creatures, and his pride, which regarded mankind as unworthy

* Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 42.
† Seneca, *de Providentiâ*, c. 3. Cicero, *pro Cluentio*, c. 54.
‡ Cicero, *pro Cluentio*, c. 54.
§ Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. iii. epist x.
‖ Ibid. *ad Familiar.* lib. iii. epist. vi.
¶ Ibid. *pro Rabirio Postumo*, c. 4

* Cicero, *in Pisonem*, c. 21. *pro Cluentio*, c. 35. *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 5.
† Ibid. *pro Roscio Amerino*, c. 43. *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 47. *in Pisonem*, c. 2. Vell. Patercul. lib. ii. c. 53.
‡ Ibid. *pro Roscio Amerino*, c. 43.
§ Ibid. *pro Roscio Amerino, passim.*

of his notice, naturally emboldened his creatures to commit numberless crimes in his name; and the fortunes acquired by his freedmen and low dependents, as they added the severest pang to the sorrow and indignation of the people, so they are alone sufficient to shew how little of real patriotism or love of justice was mingled with the pretended reforms of Sylla.

We are told by Appian that Sylla also passed a law,* by which all candidates for the Prætorship were obliged previously to have gone through the office of Quæstor; and no one could be elected Consul without having before been Prætor. To this it was added, that a certain interval must pass before a man who had filled one magistracy could be again elected to another; and he could not hold the same office a second time till after the expiration of ten years. But this law was dispensed with in favour of his own adherents; as we find that L. Lucullus was appointed Ædile when absent from Rome, and immediately afterwards succeeded to the Prætorship.† Possibly Sylla found it necessary to grant this indulgence to his own principal supporters; for in one instance he had at first seemed resolved, in a remarkable manner, to enforce the law without distinction. Lucretius Ofella, who had commanded at the siege of Præneste, offered himself as a candidate for the Consulship,‡ without having been either Prætor or Quæstor. Sylla commanded him to desist, and on his still continuing his canvass, ordered him to be slain by a Centurion in the middle of the forum. The multitude instantly seized the Centurion, and expressed great indignation at the outrage; but Sylla summoning the people before him, told them that Ofella had been put to death by his orders, and that the Centurion must be released. Appian reports that he addressed the assembly on this occasion in a style characteristic of his deep contempt for those whom he governed. "A labourer, when at plough," said he, "was annoyed by vermin; and he twice stopped from his work, and picked them off his jacket. But finding himself bitten again, to spare himself any further trouble, he threw the jacket into the fire. Now I advise those whom I have twice conquered, not to oblige me the third time to try the fire." It was natural however that his chief officers should remonstrate strongly against such a precedent as the death of Ofella; and perhaps it was owing to his knowledge of their sentiments, that he afterwards especially exempted them from the restrictions of his general law.

Victories of Pompey in Africa.

During the course of the year Pompey had completely destroyed all opposition to Sylla's Government in Africa.§ Hiarbas King of Mauritania, and Domitius his confederate, were defeated and slain: and Pompey, on his return to Rome, enjoyed the honour of a Triumph, although he was not of Senatorian rank, nor had ever filled any magistracy.

Reduction of Nola, and Volaterræ. U. C. 673. — A. C. 81.

When the nominal Consulship of M. Tullius Decula and Cn. Dolabella was expired, Sylla, while still retaining the Dictatorship, caused himself and Q. Metellus Pius to be nominated as Consuls for the year following. It appears that amidst the general submission of Italy, two towns remained unsubdued up to this time: Nola in Campania, and Volaterræ in Tuscany. The first of these had never been completely reduced since the Italian war: a Roman army had been employed against it at the period of Sylla's first Consulship; and again, when Cinna was driven from Rome by his colleague Octavius, it was to the camp before Nola that he first applied for support, and in which his attack upon the Government was first organized. Our knowledge, however, of the fate of this town, after so long a resistance, is limited to the simple fact mentioned by the epitomizer of Livy, that Sylla reduced Nola. Volaterræ had been occupied by the remains of one of the Tuscan armies defeated by Sylla in the late war;* and numbers of Romans, who had been proscribed, escaping thither and uniting with them, a force was formed amounting to four cohorts, or about 2400 men. The situation of this town resembled that of the hill forts of India, or of those remarkable fortified heights which are to be seen rising in the midst of the valley close to Luxemburg. It was built on an insulated point rising abruptly on every side from a deep and narrow valley; on the top was a flat surface of considerable extent, which the town itself occupied; and the ascent was nearly two miles in length, and was every where rough and difficult. These natural advantages enabled the garrison to hold out for two years; and their resistance led Sylla himself to take the field against them,† and to preside in person at the siege. Even at last they would only surrender on a capitulation, by which they were allowed to leave the town unmolested; while the vengeance of the conqueror fell only upon the inhabitants, whom he deprived of their lately acquired privilege of Roman citizenship. It is remarkable that this alone, of all his measures, was maintained to be illegal,‡ as exceeding even the power of the Roman people to authorize. The right of citizenship, according to Cicero, could never be taken away from any one; and it is doubtful how far Sylla's laws on this subject were observed, even during his lifetime. Thus it is satisfactory to see, that the real and substantial rights acquired by the people of Italy survived the violence of the storm, by which themselves and their party at Rome had been almost overwhelmed; and amidst such a succession of crimes and miseries, the cause of true liberty had yet gained an advantage which it continued permanently to enjoy.

Violation of property.

It is however seldom at this period of History that any thing favourable to human happiness offers itself to our notice. If the privileges of Roman citizenship were secured to the Italians beyond the power of Sylla to take away, it was not so with their properties, over which he exercised the most absolute dominion. Large tracts of land had been wrested from different cities,§ as well as from proscribed individuals; besides which there were considerable portions which had never been enclosed or appropriated; and of which Sylla now claimed the right to dispose as he thought proper. On all these he proceeded to settle the soldiers who had enabled him to attain to his present greatness. Their numbers are variously reported; the

* Appian, c. 100. † Cicero, *Academic. prior*, lib. ii. c. 1.
‡ Appian, c. 101. § Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxix.

* Strabo, lib. v. p. 246.
† Cicero, *pro Roscio Amerino*, c. 7. 37.
‡ Ibid. *pro Cæcinâ*, c. 33, *et seq.*
§ Appian, c. 100. Sallust, *Oratio Lepidi in Sullam.*

epitomizer of Livy stating them at forty-seven legions, while Appian, with far greater probability, limits them to twenty-three. To make room for 115,000 new proprietors, for such, at the lowest computation, would be the number of soldiers whom Sylla rewarded with a settlement, we may well imagine how large a proportion of the inhabitants of Italy must have been reduced to poverty, even when every allowance has been made for the probable amount of waste and unclaimed land which formed a part of the distribution. But as one individual case speaks a far clearer language than any general statement, let the reader consult the first *Eclogue* of Virgil, and he will there find a picture, drawn from reality, of the dreadful misery occasioned by these gifts of victorious leaders to their soldiers.

Having thus interested so many and such formidable supporters in maintaining his various regulations, Sylla proceeded to secure to himself a party in the assembly of the people at Rome. He gave liberty to more than ten thousand slaves,* chiefly belonging to men of the opposite faction, who had been proscribed or had fallen in battle, and he allowed them to be enrolled freely among the tribes. These new citizens, according to the usual practice of the Romans, adopted the name of him who had given them their freedom, and were all called *Cornelii*; and they of course would be most anxious to resist any counter-revolution, which, by rescinding Sylla's act, would have restored them also to their former slavery.

The persons nominated to the title of Consuls for the following year, were P. Servilius and Appius Claudius. Sylla's government was now fully established, and the ascendency of his party, and the validity of his measures, seemed no longer to depend on his continuing to hold the office of Dictator. He himself had no fondness for the mere ostentation of power, so long as he possessed the reality; and his favourite enjoyments, the gratification of his sensual and intellectual appetites, might be pursued more readily if he relieved himself from the ordinary business of the administration of the Commonwealth. Accordingly, having assembled the people in the forum,† he made a formal resignation of the Dictatorship, dismissed his lictors, and professing that he was ready to answer any charges against his late conduct, continued to walk up and down for some time, accompanied only by his friends, and then withdrew quietly to his own house. This is that famous abdication which has been ever viewed as so remarkable a point in Sylla's character; and which has been sometimes adduced to prove, that he was actuated chiefly by a regard to the public welfare in all that he had done to gain and to secure the sovereign power.

Sylla resigns the Dictatorship. U. C. 675. — A. C. 79.

But if the preceding pages have faithfully represented the state of parties at Rome, and have truly related the origin and events of the civil war, we shall form a different estimate both of the act itself, and of the motives which led to it. Sylla was the leader of the Aristocratical interest, and it was his object to raise that interest from the low condition to which Marius and Cinna had reduced it, and to invest it with a complete ascendency in the Commonwealth. This he had entirely effected. He had extirpated the chiefs of the popular party; he had plundered and almost destroyed several States of Italy, who were used to support the popular cause at Rome; he had crippled the Tribunitian power; had given to the Nobility the exclusive possession of the judicial authority; had enriched the most eminent families by the sale of the confiscated estates, which his principal partisans had purchased at a low price; and he had provided for the security of his triumph by immense grants of lands to the soldiers by whose swords he had won it. He had raised to wealth and honours a great number of his own personal dependents,* and he was himself in possession of a property amply sufficient to maintain him in a style of magnificence, and to give him the free enjoyment of his favourite pleasures. His pride had been gratified by the fullest revenge upon his own private enemies, and by the absolute control which he had exercised in the settlement of the Republic, securing the interests of his party as he thought proper, without allowing them to direct or interfere with his measures. If his object, indeed, had been to convert the Government into a Monarchy, the resignation of the Dictatorship might justly have surprised us; but viewing him as the chief of a party, whose ascendency he endeavoured to establish, whilst he himself enjoyed a preeminent share of the glory, and power, and advantages of their success, his abdication appears to have been a sacrifice of—nothing. It is clear that he was still considered as the head of his party, and that he resigned no more than a mere title, with the fatigue of the ordinary business of the State, while he continued to act as Sovereign whenever he thought proper to exert his power. This appears from a speech which Sallust ascribes to M. Æmilius Lepidus, who was Consul the year after Sylla's abdication. It is supposed to be spoken during his Consulship; and in it he continually inveighs against Sylla as the actual tyrant of the Republic, without the least allusion to any resignation which he had made of his authority. And another speech, preserved among the *Fragments* of Sallust, and ascribed to Macer Licinius, Tribune of the people, a few years afterwards, speaks of Sylla's tyranny as only ending with his life. "When Sylla was dead, who had laid this bondage upon us, you thought," says Macer to the people, "that the evil was at an end. But a worse tyrant arose in Catulus." It appears, then, that Sylla, while relieving himself from the labours of Government, retained at least a large portion of his former power, and that, having completed his work, he devolved the care of maintaining it upon the other members of his party, while he himself retired to enjoy the pursuits to which he was most strongly addicted.

Then it was, when the glare of the conqueror and the legislator were no longer thrown around him, that he sank into the mere selfish voluptuary, pampering his senses and his mind with the excitements of licentiousness and of elegant literature. His principal companions, according to Plutarch, were actors and performers of various kinds, some of whom indeed, such as the famous Q. Roscius, were of unblemished reputation, but others were of the vilest class of those wretches who ministered to every appetite of their patrons, of those men of prostituted talents, who

His manner of life after his resignation.

* Appian, c. 100.

† Ibid. c. 103, 104.

* Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 51. *Oratio Lepidi, in Sullam.*

Biography. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

above all others are most deserving of contempt and abhorrence. The intervals which were not passed in such society, Sylla employed in the composition of his own *Memoirs;* a work in which he took great interest, and in which he brought down his history to within a few days of his death. It was about a year after he resigned the Dictatorship, that he was attacked by the disorder which proved fatal to him; and which is said to have been one of the most loathsome that afflict humanity. We have in truth no very authentic accounts of his sickness; but it was the belief of the Romans in the time of Pliny,* that he who had shed such torrents of blood was visited by an awful retribution of suffering; that vermin bred incessantly in his body, and that thus he was in time destroyed. The Senate ordered that his funeral should be celebrated in the Campus Martius;† and by his own desire his body was burnt, contrary to the general practice of his family,‡ who were accustomed to commit their dead to the ground. But as he had ordered the grave of Marius to be opened, and his remains to be scattered abroad, he possibly departed from the custom of his ancestors to prevent any similar insults from being hereafter offered to himself. The members of his party, who owed their present greatness to him, testified their gratitude to their departed leader by lavishing every kind of magnificence on his funeral. The soldiers who had served under him crowded to Puteoli,§ where he had died, and escorted the body in arms to Rome. All the ministers of the Gods, all the magistrates of the Commonwealth, in their ensigns of office, all the Senate, the Equestrian order, and an immense multitude of the people, walked in the procession; and the ladies of the Nobility vied with each other in offering perfumes to throw upon the funeral pile.‖ Such was the end of Sylla, in the sixtieth year of his age, six hundred and seventy-six years after the building of Rome, and seventy-eight before the Christian æra.

His sickness and death.

U. C. 676. — A. C. 78.

And character.

His character must sufficiently be collected from the events of his life. Some anecdotes are to be found in Plutarch respecting his behaviour in his family, which we cannot prevail on ourselves to copy on Plutarch's sole authority. It appears, however, that he was strongly attached to his wife Metella, although he is said finally to have divorced her, and to have married again only a few months before his death. The predominant feature in his character was an intense pride and contempt for mankind, feelings which must ever be incompatible with a virtuous and noble nature. Indifferent to the ordinary duties and honours of the Republic, he found a stimulus during his early youth and manhood in literature and sensuality; and to these he gladly returned in his last years, when he had fully satisfied the passions which led him to take part in political contests. But when circumstances drew him into public situations, his pride could be content with no second place; and when he found himself slighted and injured, the desire of ample vengeance and of establishing his superiority beyond all rivalry, prevailed in his mind over every other. He found himself individually opposed to a man whom he envied for his military glory, and despised for his low birth and ignorance: as a Patrician he felt an Aristocratical contempt for the popular party; as a Roman he looked down with habitual arrogance upon all foreign nations. It happened that Marius his enemy was leagued with the popular cause at Rome and with the Italian States, which were claiming an equality with Roman citizens; and thus his pride as an individual, as a Noble, and as a Roman, was wounded beyond endurance by their victory. But when that victory was accompanied by crimes which awakened the abhorrence even of the most moderate men, Sylla set no bounds to his retaliation, and seemed bent upon effecting the utter extirpation of all the three parties who were united against him, Marius and his personal enemies, the popular interest, and the allied States of Italy. Careless of the means by which this end was to be accomplished, and utterly indifferent to the multiplied miseries with which it must be attended, he commenced a series of boundless cruelties, in which it is impossible to find any resemblance to the just severities of a lawful government exercised upon flagrant criminals. He did not apply himself to a calm review of the causes which had so long disturbed the peace of his country; nor, as some Tyrants have done, did he forget in his elevation the character of a party leader, and being placed above all, learn to regard all classes of citizens with an eye of impartiality. No doubt he reformed many things that needed alteration; but they were the abuses of one side only that he removed, and all that he did was to provide for the security of his party, except in those points where the common sense of every government sees that in the prevention of ordinary crimes its own interest and that of society are identified. The inscription which he is said to have dictated for his own monument, well declares that constant thirst for superiority, or in other words, that unceasing pride, which we have called his characteristic quality. It contained, in substance, that no friend had ever outdone him in the exchange of good offices, and no enemy had done him more evil than he had rendered to him again in return.

L. Cornelius Sylla. From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

The character of Sylla moreover exemplifies a truth, most useful to be remembered, yet most often contradicted or forgotten. His life, and the lives of many others in every age, and not least in our own, shew that a cultivated understanding is no warrant for virtuous principles and conduct; and that the old adage of,

> "*Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes,*
> *Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros,*"

unless a very strained interpretation be put upon the word *fideliter*, is widely at variance with the evidence of facts. Sylla had a general taste for literature; he was intimately acquainted with the writers of Greece; he delighted in the society of men of talent; and he was himself long and carefully engaged in recording the history of his own actions; yet no man was ever more stained with cruelty, nor was ever any more degraded by habitual and gross profligacy. Nor is this at all wonderful, if we consider that the intellectual faculties like the sensual are gratified by exercise; and that the pleasure derived from the employment of talent is quite distinct from the application

---

* Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. xi. c. 33. lib. xxvi. c. 13. lib. vii. c. 43.
† Livy, *Epitome*, lib. xc.
‡ Cicero, *de Legibus*, lib. ii. c. 22.
§ Appian, c. 105, 106.
‖ Plutarch, *in Sylla*, c. 38.

of the lessons taught by the understanding to the government of the affections and the conduct. In all men, whose mental powers are at all considerable, the indulgence of them is as much an object of mere natural appetite, as the gratification of hunger and thirst is to the mass of mankind; and it is only because it is less common that it is regarded as conferring on the character a much superior value. Bad men, of good natural faculties, gratify therefore with equal eagerness their animal and their intellectual desires, and are equally ignorant of the government of either. It is the part of goodness to restrain both, and to convert them to their own purposes; an effort which is as painful to pride in the one case as it is to the ordinary feelings of what is called licentiousness in the other: and it is the presence or absence of this effort which distinguishes talent from wisdom, and forms a perpetual barrier between men like Sylla, and those who have deserved the respect, and admiration, and love of posterity.

From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

Sedition, rebellion, and death of M. Lepidus.

It will form a proper conclusion to this part of our History, if we add here a short account of the disturbances that immediately followed the death of Sylla, and which originated in an attempt made by the popular party to procure the repeal of his various laws and measures. The Consulship was at this time filled by M. Æmilius Lepidus and Q. Lutatius Catulus: the former of whom had governed Sicily some years before as Prætor,* and had rendered himself infamous for his maladministration; the latter was the son of that Catulus who had been the colleague of Marius in his fourth Consulship, when he overcame the Cimbri, and had afterwards killed himself when sentenced to die by the same Marius, at the beginning of Cinna's usurpation. During Sylla's lifetime, Lepidus had attempted to revive the popular cause, and had inveighed against the tyranny under which, as he said, the Republic laboured. Upon the death of Sylla he endeavoured to deprive his remains of that magnificent funeral with which the Aristocratical party proposed to honour them;† but in this, as we have seen, he failed; and Catulus, supported by Pompey, succeeded in paying the last tribute to the late Dictator's memory. Lepidus, however, having now declared himself the enemy of the party in possession of the chief power in the State, at once proceeded to try his strength, and proposed that Sylla's acts should be rescinded,‡ which was, in other words, to move for a counter-revolution. Attempting to tread exactly in the steps of Cinna, he called on the Italians to support him,§ as he was labouring to procure a restoration of the privileges of Roman citizenship for those States which Sylla had deprived of them. Disputes and contests, we know not of how serious a kind, were frequently occurring between his partisans and those of Catulus; the Senate, however, bound both Consuls by an oath, that they would not carry their dissensions into a civil war. Lepidus perhaps consented the more readily to take this oath, as he expected, on the expiration of his Consulship, to obtain the government of a Province, and consequently the command of an army; and he considered himself as only pledged to abstain from arms whilst he was actually Consul. The Senate, on their part, anxious to remove him from the Capital, and either trusting to the obligation of his oath, or despising his means of injuring them by open rebellion, allowed him, on the expiration of his office, to receive the command of the Province of Gaul,* with the title and authority of Proconsul. No sooner did he find himself at the head of an army than he threw aside all reserve; he endeavoured to raise partisans in Etruria, the quarter of Italy in which the latest resistance had been made to the power of Sylla; whilst from his station in Gaul he might easily connect himself with those remains of the Marian party which Sertorius yet kept in the field in Spain. Numbers also of the lowest and most profligate inhabitants of Rome flocked to join him; the same men who had aided the riots of Sulpicius, and had been ready agents in the massacres of Marius and Damasippus. Lepidus marched at once towards the Capital, and approached almost as far as the very walls of the city; but the Senate were prepared for their defence. Appius Claudius the Interrex, the Consuls for the following year not being yet chosen, and Q. Catulus, as Proconsul, were charged to provide for the safety of the State; and, by the forces which they collected, Lepidus was easily checked and defeated. Destitute of any further means to continue the war in Italy, Lepidus then retired to Sardinia,† where he was soon attacked by sickness and died in the midst of his plans for renewing the contest. M. Brutus,‡ one of his officers, and the father of the famous assassin of Cæsar, was about this time taken and put to death at Mutina by Pompey; and thus the ascendency of the Aristocracy remained unimpaired, and was probably rather strengthened than injured by this rash and idle attempt to overthrow it. But the present leaders of the victorious party were men who have left behind them a purer character than most of their countrymen; and Catulus has the rare merit of sullying his triumph with no cruelties,§ and of remaining content with the suppression of the rebellion, without endeavouring to add any thing further to the powers and advantages of his friends, or to the depression of his antagonists.

From U. C. 666. — A. C. 88. to U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

U. C. 677. — A. C. 77.

* Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. iii. c. 91.
† Appian, c. 105.
‡ Florus, lib. iii. c. 23. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. xc.
§ Appian, c. 107. Sallust, *Oratio L. Philippi contra Lepidum.*

* Sallust and Appian, *locis citatis.*
† Livy, *Epitome*, lib. xc. Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 16.
‡ Livy and Plutarch, *ubi supra.*
§ Florus, lib. iii. c. 23.

CAIUS JULIUS CÆSAR.

PART I.

CONTAINING A VIEW OF THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE,

FROM U. C. 676. A. C. 78. TO U. C. 695. A. C. 59.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

THE nobility of the Julian family was so ancient and so illustrious, that even after it obtained the Imperial dignity, it needed not the exaggeration of flatterers to exalt it. Within thirty years after the commencement of the Republic we find the name of C. Julius on the list of Consuls; and the same person, or a relation of the same name, is said to have been one of the Decemviri, by whom the laws of the Twelve Tables were compiled. During the Punic wars, and the whole of the sixth century of Rome, the family produced indeed no individuals of distinguished character; but there is a Sex. Julius Cæsar among the Prætors of the year 544, a L. Julius among those of the year 569, and a Sextus Julius, who appears as Consul in 596, seven years before the third Punic war. In the seventh century, we have already had occasion to mention three of the Cæsars; namely, Sextus Julius Cæsar, who was Consul with L. Philippus, A. U. C. 662, during the famous year of the Tribuneship of Drusus, L. Julius Cæsar, who was Consul in the year following, who distinguished himself in the Italian war by a great victory over the Samnites, and who was afterwards murdered by the order of Marius, and C. Julius Cæsar, the brother of Lucius, eminent as an orator for his wit and pleasantry, whose irregular offer of himself for the Consulship in 665 first led P. Sulpicius to act the part of a popular Tribune in opposing him, and who perished, together with his brother, when Marius and Cinna first usurped the Government. But the individual to whom the name of Cæsar owes its renown with posterity, was cousin in the second degree to these two brothers, and nephew to Sex. Cæsar, the colleague of L. Philippus in the Consulship. His father was C. Julius Cæsar, a man of Prætorian rank, and who is recorded by Pliny as a remarkable instance of sudden death;* he having expired suddenly one morning at Pisa, while dressing himself. C. Cæsar married Aurelia,† of the family of Aurelius Cotta; and of these parents was born the famous Caius Julius Cæsar, about the year of Rome 653, in the Consulship of C. Marius and L. Valerius Flaccus.

The Julian family.

Of the early life of Cæsar.

Some of the incidents of his early life, his marriage with the daughter of Cinna, and his narrow escape from the proscription of Sylla, have been already related. But although there are numerous anecdotes to be found of him in the stories of his two biographers, Suetonius and Plutarch, yet the authority of both these writers is so low, and their accounts are at such variance with one another, that it is useless to repeat that which we have such imperfect grounds for believing. Without pretending to arrange the order of the several events, it will be enough to say, that he commenced his military service at an early age in Asia, and was present at the reduction of Mitylene,* the only town which remained in arms against Rome after the end of the first war with Mithridates. He studied eloquence for some time at Rhodes,† under Apollonius Molo; from whom Cicero about the same period was also receiving instructions. On one occasion he was taken by some of those Pirates, who were then so formidable on all the coasts of Greece‡ and Asia, and was detained by them till he collected from some of the neighbouring cities fifty talents for his ransom. No sooner was he released than he procured a small naval force, and set out on his own sole authority in pursuit of the pirates. He overtook them and took some of their vessels, which he brought back to the coast of Asia with a number of prisoners. He then sent word of his success to the Proconsul of Asia, requesting him to order the execution of the captives; but that officer being more inclined to have them sold for slaves, Cæsar crucified them all without loss of time, before the Proconsul's pleasure was officially known. Such conduct was not likely to recommend him to those in authority; and we are told, that on several other occasions he wished to act for himself,§ and even to take part in the war which was now renewed with Mithridates, without any commission from the Government, and without submitting himself to any of the regular officers of the Republic. These early instances of his lawless spirit are recorded with admiration by some of his historians, as affording proofs of vigour and greatness of mind.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

He first brought himself into notice at Rome by bringing a charge of corruption in his Province against Cn. Dolabella,‖ who had been Consul with M. Tullius Decula, under the Dictatorship of Sylla, and had since been appointed to the Province of Macedonia, and had obtained a Triumph for some victories over the neighbouring barbarians. Dolabella, however, was defended by Cotta and Hortensius, two of the most famous orators of that period, and was acquitted. Whatever may have been the merits of this case, Cæsar probably was glad to seize any opportunity of annoying the partisans of Sylla; and even in his early youth he made no secret of his enmity to the Aristocratical party, and obtained the credit of boldly supporting the weaker cause, by an ostentation of his regard for

His first public appearance at Rome, where he espouses the popular party.

* Pliny, *Histor. Natur.* lib. vii. c. 53.
† Suetonius, *in C. Jul. Cæsare*, c. 74.

* Suetonius, ibid. c. 2. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxxxix.
† Suetonius, c. 4. Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 91.
‡ Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 67. Suetonius, c. 4.
§ Ibid. c. 67. Ibid. c. 4.
‖ Suetonius, c. 4. Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 92.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

the memory of Marius and Cinna. He lost during his Quæstorship both his own wife,* Cornelia, the daughter of Cinna, and his aunt Julia, who had been the wife of the elder Marius. He pronounced an oration in honour of each of them; and, at the funeral of his aunt, he ordered that the images of her husband Marius should be exhibited amongst those of her other deceased relations and ancestors; which, according to the custom of the Romans, were always carried in the procession on such occasions. Marius having been adjudged a traitor, the sight of his statues produced a great surprise among the people; and the lower populace, looking upon them as a pledge of the revival of the popular party, welcomed them as they passed with the loudest acclamations. But, whilst Cæsar was thus giving tokens of the danger which the Aristocracy had to apprehend from his political career, he almost lulled their fears by the unbounded infamy of his personal character. We will not and cannot repeat the picture which ancient writers,† little scrupulous on such points, have drawn of his debaucheries: it will be sufficient to say, that he was stained with numerous adulteries committed with women of the noblest families; that his profligacies in other points drew upon him general disgrace, even amidst the lax morality of his own contemporaries, and are such that their very flagitiousness has in part saved them from the abhorrence of posterity, because modern writers cannot pollute their pages with the mention of them.

State of the Roman Empire about the year 681, B.C. 73.

With such an outline of the family and the early life of C. Cæsar, we shall close his personal history for the present. According to the plan which we have pursued on former occasions, we shall attempt to describe the state of the Roman Empire immediately before that period at which his ambition openly aspired to enslave it; and we trust to be forgiven, if we sacrifice to this object some details of particular facts, which are either little worthy of attention, or, from their great notoriety, are already familiar to every reader.

If a merchant of Alexandria had traversed the Mediterranean in the year of Rome 680; if he had been bound in the first instance to Spain; if thence he had been led by circumstances to visit the coasts of Italy, and to pass a short time at Rome itself; if then, while pursuing his voyage homewards, he had met with the fate which at that period was most likely to befall him, that of falling into the hands of Pirates; and finally, if he had touched at some places on the coasts of Greece and Asia Minor, while his captors were returning with their prize to their strongholds in Cilicia; and if, having effected his ransom, he had at last been happy enough to reach Egypt in safety, and had there recorded the story of his eventful voyage, and of the various scenes which he had witnessed; with what delight should we have welcomed such a treasure, and how thankful should we feel to that African traveller whose researches should procure for us so valuable a fund of information. The thought indeed of the knowledge of antiquity which we desire, is enough to make us discontented with that which we possess. But in imagining the case of the Egyptian merchant, our object is to bring before our readers at one view the state of the different extremities of the Mediterranean; and to enable them to judge of the condition of the times, by describing the scenes which would have presented themselves to the eyes of an individual, in whatever quarter of the Roman Empire his fortune might have placed him.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695 — A. C. 59.

If a trading vessel had approached the more southern parts of Spain, she might have found every thing tranquil; but if her course had been directed towards the mouths of the Sucro or the Ebro, she would have probably been stopped by the light cruisers of Sertorius,* which covered the whole coast, in order to intercept any supplies coming by sea for the armies of Pompey and Metellus. On shore the country was suffering under the miseries of a long and dubious warfare. We have already slightly mentioned the beginnings of Sertorius's career, and we shall have occasion to speak of him hereafter more at length. He had at first been opposed in Spain by Q. Metellus Pius; but, when that officer was found unable to bring the war to a conclusion, and Sertorius had been greatly reinforced by the troops which had followed Lepidus in his attempt to revive the popular cause, and which after his defeat M. Perpenna had led into Spain,† the Senate deemed it necessary to intrust the command to a General of the highest reputation, and accordingly fixed their choice upon Pompey. Sertorius, however, withstood the united efforts of his two antagonists with great ability and success: he availed himself of the activity and ingenuity of the Spaniards, who were warmly attached to him, and who became most excellent soldiers, when they had received from him some portion of discipline and military skill in addition to their natural excellences. The war, which had begun before the death of Sylla, was still in the year 680 maintained with unabated vigour; nor was it terminated till two years afterwards; when, Sertorius having been assassinated by some of his officers, who were jealous of his talents, but very unable to supply his place, Pompey obtained an easy victory, reduced the whole of Spain to a state of obedience, and returned to Rome to enjoy the honours of a Triumph, and to enter upon the office of Consul. In the mean time we find that his army,‡ for a considerable portion of the time that it had served in Spain, was very irregularly paid, and was obliged to support itself at the expense of the country which was the seat of war. This was also the case with the army of Sertorius; so that the whole north-east of Spain, as may readily be imagined, was reduced to a state of the greatest poverty and desolation.

Of Spain.

U. C. 682

Pursuing a coasting navigation from Spain towards Italy, a vessel would naturally stop at some of the ports of the Province of Gaul. It appears that the Gauls on both sides of the Alps had taken up arms in the cause of Lepidus; and Pompey, when marching into Spain, had inflicted on them a severe chastisement,§ and had expelled many of the Transalpine Gauls in particular from their cities and territories. During the war with Sertorius, the Province of Gaul was obliged to contribute largely to the necessities of the Roman armies; and both Metellus and Pompey, on two several occasions, wintered there,‖ when the

Of Gaul.

* Suetonius, c. 6. Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 5.
† Suetonius, c. 49, *et seq. et Auctores ibi citati.*

* Plutarch, *in Sertorio*, c. 21. Strabo, lib. iii. p. 167. edit. Xyland.
† Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 108.
‡ *Epistola Cn. Pompeii, apud Fragm.* Sallust.
§ Cicero, *pro Fonteio*, c. 2. *pro Lege Manilia*, c. 10.
‖ *Epistola Cn. Pompeii, apud* Sallust. Cicero, *pro Fonteio*, c. 3.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

country to the south of the Pyrenees was too much exhausted to maintain them. Manius Fonteius was about this time Governor of the Province, and he made himself very odious to the natives, not only by the rigour with which he exacted supplies of horses, corn, and money, for the troops in Spain, but by the duties which he levied on their wines,* and, as they alleged, by the partial and corrupt manner in which he demanded their services in making roads.† Fonteius was afterwards brought to trial at Rome for his conduct in his Province; and while Cicero, in his defence of him, denies strongly the charge of corruption, he admits the severity, or as he calls it, the vigour, with which he maintained the authority of Rome amongst a people always turbulent and disaffected, and who were so lately in open rebellion.

Of Italy.

From Gaul a short passage would transport the voyager to the mouth of the Tiber, and would place him amongst all the various rumours, and interests, and speculations which abound in the seat of Government of a great Empire. At the period of which we are now speaking, he would have found the public attention seriously excited by an insurrection of gladiators, which had broken out a short time before.

Insurrection of the gladiators under Spartacus.

About seventy persons of this class,‡ mostly natives of Gaul and Thrace, who had been either taken prisoners in war, or carried off by slave-traders from their own country, had effected their escape from the place where they were kept in training at Capua. Having fallen in with some waggons on the road, which were carrying a quantity of arms for the use of the gladiators in a neighbouring city, they seized the whole supply, and retired to Mount Vesuvius, as to a port which they might maintain with advantage. Here they chose three leaders, Spartacus, Crixus, and Ænomaus; and having repulsed the first attempts which were made to reduce them, their numbers were rapidly swelled by the concourse of fugitive slaves from all quarters, and by many of the poorest class of freemen, who were allured by the prospect of plunder. They were attacked by a regular force commanded by a Roman Prætor; and having completely defeated it, they quitted their asylum of Mount Vesuvius, and receiving daily large additions to their numbers, they plundered several of the principal cities in Campania, intending, when satiated with plunder, to march towards the Alps, and thus to effect their escape in safety to their own countries, carrying with them the spoils of Italy.

State of parties in Rome.

An intelligent and curious traveller would naturally have wished to gain some insight into the state of parties in the Capital, and into the views and feelings of the people with respect to public affairs. Five years had elapsed since the death of Sylla, and the laws which he had enacted were still almost wholly in force, and the depression of the popular interest was consequently almost the same as after his victory. Since the defeat of Lepidus, one or two Tribunes had attempted to restore their office to its former powers and dignities; but their efforts had been ineffectual, and one of them, Cn Sicinius, is said to have lost his life through the violence of his opponents.§ C. Cotta, however, who was Consul in the year 678, finding the people in a condition of great distress, owing to the disturbed state of many of the Provinces which used to supply the Capital with corn, and to the extensive depredations committed by the Cilician pirates, deemed it expedient to try some means of conciliating them. Accordingly he procured the repeal of that law of Sylla,* by which those who had been Tribunes of the people had been declared ineligible to any of the higher magistracies; and he was empowered by the Senate to sell the tithes of wine and oil, which the Sicilians always paid in kind,† not in Sicily, as had hitherto been the practice, but at Rome, in order somewhat to lower the price of provisions in the Roman markets. A certain distribution of corn was also made among the poorer citizens,‡ by which each man received five pecks at a very low price. But these were only temporary experiments; and we find C. Macer Licinius, one of the Tribunes for the year 680, lamenting the humbled and dispirited state of the people, who, so soon as they left the forum, forgot all their political interests, and were desirous only of gaining undisturbed a subsistence for themselves and their families. These are the circumstances which are above all others most unfavourable to the cause of true Liberty; and they are the natural result of bloody civil dissensions, which generally leave behind them a disgust for political business, attended with a large portion of individual distress. In order to rouse the people from their apathy, the popular leaders are then tempted to employ stimulants of the most violent nature; to exaggerate the public grievances, and to misrepresent and traduce the party of their antagonists, thinking that nothing less than an excessive indignation can repair the evils of an excessive indifference. At Rome, however, during the period of which we are now speaking, the moderation and the popular virtues of many of the principal individuals of the Aristocracy obviated in a great measure the mischief of these invectives. The people were taught to feel their own power, and to exercise it; but they respected the Senate, and continued for some time to submit to its regulated influence and authority; till the efforts of some worthless individuals again excited jealousies and dissensions: in the course of which, the Senate and the people were opposed to one another in a quarrel which was not their own; and a war, in which no national nor public interests were properly involved, enabled one profligate adventurer to overturn the whole Constitution, and to overwhelm all ranks of the Commonwealth together under his own despotism.

U. C. 678.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

Origin and progress of the Pirates of Cilicia.

We have said that a merchant vessel, bound from Rome to the eastern part of the Mediterranean in the year 680, would, in all probability, have fallen into the power of some of the Pirates by whom the sea was at this time infested. At no other period in the history of the world has Piracy been carried to such a formidable height; and even the exploits of the famous Buccaneers in America are less wonderful, when we consider that the Pirates of Asia did not confine their ravages to a distant quarter of the Roman Empire, where the arm of the Government would necessarily

* Cicero, *pro Fonteio*, c. 5. † Ibid. c. 4.
‡ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. xcv. Plutarch, *in Crasso*, c. 8. Appian, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. i. c. 116.
§ *Oratio C. Licinii Macri, apud Fragm.* Sallust.

* Asconius, *in Ciceron. pro Cornelio Oration.* 1.
† Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. iii. c. 7.
‡ *Oratio C. Macri, apud Fragm.* Sallust.

act with less vigour, but that they insulted and annoyed the neighbourhood of the Capital itself. We possess only imperfect accounts of their origin; but we learn that in the wars between Greece and Persia,* the Cilicians usually formed a considerable part of the King's navies, and that the nature of their country disposed them to maritime affairs. The chain of Mount Taurus,† in its course from the western coast of Asia Minor, approaches nearly to the Mediterranean, towards the south-eastern extremity of the Peninsula; leaving between itself and the sea a district of unequal breadth and dissimilar character, which was divided into two parts, the mountainous and the plain Cilicia. Of these, the mountainous Cilicia presented a number of strongholds, built on high and steep cliffs overhanging the sea, and each, for the most part, commanding either a small harbour, or a smooth and sheltered beach, which, for the purposes of ancient navigation, was hardly less convenient. With these facilities of access to the sea, and of escape from its violence or from the pursuit of an enemy, were combined the advantages of an inexhaustible store of timber in the cedar forests of Taurus, and the stimulus afforded by the natural poverty of a mountain region, which inclined its inhabitants to a life of plunder. A people of this description can only be civilized by the systematic efforts of a powerful Government; but the Cilicians had first been included in the Empire of Persia, and after the conquests and early death of Alexander, they formed a part of the Kingdom of Syria. But neither the Kings of Persia nor of Syria were likely to employ themselves in civilising their barbarian subjects; and the character and habits of the Cilicians remained unchanged, till, in the seventh century of Rome, the increasing weakness and the constant family dissensions of their Sovereigns enabled them to indulge their inclinations with less restraint. The chiefs of the several strongholds along the coast, despising the authority of the Syrian Government,‡ commenced a system of plunder; and the circumstances of the times determined them to follow peculiarly the occupation of man-stealers. The demand for slaves among the great land proprietors of Italy so far exceeded the occasional supply produced by the conquests of the Republic, that the slave-trade was become a most lucrative branch of commerce; and the Cilicians, being bold and able seamen, carried it on with success, by making descents on various parts of the neighbouring coast, and surprising the persons of the inhabitants. They then carried their captives to Delos, which was so great a mart for this traffic, that many thousands of slaves might be landed there, sold, and exported again on the same day. Doubtless the well-known horrors of the "middle passage" were experienced often by the unhappy wretches who were crowded together in narrow vessels, built far more for swiftness than for the reception of passengers, and who were exposed to the cruelty and merciless avarice of a crew of barbarian Pirates; whilst they themselves would frequently be persons of some fortune and education, torn away, with their wives and children, from the enjoyment of all the comforts of civilized life. Nor did the neighbouring states of Cyprus and Egypt attempt to prevent these atrocities; but they are said to have witnessed them with pleasure through jealousy of the Syrians, who were the chief sufferers. But both they who neglected to crush the evil, and the Romans, who had first given occasion to it, began soon to feel its effects themselves. Gain and impunity encouraged the Pirates to extend their robberies: property and merchandise of every kind, and belonging to every nation, were attacked without scruple; insomuch, that the Romans were obliged to notice these Piracies as early as the year 651, and M. Antonius the Orator, who was then Prætor, received Cilicia as his Province,* and there obtained some victories, which were held sufficient to entitle him to the honour of the smaller Triumph or Ovation. The war with Mithridates followed in about fourteen years; and during that war the Cilician Pirates offered their services to the King of Pontus against the Romans,† and infested the Ægean so much with their light squadrons, that Sylla often felt considerable annoyance from them. But after the regular war was at an end, the Pirates became more formidable than ever: they were joined by many individuals who had been ruined during the late contest; and now no longer wearing the semblance of auxiliaries to a regular Government, they extended their cruises to all parts of the Mediterranean; and not only made partial descents, but attacked and often made themselves masters of fortified towns situated on the coast. Under these circumstances, P. Servilius Vatia, who had been Consul in the year 674, was in the year following sent to repress the Pirates;‡ and he appears to have held the command during some years, in the course of which he defeated them at sea, and also stormed so many of their fortresses in Pamphylia and the neighbouring country of Isauria, that he received the surname of *Isauricus*, and was considered to have put an end altogether to the evil. These hopes, however, were soon disappointed. The trade of Piracy had been found so profitable, that many others of the maritime States of Asia Minor were engaged in it as well as the Cilicians;§ and no partial losses could put a stop to a system carried on on so extensive a scale. A more vigorous attempt to repress it had been made indeed about the year 678, when M. Antonius, the son of the Orator, and father of the Triumvir, received an extraordinary command,‖ extending over all the sea coasts of the Mediterranean, that he might be enabled to check the enemy at once in every quarter. But Antonius seems to have distinguished himself by nothing but his oppression and his exactions from the allies of Rome, and his injustice towards neutral States: and the conduct of his subordinate officers greatly resembled his own. The robberies of the Pirates continued unabated, and the behaviour of the Roman commanders only added to the general misery. It is, however, by some particular facts that we may best convey a notion of the extent of the public losses and dishonour. In the year 680, the notorious C. Verres

* Herodotus, *Polymn.* c. 91. *Urania*, c. 68, Thucydides, lib. i. c. 112.

† Strabo, lib. xiv. p. 766, *et seq.* edit. Xyland.

‡ Ibid.

* Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. i. c. 19. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. 68.

† Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 24. Appian, *de Bell. Mithridat.* c. 92.

‡ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 3. Strabo, lib. xii. p. 668. edit. Xyland.

§ Appian, *de Bell. Mithridat.* c. 92.

‖ Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. ii. c. 3. lib. iii. c. 91.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59

was appointed to command the Province of Sicily as Proprætor; and during his administration, a Piratical chief named Heracleo,* with a light squadron of four vessels, appeared on the coasts of the island, defeated and burnt an ill-provided fleet which had attempted to oppose him, and entered in a bravado into the very harbour of Syracuse, which, having surveyed at his leisure, he again put to sea without molestation. The communication between Italy and Greece was intercepted during the whole summer;† several officers going abroad, with commissions from the Senate, on the public service, were taken, and released for a ransom; and two Prætors, with their lictors, while going abroad to take the command of their provinces, fell into the hands of the Pirates. Descents were made on both coasts of Italy; the harbour of Caieta, which was full of Roman vessels, was entered before the eyes of a Roman Prætor, and every thing in it was taken or destroyed; the children of M. Antonius the Orator, at the very time, apparently, that their brother was commanding against the Pirates, were carried off from the house of their family at Misenum, and were ransomed for a large sum of money. Nay, the mouth of the Tiber itself was not secure from insult; and a fleet, which one of the Consuls had been appointed to command, was surprised and taken at Ostia, within twenty miles of Rome. While such were the affronts sustained so near the seat of Government itself, it will excite no surprise to hear that Cnidus, Samos, and Colophon, with four hundred other cities, were taken at different times by this daring enemy;‡ and that some of the most famous and richest Temples, those of Juno at Samos, at Argos, and at Lacinium in Italy; those of Apollo at Leucas and Actium; those of Neptune at the Isthmus of Corinth and at Tænarus; and that of Ceres and Proserpine in Samothrace were violated and ransacked. The revenues and the commerce of Rome were alike intercepted or suspended; and the power of the Republic was, for a while, baffled or despised by an enemy, without a country and without a government, who possessed no other resources than the plunder which they had acquired by their Piracies.

Oppression of Roman Governors in the Provinces.

In describing the progress of the Pirates, we have anticipated the mention of the scenes which would have presented themselves to the eyes of a voyager in the seas and on the coasts of Greece and Asia Minor. If any accident had led him to visit the interior of those countries, he would have found the violences of the Pirates almost equalled by the tyranny of the Roman Governors and officers. It appears that, for several years after the triumph of the Aristocratical party under Sylla, the crimes of the Roman Magistrates and Generals, and the excesses which their examples encouraged their soldiers to commit, were unusually great;§ and that the corrupt state of the tribunals at Rome, where the judicial power was vested entirely in the hands of Senators, ensured a frequent impunity to such offenders. When Cicero accused Verres, in the year 683, he did not hesitate to declare, that it was the wish of the Provinces that the laws against the maladministration of Roman officers might be repealed;* for, whilst they existed, corrupt Governors increased their extortions, that they might have wherewithal to reward their advocates and to bribe their Judges, in case they should be brought to trial; and the most respectable of the Romans, and the warmest supporters of the cause of the Nobility, Q. Catulus and Cn. Pompey, confessed and deplored the truth of this statement. History has preserved to us the names of Cn. Dolabella, who was tried for his misgovernment of Macedonia; of another Cn. Dolabella, who was accused of corruption and cruelty in Cilicia;† of M. Antonius, who has been already mentioned as infamous for his general misconduct in the extensive command which had been intrusted to him; of his brother C. Antonius, who was brought to trial for his exactions in Greece;‡ of Q. Calidius, who was charged with oppression in Spain;§ of Manius Fonteius, whom Cicero defended against the complaints of the Gauls; and above all, of C. Verres, who for three years practised every kind of cruelty and corruption in Sicily. Besides these were officers, who are charged with no personal corruption, yet whose conduct towards foreign States was harsh and unjust. P. Servilius has been already mentioned as having gained several victories over the Pirates in Pamphylia and Isauria. Amongst other places, they had occupied Olympus, a city of Lycia; and Servilius besieged and took the town from them. The Lycians, to whom it of right belonged, had carefully abstained from imitating the example of their neighbours,‖ and had taken no part in the depredations of the Pirates; yet the ornaments of the city were carried off as spoils to Rome, and the people of Olympus were deprived of a portion of their territory.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C 59.

A Gaulish chief, while exhorting his countrymen to maintain their independence against the arms of Rome, is represented by Cæsar as describing, in two words, the degraded condition of that part of Gaul which was already a Roman Province.¶ He called it "*subjecta securibus*," "subject to the lictor's axe:" and although the last extremities of tyranny might have been comparatively rare, yet, in fact, the lives of the Provincials were subject to the arbitrary will of the Governors, without any immediate protection, and too often with only a feeble prospect of retribution upon their oppressor. When Verres was in Asia,** as Quæstor to Cn. Dolabella, he was sent by him on a mission to Nicomedes King of Bithynia, and on his way he passed through Lampsacus. He was there informed that Philodamus, one of the principal citizens, had an unmarried daughter of extraordinary beauty; and in order to effect the infamous design which he instantly entertained, he caused one of his creatures to be lodged at the house of Philodamus. This man, whose name was Rubrius, was entertained with the greatest hospitality, and was desired to name the persons whom he wished to form the company; Philodamus sending even his own son to sup at the

* Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. v. c. 34, 35. 37.
† Ibid. *pro Lege Manilià*, c. 11, 12.
‡ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 24.
§ Cicero, *pro Lege Manilià*, c. 13. 22.

* Cicero, *in Verrem*, actio i. c. 14, 15.
† Ibid. lib. i. c. 38.
‡ Q. Cicero, *de Petitione Consulatûs*, c. 2.
§ Cicero, *in Verrem*, act. i. c. 13. lib. iii. c. 25. *et* Asconius, *in* act. i. *in Verrem*.
‖ Strabo, lib. xiv. p. 762. edit. Xyland. Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 21. *de Lege Agrar.* i. c. 2.
¶ *De Bello Gallico*, lib. vii. c. 71.
** Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 24, *et seq.*

house of a friend, that he might have room for a greater number of Roman officers. Towards the close of the evening, Rubrius called upon Philodamus to introduce his daughter to their party; a proposal which, according to the manners of the Greeks, was one of the utmost insult and indelicacy. The father refused, and his guests, assisted by their slaves and by some of the lictors of Verres, proceeded to assault him in his own house, and to threaten the honour of his daughter. He contrived to inform his son of his danger, and the young man instantly flew to the house, followed by a crowd of the people of Lampsacus, who were roused by the report of so gross an outrage. In the scuffle that ensued, Rubrius and some of his slaves were wounded and a lictor was killed; and on the next day, when it was known who was the original author of the attempt, the people crowded to the house where Verres lodged, and were with difficulty prevented from exercising on him a summary vengeance. He escaped, however, and Philodamus and his son were brought to trial before C. Nero, the Governor of the Province of Asia, for the death of the lictor. At the earnest request of Verres, Dolabella left his own Province of Cilicia to assist at the trial; Verres himself was present also; and he and Dolabella used all their influence, both by vehemence and supplication, to procure the condemnation of the prisoners. Nero, a weak and timid man, yielded to their instances, and Philodamus and his son were beheaded in the market place of Lampsacus. Dolabella was afterwards accused, as we have seen, of corruption in his own Province, and was condemned to exile, which he underwent; but Verres was elected Prætor, and exercised jurisdiction both in Rome and in Sicily; nor was he ever questioned for his conduct at Lampsacus, till after the perpetration of numberless additional crimes, when Cicero, his accuser, mentioned this early enormity as preparatory to the series of his greater and more recent offences. Nero, it should be observed, by whose sentence Philodamus and his son were put to death, was never brought to trial at all. It is not possible that actions so dreadful as this should have been of very frequent occurrence; still the circumstances which we have related were far from singular; and every Province in the Empire could probably at some time have produced instances of equal, or even of greater, enormity. But that one such act should have been committed with impunity, shews how wretched was the condition of those countries that were subject to the yoke of the Roman Government.

Conclusion of the war with the gladiators.

In tracing the course of events from the year 680 to 690, the only wars which will here demand our attention are those with Spartacus and with the Pirates. The beginnings of both have been already noticed; and we have seen that in the year 680 Spartacus was carrying devastation over some of the finest districts of Italy. In the following year a part of his forces was destroyed by Q. Arrius, one of the Prætors;* but he himself, intending to carry into execution his plan of escaping over the Alps into Germany, was encountered by Cn. Lentulus, one of the Consuls, and gained a complete victory over him; after which he engaged and defeated another army, commanded by the other Consul, L. Gellius, and the lately victorious Prætor, Q. Arrius. All obstacles to his march being thus removed, he continued his course as far as Cisalpine Gaul; where he found himself again opposed by a third army, under the command of C. Cassius, one of the Consuls of the former year, and Cn. Manlius, one of the Prætors. He attacked this new enemy near Mutina, and gained a third complete victory; but it appears that these repeated successes intoxicated him or his followers, and instead of continuing their march to the Alps, which they might have effected with perfect safety, they returned towards the south, dazzled by fantastic hopes of the conquest and plunder of Rome itself. But finding, probably, that any attempt upon the Capital was impracticable, Spartacus passed the winter without venturing on any exploit of importance, maintaining his soldiers, we may suppose, upon the plunder of the country. Dissensions, meanwhile, crept in amongst his followers, which proved his ruin. The Gauls and Germans still wished to return to their own country,* and finding that they could not prevail on the majority of the army to join them, they separated from Spartacus, and commenced their march to the northward by themselves. The Senate, on their part, had committed the conduct of the war to M. Crassus, who was the Prætor; and the new General, according to the practice which we have before noticed among the Roman commanders after a series of disasters, began his career by severe executions upon the soldiers of the defeated armies; and having thus taught them to dread him more than the enemy, he first assaulted the division of the Gauls and Germans, and put the greatest part of them to the sword. He then engaged with the main army under Spartacus, and having won a second victory, obliged him to retreat to the southern extremity of Italy. It was the wish of the gladiators to effect their passage into Sicily, in the hope of reviving the insurrections of the slaves, which had raged with such violence in that island not many years before. To accomplish their purpose, they entered into a treaty with some of the Cilician Pirates, who chanced to be cruising in the neighbourhood; but the Pirates are said to have first secured the money for their transport,† and then to have sailed away without fulfilling their part of the engagement. Spartacus then endeavoured to construct rafts on the Italian shore;‡ but the active pursuit of Crassus rendered this impracticable, and he was soon blockaded in a small peninsula near Rhegium, in which he had taken refuge. He effected his escape, however, by passing unobserved, in a dark and stormy night, through the enemy's lines, and with the troops that still remained to him, he directed his march towards the mountains of Petilia in Lucania.§ Here the tidings of the return of Pompey from Spain, made both Crassus and Spartacus anxious to risk a battle before that dreaded General could take a part in the contest. Accordingly a desperate action ensued, in which Spartacus was defeated and slain, and his army dispersed or destroyed; but Pompey laid a claim to a share in the victory, because he fell in with some parties

U. C. 682.

U. C. 681.

* Livy, *Epitom.* lib. xcvi. Plutarch, *in Crasso*, c. 9. Florus, lib. iii. c. 20.

* Livy, *Epitom.* lib. xcvii. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 118.
† Plutarch, *in Crasso*, c. 10.
‡ Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. v. c. 2.
§ Plutarch, *in Crasso*, c. 11. Appian, lib. i. c. 120.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

of fugitives who had escaped from the battle, and cut them to pieces. A considerable number of prisoners were taken, who were crucified along the road from Rome to Capua, and their bodies extended at intervals along the whole of the distance.

The war with the Pirates was not concluded till four years afterwards; and some events occurred in the intervening period, which will require our notice. Pompey, although we have so often had occasion to mention his name, had as yet held no public magistracy, and was therefore precluded, by one of Sylla's laws, from offering himself as a candidate for the Consulship. But the extraordinary circumstances attending his career, and the services he had rendered to the Aristocratical party on so many occasions, disposed the Senate to regard him with unusual favour; while, on the other hand, he had always possessed the affection of the people, who seem to have excepted him from the general aversion which they entertained towards the partisans of Sylla. At this time his return from Spain was looked forward to by the popular party with an anxious hope that he would become their leader, and enable them to repeal some of those laws which, as they thought, had so greatly encroached upon their liberties. Their chief wish was for the complete restoration of the Tribunitian power; not only for its own sake, but as preparatory to effecting a reform in the constitution of the Courts of Justice.* The natural feelings of the people at large were shocked by the long series of crimes which their officers were continually committing in the Provinces with impunity; and so long as the Judges were taken only from among the men who had enjoyed or were expecting to succeed to the commands in which these excesses were perpetrated, it was not likely that the evil would be effectually remedied. Looking then upon Pompey as on a young man of popular qualities, who would be glad to acquire a claim to the lasting gratitude of the majority of his countrymen, the people welcomed his appearance with joy; and a decree of the Senate being passed,† allowing him to be a candidate for the Consulship, although he had not held the previous offices of Quæstor and Prætor, he was elected Consul, together with M. Licinius Crassus, who had distinguished himself by his recent victory over the gladiators. Pompey did not disappoint the hopes which were formed of him. After his election,‡ when he made his first speech to the people before entering on his office, he promised to restore the Tribunitian power, and to endeavour to remedy the grievances of the Provinces, and the corrupt state of the Courts of Justice. His first declaration was received with murmurs of delight; but when he spoke of reforming the Courts of Justice, he was interrupted by a loud and general shout of applause. Accordingly his Consulship is memorable for the repeal of Sylla's laws respecting the Tribuneship,§ and the restoration of that office to its original privileges; and also for the law of L. Aurelius Cotta, one of the Prætors, which was passed with the sanction of Pompey, and which provided that the Judges should hereafter be chosen partly from among the Senators, partly from the Equestrian order, and partly from the Tribuni Ærarii.* These last, as far as appears, were plebeians, possessed of a certain property,† and on that account were appointed to act as agents for the payment of the legions; it being their office to receive the money for that purpose from the Quæstors of the city, and to negociate the business of transmitting it to the Provincial Quæstors, that it might by them be issued to the troops. The object of the law in adding this additional class to those of the Senate and the Knights, was to establish the Courts of Justice on a less exclusive system than before, while it endeavoured to obviate the evil of corruption amongst the Judges, by providing that they should only be chosen from among men of competent fortune. At the conclusion of the year, which had been marked by such welcome acts, Pompey increased his popularity still more, by declaring that he would not accept the government of any Province;‡ and accordingly, when his Consulship was expired, he continued to reside at Rome as a private individual.

Consulship of Pompey and Crassus. U. C. 683.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

The extreme disorders of the times had filled men, according to the usual course of opinions, with the desire of seeing the arm of authority strengthened; and thus the Censorial power,§ which was, on many accounts justly obnoxious, and which had been discontinued since the beginning of the late civil wars, was now revived agreeably to the general wish of the people. It was exercised with great severity by the Censors, Cn. Lentulus and L. Gellius, who removed sixty-four persons from the lists of the Senate;‖ and probably gratified the public feeling by stigmatizing so large a portion of the Nobility. They are charged, indeed, with having listened too lightly to popular reports,¶ and with having affixed their censure on some characters without any sufficient knowledge of their demerits. Instances, too, occur of their disagreement with one another,** and of one of them disapproving and acting in opposition to the sentence of his colleague. But, on the whole, it is probable that the revival of the Censorship was beneficial; and faulty as were the old institutions of the Commonwealth, they were far better than the general lawlessness, and tyranny, and corruption, which had of late superseded them.

The Censorship revived after some years' discontinuance of it.

The evils of the Piratical war still continued; nor did the Consuls of the two following years do any thing effectual to remove them. We have seen that the experiment had been already tried of appointing one man, with supreme command, to act in every quarter of the Mediterranean; but the misconduct of the individual selected, M. Antonius, had disappointed the hopes which had been entertained of its success. There was, however, another person in the Commonwealth, whose personal character was likely to add weight to whatever authority was intrusted to him, whose high military talents fitted him to combat with the enemies of the State, while his integrity and humanity would protect and conciliate its subjects and allies. Accordingly, in the Consulship of C. Piso and

The war with the Pirates. U. C. 686.

* Cicero, *in Verrem*, actio I. c. 15.
† Ibid. *pro Lege Manilii*, c. 21.
‡ Ibid. *in Verrem*, actio i. c. 15.
§ Ibid. *de Legibus*, lib. iii. c. 11. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. xcvii.

* Asconius, *in Ciceronis pro Cornelio Oration.* i. Cicero, *ad Quintum Fratrem*, lib. ii. epist. vi. Cicero, *Philippica*, i. c. 8.
† *Facciolati Lexicon, in Voce "Tribunus."*
‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 55.
§ Cicero, *in Q. Cæcilium*, c. 3.
‖ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. xcviii.
¶ Cicero, *pro Cluentio*, c. 47. ** Ibid.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

Manius Acilius Glabrio, Aulus Gabinus,* one of the Tribunes, proposed to the people that the management of the war with the Pirates should be committed to a single person for the term of three years; and that the power of the officer thus chosen, should extend over every part of the Empire, with authority to raise such supplies of men and money as he should think proper, and that he should have under him a certain number of lieutenants of Senatorian rank, nominated by the Senate. Gabinius was known to be a partisan of Pompey, and his character is said to have been bad: his own motives, therefore, in proposing this measure, may well be suspected; but the measure itself, if stript of some of its clauses, seems not to have been justly blamable. The people took it up with eagerness, and immediately fixed upon Pompey as the individual to be appointed to this extraordinary command. But the high Aristocratical party now began to pause in lavishing upon him unusual honours. His late conduct, during his Consulship, had shewn that he was not insensible to the welfare of the people at large, nor indifferent to the charms of popularity. He could not, therefore, be considered as an undoubted supporter of the Nobility on all occasions; and his personal renown seemed to raise him above their level. The motion of Gabinius was therefore generally opposed in the Senate, and especially by Q. Catulus and Q. Hortensius;† and the negative of two of the Tribunes, L. Trebellius and L. Roscius, was secured, according to the old practice of the Aristocracy, to stop the progress of the law. Both parties, as usual, had, at the very outset of the dispute, resorted to violence: the person of Gabinius, we are told, was threatened in the Senate, when he first announced there his intended law; and the mob, in return, beset the Senate-house, and having laid hold on C. Piso the Consul, were with difficulty persuaded by Gabinius to let him go without injury. But a more mischievous step was taken by the proposer of the measure, when he proceeded to imitate the conduct of Tiberius Gracchus,‡ and finding Trebellius obstinate in his opposition, submitted to the assembly the question of his degradation from his office. Trebellius, however, was less resolute than Octavius; and before the eighteenth tribe was called on to vote, he withdrew his negative upon the law. Yet the people listened with respect to Q. Catulus, when he, having been expressly called upon by Gabinius to deliver his sentiments, endeavoured, in manly and temperate language, to prove to them the mischiefs of the intended measure. That he should have prevailed, indeed, was not to be expected, but the Aristocracy disappointed any personal views which Gabinius might have had in procuring so extensive a command for Pompey; for although Pompey himself made application in his behalf, the Senate refused to insert the name of Gabinius amongst those of the fifteen lieutenants who were to act under his orders.§

Law of A. Gabinius, granting an extraordinary commission to Pompey.

Pompey reduces the Pirates to submission.

It was late in the year when the law of Gabinius was carried;‖ but Pompey employed the winter most diligently in making immense preparations for the war. He divided the care of the different parts of the Mediterranean among his several lieutenants; resolving himself to superintend their proceedings in every quarter, and to bestow his peculiar attention wherever it should be most needed. Before the winter was well ended, he put to sea, and deeming it important to open, as soon as possible, the communication between the Capital and those countries from which it was usually supplied with corn, he sailed first to Sicily, thence crossed over to Africa, and having carefully scoured the coasts there, he returned to Sardinia, stationing a sufficient fleet off the island, and strong guards on different points along the shore, as he had done in the two Provinces which he had previously visited. These operations were completed, according to Plutarch,* in less than six weeks; and he then returned to Italy, where he remained for a short time, disposing his forces for the protection of both coasts of that peninsula, and sending squadrons and land forces to secure the Provinces of Spain, Gaul, and Illyricum. The effect of all these measures was to hunt out the Pirates from all their haunts in the western quarters of the Mediterranean, and to drive them gradually back to the seat of their main power in Cilicia. Thither, accordingly, Pompey sailed in pursuit of them,† and expecting to meet with a long and obstinate resistance in the strongholds on that coast, he provided himself with every thing necessary for a succession of sieges. But the fame of his personal character went before him; and the vigour of his military operations, combined with the humanity which he had shewn to those of the Pirates who first fell into his hands, at once deterred the enemy from continuing to oppose him, and encouraged them to trust themselves to his mercy. On his arrival off the coasts of Cilicia, fortresses and ships were successively surrendered to him without a blow. Nor did he deceive the confidence thus reposed in him; but after receiving the submissions of the Pirates, after delivering the prisoners whom he found in their hands, and becoming master of all their resources, he took measures for reclaiming the inhabitants of those countries from that rude and wretched state of life which tempted them to robbery. The town of Soli, with some others in the neighbourhood,‡ had been lately deprived of their citizens by Tigranes King of Armenia, who had transplanted them into Upper Asia, to people his new Capital Tigranocerta. Into the towns thus deserted, Pompey brought some of the Pirates who had surrendered, and settled them in a situation where they might naturally be led to taste and to value the blessings of peace and civilisation; while he removed others into some of the districts in the interior,§ which, perhaps, their own incursions, on former occasions, had reduced to desolation, and placed them where the constant sight of the sea might not tempt them to resume their former occupation of Piracy. By this admirable conduct Pompey obtained a glory very different from that usually gained by Roman Generals; and in seven weeks from the time of his leaving Italy for the East,‖ he had cleared every

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

* Cicero, *pro Lege Manilii*, c. 18. Dion Cassius, lib. iii. p. 10. edit. Leunclavii.

† Cicero, *pro Lege Manilii*, c. 18. Dion Cassius, *ubi supra*. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii.

‡ Cicero, *pro Cornelio*, *et* Asconii *Commentarius*.

§ Ibid. *pro Lege Manilii*, c. 19. ‖ Ibid. c. 12.

* Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 26.

† Cicero, *pro Lege Manilii*, c. 12. Florus, lib. iii. c. 6. Appian, *de Bello Mithridatico*, c. 96.

‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxv. p. 2. lib. xxxvi. p. 18. Appian, c. 96.

§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 57.

‖ Cicero, *pro Lege Manilii*, c. 12.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

corner of the sea from the enemy, and had provided for the stability of his victory by those measures of wisdom and goodness which alone, in public as well as in private conduct, can permanently ensure a happy result.

War of Crete. Conquest of that island by Q. Metellus.

Whilst he was thus employed in Cilicia, he received a deputation from the people of Crete,* who were at this time attacked by Q. Metellus, a Roman Proconsul, and who, refusing to submit to him, were willing to trust themselves to the mercy of Pompey. It appears that M. Antonius,† amongst various other acts of injustice which had signalized his command, had commenced hostilities against the Cretans without any just provocation, from the mere ambition to conquer that famous island which had thus long preserved its independence. He failed, however, in his attempt, and had himself died whilst engaged in it. But the Romans, little solicitous about the origin of their wars, finding that one of their officers had engaged them in a quarrel with the Cretans, resolved to continue it; and Q. Metellus, who had been Consul in the year 684, was sent, after his Consulship, into Crete as his Province. He carried on his operations very successfully, and was looking forward to the speedy reduction of the whole island, when the Cretans, hearing of the extraordinary powers committed to Pompey, and of his merciful treatment of those whom he had conquered, sent a deputation to him in Pamphylia,‡ requesting him to receive their submission. Crete, with every other island in the Mediterranean, was included within the limits of Pompey's authority; he sent, therefore, to Metellus, desiring him to abstain from further hostilities, and at the same time despatched Octavius, an officer of his own, to receive the offered surrender. Metellus treated the message with contempt;§ and when Octavius threw himself into the town of Lappa, trusting that his character as a Roman officer would protect the inhabitants, Metellus besieged and took the place, and put the Cilicians, who formed the garrison, to death. Octavius then employed a part of the force under Pompey's command, which L. Sisenna, one of his lieutenants, had brought over from Greece, in defending some of the remaining cities of Crete against Metellus; but being too weak to act with effect in their behalf, he was obliged at last to quit the island, and Metellus then soon completed the conquest of every part of it. His conduct was marked with the usual cruelty of the Romans, embittered, in this instance, by personal irritation at the preference which the Cretans had shewn for Pompey. After the ordinary succession of executions and exactions,‖ Crete was reduced to the form of a Roman Province, and Metellus arranged the affairs of the island as he thought proper. But the dispute, which arose from his disobedience to Pompey's authority, was for some time an obstacle to his enjoying the honour of a Triumph; till some years afterwards the Senate, being more and more alienated from Pompey, thought proper to grant it.¶

* Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvi. p. 8.

† Florus, lib. iii. c. 7. Asconius, *in Ciceron. Divinat. in Cæcilium.*

‡ Cicero, *pro Lege Manilii*, c. 12.

§ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvi. p. 8.

‖ Florus, lib. iii. c. 7. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. c.

¶ The conduct of Pompey in this transaction is represented in a very different light by some modern writers, who have echoed the sentiments of Plutarch. They impute Pompey's behaviour to a mean desire of robbing Metellus of the glory of his conquest; and Plutarch dwells upon the extravagance of his actually supporting Pirates against the power that was employed in punishing them. It is probable, that his vanity was flattered by the preference which the Cretans shewed for him; but it is also likely that he, who was acting in Cilicia on such wise and merciful views, was eager to stop the cruelties of Metellus, and to give the Cretans, a people unjustly attacked by the Romans in the outset, the benefit of his own humane policy. Be this as it may, as Pompey's commission certainly extended to Crete, Metellus was guilty of an act of rebellion in resisting his authority, and became himself the robber and the outlaw, in persisting to attack places protected by a superior officer of his Government. It may be a question, whether it was owing to the mildness of Pompey's temper, or to the strength of the Aristocratical faction, that Metellus was never brought to trial and punished as he deserved for his disobedience.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvi. p. 18. edit. Leunclav.

† Cicero, *pro Cornelio*, i. *Fragm.*

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

In this part of the History of the internal state of Rome, we must again remind the reader of the necessary imperfection of our account. The varying objects pursued by parties and by individuals at different times, can only be explained by so full a knowledge of the circumstances and characters, as should either remove or account for that which apparently was inconsistent; and the same knowledge could alone enable us to judge correctly of the merits of several measures, which otherwise we might approve or condemn presumptously and erroneously. Such a knowledge, however, cannot now be obtained, and the conjectures by which we have endeavoured to supply it, we wish always to propose with a full consciousness of their uncertainty; for it may happen that some detached passage of an ancient author may have escaped our researches, which, had we known it, would have obliged us to alter, or to qualify, the theory which we had ventured to offer. With this caution we proceed to trace the disorders from which, henceforward, scarcely a year, during the existence of the Commonwealth, was exempt.

Tribuneship of C. Cornelius. U. C. 686.

Amongst the evils by which the State was beset, that of obtaining public offices by undue means was at this time severely felt.* Like many other grievances it was loudly complained of by the people, and some measure was called for that might remove or lessen it. C. Cornelius, who was one of the Tribunes for the year 686, resolved to take up the subject, and proposed to bring in a law which should punish all bribery or undue influence in elections in the severest manner. The Senate wishing the measure to proceed from themselves rather than from one of the Tribunes, directed C. Calpurnius Piso, who was then Consul, to prepare a law to the same effect with that of Cornelius, except that its penalties were somewhat less severe. Cornelius, on his side, regarded this interference of the Senate with jealousy and suspicion, and the people, in general, violently opposed the law of Piso;† as if its only object were to baffle and disappoint their wish for an effective check to the evil complained of. Some serious tumults appear to have arisen; and the Consul, provoked at the opposition with which he met, called upon every citizen, who was a wellwisher to his country, to assist in procuring the enactment of the law. This was deemed equivalent to summoning them to support the Consular authority by force, as was usual in cases of

extreme danger; but even this appeal failing of its effect, and the election for the ensuing year drawing on,* and being preceded by the usual scenes of violence and corruption during the canvass, the Senate, by their own sole authority, decreed that the law should be enacted, and voted a guard to the Consuls for the maintenance of the public peace. It had happened that Cornelius had been already disgusted with the conduct of the Senate on another occasion during his Tribuneship. The Provinces and Allies of the Commonwealth were in the habit of often sending deputies to Rome,† sometimes to compliment the officers who had exercised the Government amongst them, sometimes to complain of their tyranny, and sometimes to make interest among their friends at Rome to procure some measure which they deemed expedient for their country. It often happened that the deputies were detained at Rome for a considerable period; and in the want of those resources which modern commerce has devised to facilitate the obtaining money in foreign countries, they were obliged to borrow the sums they wanted of wealthy individuals, and could only procure them by engaging to pay an exorbitant interest. Many of the provincial cities were thus burdened with a debt; and their creditors were not unfrequently employed under the Proconsul or Prætor of the Province,‡ and were then ready to abet him in all his proceedings, in order to purchase the aid of his authority in recovering, by a summary process, the money that was due to them. The evils and the scandal of this system were equally great, and C. Cornelius had moved the Senate to repress them, by forbidding any Roman citizen to lend money to the deputies of foreign States or countries. But the Senate did not second his wishes; and this had already given him a handle for inveighing against that body in the assemblies of the people. When, therefore, they had again thwarted his projects of reform,§ by substituting a weaker measure in the place of his proposed law against bribery, he determined to attack one of the privileges which they had gradually usurped in later times, and which had degenerated into an abuse of a flagrant nature. This was no other than a power of dispensing with the laws in particular cases: such, for example, as that of Pompey, who had been allowed, by a decree of the Senate, to offer himself as a candidate for the Consulship before he had been Prætor or Quæstor, in direct violation of the existing laws. In former times these dispensations, after they had passed the Senate, had, in theory at least, if not in practice, required the sanction of the People to give them validity; but by degrees this sanction became so merely a form, that it was neglected altogether; and the usual expression in the decrees of the Senate, "that the matter should be submitted to the approval of the People," was at last omitted as superfluous. This perhaps might have been a change well suited to the altered circumstances of the Commonwealth; but it was accompanied by another which was nothing but an abuse. These dispensations were often granted by some of those members who took an active part in public business, when none but themselves were present in the Senate-house; and thus the privilege was engrossed, in fact, by a few individuals of the highest rank and consideration, who availed themselves of it as of a valuable store of patronage. To correct this system, C. Cornelius proposed to revive and enforce the old principle of the Constitution, that no one should be exempted from the observance of any law, except by the authority of the People. The Aristocratical party, resisting this alteration, procured the negative of one of the Tribunes, P. Servilius Globulus, to stop the progress of the proposed law. When, therefore, the day arrived on which the question was to come before the People, and the crier began to repeat aloud the terms of the law, with a clerk standing behind to prompt him, Globulus forbade both the clerk and the crier to proceed. Cornelius then took the law from the hands of the clerk and read it himself; not intending, as his friends declared, to propose it to the People in defiance of his colleague's negative, but merely to satisfy himself what the provisions were which he was not allowed to submit to their decision.* However the Consul, C. Piso, who witnessed the fact, interpreted it in a different manner, and loudly exclaimed that Cornelius was destroying the very essence of the Tribunitian power. The multitude received this speech with violent expressions of displeasure; and when Piso sent his lictors to arrest some of those whom he observed as most outrageous, the lictors were resisted, their fasces were broken, and stones were thrown by some persons at the extremity of the crowd against the Consul himself. But Cornelius, far from abetting these disorders, immediately broke up the assembly, and relinquished his law; and in order to shew his willingness to conciliate his opponents, he brought it forward again without its obnoxious clauses, proposing merely that no dispensation from the laws should be considered as valid, unless two hundred members had been present in the Senate when it was granted; and that although the sanction of the People was necessary as a point of form, yet that it should not be lawful for any Tribune to negative a dispensation which had regularly passed the Senate.† In this amended state the law was too reasonable to be openly opposed; but the leading Senators were greatly offended that their particular influence should be at all diminished. Another salutary measure was brought forward and carried by Cornelius, which appears to have been entirely free from any factious design or tendency. It seems that the Prætors had a large discretionary power in the administration of justice, and that it was usual for every Prætor,‡ when he entered upon his office,

He proposes a law to regulate the dispensing power of the Senate.

It is negatived.

But passed in an amended shape.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvi. p. 19.
† Asconius, *Argumentum in Ciceron. pro Cornelio*, i.
‡ Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. i. c. 29.
§ Asconius, *Argumentum in Ciceron. pro Cornelio*, i.

* Cicero, *in Vatinium*, c. 2. *Defendebatur non recitandi causâ legisse sed recognoscendi.* It seems that persons were in the habit of reading aloud, even when reading by themselves alone, and thus the action of Cornelius might have had no other motive than that which his friends represented. In the Acts of the Apostles, when the Ethiopian eunuch was reading the Scriptures to himself, as he travelled in his chariot, he evidently pronounced the words aloud; for it is said, that "Philip *heard* him reading;" whereas now, the natural expression would be, that a man reading alone in a carriage was *seen* reading.

† *Ne quis in senatu legibus solveretur, nisi* CC *adfuissent, neve quis, quum solutus esset, intercederet, quum de eâ re ad populum ferretur.* Asconius, *Argumentum in Ciceron. pro Cornelio*, i.

‡ Asconius, *ubi supra. Conf.* Dion Cass. lib. xxxvi. p. 19.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

to publish a proclamation, declaring, generally, the principles on which his decisions would be founded during the year. But from these principles the Prætors continually deviated, alleging, we may suppose, that the equity of particular cases required them to depart from their general rule. Whatever may be the advantages or disadvantages of leaving much to the discretion of Judges in well-ordered Governments, and in a tolerably pure state of public morals, we may well conceive that with such officers as the Roman Prætors are described to have been at this period, whatever discretionary power they possessed, was likely to be abused for their own purposes. Accordingly Cornelius was listened to with general approbation when he proposed a law obliging the Prætors to conform in all cases to the principles laid down in their own proclamations; and this measure also was carried without any open resistance. It is said that he brought forward several other laws during his Tribuneship, which were negatived by some of his colleagues; but the particulars are not mentioned.

Law to abridge the discretionary power of the Prætors.

Cornelius is brought to trial. U. C. 687.

The resentment, however, which his conduct had excited, broke out as soon as his year of office was expired. He was accused of what, perhaps, may best be expressed in English by the general term of "high crimes and misdemeanours;"* but on the day appointed for the trial, P. Cassius the Prætor, who was to act as Judge, did not appear; and a mob assembling at the instigation, as it is said, of Manilius, one of the Tribunes, assaulted the accusers, threatening them with death if they did not abandon their accusation, and, finally, obliged them to fly for their lives. Cornelius appears to have had no share in this riot; but his trial was again resumed in the year following, and he was arraigned chiefly for having read aloud his law to the people, after another Tribune had interposed his negative against it. On this point Q. Catulus, Q. Hortensius, Q. Metellus Pius, and L. Lucullus, all came forward to give their evidence with a strong leaning against him; while, on the other hand, Cicero undertook his defence, and is said to have conducted it with the greatest ability in two speeches, of which, unfortunately, only a few fragments remain to us. His eloquence was received with bursts of applause from the assembled people,† and Cornelius, as far as we can learn, was acquitted.‡

The trial broken off by a riot.

He is tried again and acquitted. U. C. 688.

We have dwelt the longer upon the Tribuneship and laws of Cornelius, because he appears to have been one of the few men of his time who advocated firmly and temperately the real interests of the people; and because the opposition which he met with from the Aristocracy, shews how much they were inclined to resist not only the seditious, but even the fairest and most moderate supporters of reform, as if every thing were mischievous which did not tend to maintain their exclusive ascendency. At a crisis such as that in which Rome was now placed, there were few popular leaders who were disposed to imitate the temper and judgment of Cornelius, and the treatment which he met with was likely still more to diminish the number. Men of real sense and patriotism were deterred from the task of redressing grievances, when they found that they could only succeed at the price of provoking a strong resistance on the part of the Nobility, and, perhaps, dangerously exciting the passions of the multitude. But profligate adventurers, to whom sedition was in itself an end, instead of being regarded with aversion even as the means of obtaining some real good, were rejoiced to find the Senate so selfish and shortsighted. They could then say, with more plausibility, that the Aristocracy were habitually the enemies and oppressors of the poor, and that nothing could effectually benefit the Commonwealth but a total revolution in the state of society.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

In the year 687 C. Manilius, one of the Tribunes,* proposed a renewal of one of the laws which had been passed during the triumph of the popular party under Carbo, and which had subsequently, we may suppose, been annulled by Sylla. By this law the freedmen had been enrolled promiscuously in all the tribes, instead of being confined, as before, to the four city tribes only. Manilius procured its revival, by proposing it suddenly at a late hour of the day when the majority of respectable citizens had left the forum;† but it was instantly annulled by the Senate, as having been illegally passed, and Manilius himself was induced to abandon any further mention of it.‡ But finding that he was still threatened with the resentment of the Aristocracy, he resolved to secure himself by courting more assiduously the favour of the People, and by gaining the protection of an individual, whose friends it might not be politic for the Senate to attack. This is said to have been the origin of the famous Manilian law, by which it was proposed to commit the sole management of the war with Mithridates and Tigranes to Pompey, and to continue to him a large portion of the extraordinary powers with which he was already invested to act against the Pirates. The Aristocratical party, as may be supposed, warmly opposed the law, but it was supported by Cæsar and by Cicero, and finally carried.§ It is probable that the mere military part of the command might have been safely intrusted to other hands; but with the peculiar temptations which the East offered to plunder and extortion, no officer could have been so well chosen as Pompey to retrieve the lost character of Roman magistrates, to conciliate the affections of the people of the Provinces, and to administer his extensive command with justice, humanity, and wisdom. Nor would the measure, in strictness, have been dangerous, even as a precedent; for as Pompey was appointed to wield such unusual powers on account of his tried moderation and integrity, there was little probability that officers would often be found with similar qualities to entitle them to a similar honour.

Tribuneship of C. Manilius.

The Manilian law.

Towards the close of the year P. Cornelius Sylla,‖ a relation of the late Dictator, and P. Autronius, were elected Consuls for the year following; but being shortly after accused of bribery, and being found guilty, the election was declared null and void, and L. Aurelius Cotta and L. Manlius Torquatus were chosen in their room. The famous L. Sergius Catilina

* "*De Majestate.*"
† Quintilian, lib. viii. c. 3.
‡ Ibid. lib. vi. c. 5. "*ut Cornelium ipsa confessionis fiducia eripuerit.*"

* Asconius, *in Ciceron. Orat. pro Milone*, c. 8. and Cicero, *Orat. pro Cornelio*, i.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvi. p. 20. edit. Leunclav.
‡ Cicero, *pro Cornelio*, i. *Fragm.*
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvi. p. 20.
‖ Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 18. Cicero, *pro P. Sylla*, c. 17. 32.

had intended to offer himself as a candidate, but he was also at this time under accusation for misconduct in his late Province of Africa,* and the Senate resolved that under such circumstances he could not be elected. Irritated at his disappointment, he entered into a conspiracy with P. Autronius and Cn. Piso, a young man of noble birth, but needy and profligate; and it was resolved that the two Consuls elect, Cotta and Manlius, should be murdered in the Capitol on the first of January, when they would first enter upon their office; that Catiline and Autronius should then seize upon the Consulship, and Piso should be sent with an army to secure the important Province of Spain. The design was suspected, and its execution was therefore postponed to the fifth of February, when it was intended to assassinate not the Consuls only, but a great number of the Senators when assembled in the Senate-house. Catiline, however, gave the signal for the massacre before the armed men, whom they had hired to execute it, were collected in sufficient force; and after this second disappointment the attempt was relinquished. But although this conspiracy is mentioned by Cicero and Sallust as a matter perfectly notorious, yet the authors of it were suffered to remain unquestioned, and Catiline ventured, two years afterwards, to offer himself again as a candidate for the highest office in the Commonwealth.

From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

First conspiracy of Catiline, Autronius, and Piso.

U. C. 688.

The year which had begun with such alarming circumstances was marked in its progress with little that is remarkable. Catiline's trial for misconduct in his Province came on, but he was acquitted: an escape which he is said to have owed to the corruption of his judges and of his accuser, P. Clodius,† who suffered himself to be bribed by Catiline to weaken purposely the force of his own accusation. At this time also M. Crassus and Q. Catulus were acting as Censors; but they were warmly at variance with each other on an important question relating to the inhabitants of Cisalpine Gaul to the north of the Po.‡ Crassus wished to extend the privileges of Roman citizenship to them as to all the other people within the Alps; but Catulus, according to the usual policy of the Aristocratical party, was adverse to the measure; and both persisting in their respective opinions, resigned the Censorship. It was thought by many, that the streets of Rome were thronged too much already, without swelling the number of citizens still more; and C. Papius,§ one of the Tribunes, proposed and carried a law, by which all foreigners were ordered to depart from Rome. This measure occasioned, probably, great inconvenience and distress to individuals, without any important benefits to the public peace. While the number of needy and profligate citizens was so great, and whilst such multitudes of slaves and gladiators were kept in the city, ready at all times to serve the purposes of riot and violence, it was of little avail to drive away the small proportion of free foreigners who might possibly have strengthened the cause of any sedition.

Censorship of M. Crassus and Q. Catulus.

The Papian law.

* Q. Cicero, *de Petitione Consulatûs*, c. iii. Cicero, *Fragm. Orationis in Togâ Candidâ*. Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 18.

† Cicero, *de Haruspicum Responsis*, c. 20. *Fragm. Orat. in Togâ Candidâ*.

‡ Plutarch, *in Crasso*, c. 13. Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 33.

§ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 33. Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. iii. c. 11.

In the year following, L. Julius Cæsar and C. Marcius Figulus were chosen Consuls. Catiline now was preparing to renew his canvass for the Consulship, and to combine it with the plan of a second conspiracy. This man must not be classed among the ordinary leaders of the popular party who opposed the authority of the Senate; nor with such men as the Gracchi, who, although their meditated changes threatened to affect the tenure of property, yet proposed no more than that which an unrepealed law of the Republic had already sanctioned, and who, with all their rashness and violence, would have shrunk from the thought of shedding the blood of the noblest of their countrymen. But Catiline, from his early youth, had been stained with crimes: in the proscription of Sylla he had distinguished himself by peculiar cruelty and rapacity;* and since that period the free indulgence of his profligate desires had reduced him to indigence, which he had again repaired by his extortions in his Province, but which was returning upon him afresh from the usual tenour of his life in Rome. He was of a Patrician family, and found many others amongst the Nobility who resembled him in profligacy and neediness, and who were willing to share with him all his projects of revolution:† to these were added a multitude of worthless and desperate men from the lower classes of society. Whoever disliked a life of labour, whoever wished to be relieved from the restraints of law, whoever were involved in debts which they could only hope to wipe off by the murder of their creditors,—the envious, the rapacious, and the revengeful, who form so large a portion of mankind,—all were ready to embrace a scheme which promised them plunder, and license, and bloodshed. Political circumstances added others to the number of the conspirators. The inhabitants of Tuscany,‡ who had been deprived of their lands by Sylla's confiscations, were eager to recover their property; many of the soldiers who had received these lands as settlements had since become involved by their extravagance or ignorance of farming, and were anxious for a second civil war that they might receive fresh rewards; whilst the children of those who had been proscribed, being excluded by Sylla's laws from all the honours of the Commonwealth during their lives, were anxious to raise themselves from this state of degradation. It is mentioned, too, that a great many women of birth and talents,§ but of infamous character, who, in the decay of their youthful beauty, had no longer the means of indulging their extravagant habits, and had thus contracted considerable debts, were ready to use all their arts and influence in support of the conspiracy, and to assist it more directly by the use of poison or the dagger against their own husbands, whose rank or character might render them valuable friends to the Constitution of their country.

The chief grievance on which Catiline dwelt, when endeavouring to excite his associates to overthrow the existing Government, was the monopoly of honours and riches amongst a few great families,‖ by which the bulk of the People were kept in a degraded and impoverished condition. This complaint was utterly

From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

Beginnings of the second conspiracy of Catiline. U. C. 689.

* Q. Cicero, *de Petitione Consulat.* c. 2, 3.

† Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 17.

‡ Ibid. c. 28.

§ Ibid. c. 24.

‖ Ibid. c. 20.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

groundless in his own mouth, or in the mouths of all the Patrician conspirators of his party: they certainly were not excluded by any Aristocratical jealousy from office; nor is it possible to trace, in the lists of Consuls and Prætors about this period, any signs of a predominant influence exercised either by a few individuals, or by a few particular families of the Aristocracy. But it is true that the Nobility, as a body, were unwilling to see the highest posts in the Commonwealth occupied by men of inferior birth and fortune, and wished to make the Constitution too nearly resemble an oligarchy. The same C. Piso, who was Consul when C. Cornelius was Tribune, and who had been so strongly opposed to him, is said to have declared to the assembled People,* when, in his quality of Consul, he was presiding at the election of Consuls for the ensuing year, that if M. Palicanus, a man of humble origin and a popular Tribune, should be chosen by the votes of the Comitia, he never would return him as duly elected. This no doubt was an extreme case; yet the lists of Consuls sufficiently prove that no one could easily attain that dignity, unless he were of noble blood and distinguished connections; and at the time of Catiline's conspiracy, Cicero's pretensions to the Consulship, for which he was now a candidate, were much discouraged by the high Aristocratical party.† His character, however, was so pure, his eloquence so popular, and his political principles so much inclined to support the Senate, that these merits atoned for his want of family; and as Catiline's projects excited considerable alarm, the Nobility perceived the necessity of having a Consul able and willing to check them, and thus M. Cicero and C. Antonius were elected to fill the Consulship for the following year.

Election of M. Cicero to the Consulship.

Thus disappointed in his hopes of obtaining a place of lawful power, Catiline turned more zealously to his schemes of revolution; and whilst he was increasing the number of his partisans at Rome, he provided depots of arms in different parts of Italy; and having found means to borrow money on his own credit, and that of his friends, he transmitted it to Fæsulæ in Tuscany, to the care of one C. Manlius, who was to commence the intended insurrection in the country. At the same time he contrived repeated attempts against the life of Cicero; and in the midst of these designs, he actually proposed to offer himself once more, at the ensuing elections, as a candidate for the Consulship. His plans, however, had been constantly communicated to different persons, and from a very early period of the conspiracy had been denounced to the Consul Cicero. One of his associates, Q. Curius,‡ had long been engaged in a criminal connection with a woman of the name of Fulvia, who resembled, in the general profligacy and extravagance of her manner of living, those females whom we have already mentioned among the accomplices of Catiline; but who, from some feelings of humanity, or private connections, or some regard for the Constitution of her country, was a stranger to all the plans of the conspirators. Curius was a man of good family, but indigent; and having no means left of gratifying Fulvia's habits of expense, he found himself a less welcome visiter to her. But so soon as he had become acquainted with the views of Catiline, and had heard the splendid allurements which he held out to his partisans, he endeavoured to regain her favour, by assuring her that in a short time he should be enabled to testify, in the amplest manner, the affection which he bore her. Some doubts expressed by Fulvia as to his sincerity, led him in his own defence to disclose the means to which he was looking for his enrichment; and Fulvia, struck with horror at this communication, lost no time in making several persons acquainted with it. Afterwards, when Cicero became Consul, he gained her over entirely to the interests of the Commonwealth, and empowered her to make Curius such promises, as tempted him to give regular information of all that passed at every meeting of the conspirators. Through this channel he also gained timely notice of the designs formed against his own life; and took care to keep a strong body of his friends and dependents near his person, that they might defend him either from assassination or from open violence.

The designs of Catiline communicated by Q. Curius to Cicero.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

Such, however, were the imperfections of the Roman laws, that, with the fullest knowledge of the existence and constant progress of a treasonable conspiracy, the Consul was obliged to wait for some overt act of rebellion, before he could venture to act officially against the guilty. In the mean time the people in general were ignorant of the dangers which threatened the State; and whilst Catiline was carrying on his projects of revolution in secret, several other matters of far less importance successively engaged the attention of the public. P. Servilius Rullus, one of the Tribunes,* proposed to gratify the lower orders by a new Agrarian law, framed on a scale far more extensive than any that had preceded it, and conferring powers unusually great on the Commissioners by whom it was to be carried into effect. The general object of the law was to provide the poorer citizens with settlements of land in Italy; and for this purpose a commission of ten persons was to be appointed, who should be enabled to sell national property of every description in every part of the Empire, and, with the money arising from the sale, should purchase lands in Italy, and settle upon them colonies of Roman citizens. With something more than the usual arbitrary jurisdiction intrusted to commissions of this nature, the Commissioners were constituted sole judges of what was national property, and were authorized to fix the place of sale wherever they should think proper; a door being thus opened on the one hand to the greatest oppression, and on the other to the most shameful corruption. The commission, moreover, was to exist for five years, and during its existence none of its members could be subjected to trial for misconduct;† and two hundred of the Equestrian order were to be chosen yearly as a sort of guard of honour, that the Commissioners might travel every where with Kingly state, and with more than Kingly power; for, it seems, they were empowered every where to enforce their authority by punishments, inflicted at their own discretion, while there was no other power which could protect from their jurisdiction, or reverse their sentences. It was proposed

Events of the early part of Cicero's Consulship.

The Agrarian law of P. Rullus.

* Valerius Maximus, lib. iii. c. 8.
† Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 23.
‡ Ibid. c. 23.

* Cicero, *Orationes de Lege Agrariâ.*
† Ibid. ii. c. 13.

further that these sovereign magistrates should be chosen by a majority out of seventeen tribes only;* that the tribes who were to elect should be chosen by lot, and the Comitia should be held by the framer of the law, that is, by Rullus himself; so that, according to the well-known influence exercised over the result of an election at Rome by the officer who presided at it and received the votes, Rullus might calculate fairly on being placed himself on the commission. This Agrarian law is not the only instance in History in which a popular party has incurred general odium by attempting, under the colour of an extraordinary commission, to confer immoderate powers upon its own leaders. Cicero instantly perceived the advantage which was afforded him; and, whilst he professed to approve the principle of Agrarian laws, he attacked this particular measure as a mere device to invest ten persons with absolute sovereignty over the whole Empire; and as Rullus had not acquired such an ascendency over the people as to make them deaf to all insinuations against the purity of his views, the eloquence of Cicero was listened to with delight; one of the other Tribunes promised to negative the law if it should be submitted to the votes of the people;* and Rullus, thus finding the popular feeling turned against him, abandoned his measure without further trial.

The Aristocratical party were contented with having exposed the folly of their adversaries' scheme, and with having completely defeated their attempt. It is ever the case in party warfare that the public good is sacrificed, while the contending factions appeal almost exclusively to the most contemptible of all arguments, those which derive their force from the weakness or contradictions of an opponent. The proposed law of Rullus was extravagant and absurd; but was there no other practicable plan for the relief of the poor, which Cicero, the professed friend of the principle of Agrarian laws, might have most seasonably devised, to remove some portion of the really existing sufferings of the lower orders, and to conciliate their affections to the Nobility at a period so fraught with danger to the Commonwealth? When the temptations of the Capital, and the distressed state of the country, had drawn to Rome so large a portion of the free population of Italy; when Samnium and some of the neighbouring districts were almost a wilderness, and Etruria was overrun with banditti; above all, when a conspiracy was known to exist, which struck at the very foundation of the present order of things; sound policy surely demanded that the chief magistrates of the State should themselves propose some expedient, which, by relieving the indigent, and restoring Italy in general to a more healthful condition, might deprive the enemies of society of their principal resources. A severe but necessary tax, levied upon all establishments of slaves above a certain number, might have gradually resupplied the country with a population of free labourers; or, as the Agrarian laws were the ordinary method of providing for the poor at Rome, the product of such a tax might have been employed in the purchase or rent of lands to be distributed among the poorer citizens; and such a step, abhorrent as it may be to our notions, might perhaps have alleviated the public distresses, and certainly would have enabled the Nobility to resist the attacks of seditious adventurers with a greater consciousness of innocence, and a better claim to the support of the people at large.

After the defeat of the proposed Agrarian law, an attempt was made by some of the popular party to procure the restoration of the children of those whom Sylla had proscribed to the common rights and dignities of citizens, by rendering them eligible to public offices. On this occasion Cicero again displayed his eloquence with success, in opposing the law. He alleged that the existing order of things was so much built upon the laws of Sylla,* that the sons of those who had suffered under his government could not, without danger, be relieved from the disabilities under which they laboured. Of the justice of this argument we have no adequate means of judging: it admitted, at least, that the exclusion of so many innocent individuals was an evil; but whether their influence, could they have exerted it, would have tended to reform or to revolutionize the actual order of things, we cannot easily determine. From the general profligacy of the times, however, we may conjecture that a depressed party, invested suddenly with power, was not likely to exercise it with moderation, or with any regard to the public welfare.

Proposal for the repeal of the law of Sylla respecting the children of the proscribed.

The next proceeding of the popular party was more clearly deserving of censure. It has been already noticed, that C. Cæsar had, on one or two occasions, expressed with some ostentation his affection for the party of Marius, and he now attempted to vindicate the memory of L. Saturninus, who, having been for a long time the associate of Marius, was afterwards opposed by him as the reluctant instrument of the Senate, and, having been taken in actual rebellion, had been murdered by the armed citizens, who broke into his place of confinement. Cæsar,† it is said, instigated T. Altius Labienus, at this time one of the Tribunes, and afterwards distinguished in Gaul as one of Cæsar's lieutenants, and in the civil war as a partisan of Pompey, to accuse C. Rabirius, an aged Senator, as the perpetrator of this murder. The cause was first tried before L. Cæsar and C. Cæsar,‡ who were appointed by lot to act as special Commissioners in this case, by virtue of the Prætor's order; and the accused was arraigned according to the old law of murder, by which, if he had been found guilty, he would have been condemned to be hanged. But this mode of proceeding was stopped by Rabirius appealing to the people, or by the interference of Cicero as Consul,§ as his speech seems to imply, and his procuring the removal of the cause before another tribunal. The people, however, it is said, were likely to condemn the accused, when Q. Metellus Celer,‖ one of the Prætors, obliged the meeting to break up by tearing down the ensign, which was always flying on the Janiculum whilst the people were assembled, and without which, according to ancient custom, they could not lawfully continue their deliberations. In this manner Rabirius escaped; for Labienus or his instigators did not think proper to bring forward the business again; whether despairing of again finding

Trial of C. Rabirius.

* Cicero, *de Lege Agrariâ*, ii. c. 7. † Ibid. *pro Sullâ*, c. 23.

* Quinctilian, lib. xi. c. 1. s. 85.
† Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 12.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. c. 42.
§ Cicero, *pro Rabirio*, c. 4, 5.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. c. 42.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

the people equally disposed to condemn the accused, or whether the progress of the conspiracy of Catiline began now to turn men's attention more entirely to a different subject.

The Comitia for the election of Consuls were on the point of being held, when Cicero acquainted the Senate with some of the facts of which he was in possession relative to the conspiracy, and persuaded them to order the postponement of the elections, that the state of affairs might previously undergo a full discussion.* On the following day, when the Senators were assembled, Cicero taxed Catiline openly with the criminal designs imputed to him, and called on him to justify himself. But when he had said in reply, that there were two parties in the Commonwealth, the one weak both in its head and its body, the other strong in body but headless, and that he was resolved to supply it with a head; the Senate expressed their indignation by a general murmur, and the decree, usual in all dangerous emergencies,† was passed, "That the Consuls should provide for the safety of the Republic." Cicero, however, did not avail himself as yet of the ample powers thus committed to him: he contented himself with defending his own person on the day of the election, by going down to the Campus Martius attended by a strong escort;‡ and having seen Catiline once more rejected, and D. Junius Silanus and L. Muræna chosen Consuls, he continued to learn all Catiline's plans from the information of Curius, and to take the proper precautions to obviate every attempt that might be made of a nature directly hostile.

The agents of Catiline take up arms in Etruria.

In the mean time C. Manlius, according to the instructions of Catiline, had taken up arms in Etruria;§ and two others of the conspirators had been despatched to excite insurrections in Picenum and Apulia. To oppose these movements, two of the Prætors and two Proconsuls, who had lately returned from their Provinces, and who, having claimed the honour of a Triumph, were both waiting, with their armies not yet disbanded, in the neighbourhood of Rome, were sent into the different quarters where the danger was most threatening; while guards were stationed in different parts of Rome itself, and the public mind was studiously alarmed with reports of the atrocious designs of the conspirators. Catiline finding himself the object of univeral suspicion, offered successively to commit himself to the custody of several individuals of distinction, and amongst others even to that of the Consul;‖ but no one would undertake such a charge; Cicero being anxious to oblige him to leave Rome, and the others being, probably, unwilling to incur so great a responsibility, and supposing, perhaps, that Catiline's accomplices in the city were numerous enough to effect his rescue, and that they who held him in custody would be the first marked out for destruction. It appears that Cicero having full information of the extent of the conspiracy, and knowing that there were many persons engaged in it whom he could not venture to punish without driving them first into some act of open treason, was desirous that it should not merely be checked for a time, and allowed again to prosecute its plans in secret, so as to keep the country in perpetual alarm, but that it should be brought at once to its execution: for he trusted to the precautions which he had taken to ensure the Commonwealth from any danger which the explosion might occasion; and after it had taken place he knew that the Consular authority might be freely used, to deliver society effectually from those who had so long been plotting against it.

Catiline's Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

The measures of Catiline were greatly embarrassed by this policy: his accomplices in Rome were restrained and awed by the vigilance of the Government, and could not be roused to action; so that he resolved to put himself at the head of the forces, already in arms in Etruria, and try his fortune in the field. He called together his principal associates,* late at night, at the house of M. Porcius Læca: he complained of their inactivity; proposed to them in greater detail his plans for the general insurrection in the country; and declared his own intention of joining the army of C. Manlius without delay, if Cicero could by any means be removed before his departure. Upon this two Roman Knights,† C. Cornelius and L. Vargunteius, engaged to go early the next morning to the Consul's house, to procure an interview with him, and to assassinate him in his own chamber. But Curius did not fail to give information as usual of what had been undertaken; and when the intended assassins arrived at Cicero's doors, they were refused admittance. Notwithstanding this disappointment, there were other parts of the conspirators' plans which might be avoided with greater difficulty, and Cicero assembled the Senate on the following day, the eighth of November, in the temple of Jupiter Stator, on the ascent of the Palatine hill; a place of unusual security from its situation and the nature of its buildings. It was on this occasion that Catiline ventured to appear in the Senate to defend himself against the imputations under which he laboured; and was attacked by Cicero in a vehement invective, in which he was told instantly to leave Rome, where all his treasons were now fully known, and would be no longer tolerated. His attempted excuses were drowned by a general cry of indignation; he at once left the Senate, and on the very same night quitted the city,‡ and hastened to join his associate Manlius in Tuscany. But on his way thither he wrote letters to several persons of high rank at Rome, still asserting his innocence, and saying that, oppressed as he was by the violence of his enemies, he was going to retire to Marseilles, and there live in banishment, rather than involve his country, on his account, in civil disorders. In the want of those regular channels of information, by which events are so speedily and so surely known in our days from one end of a country to the other, this statement might continue to be believed by a large portion of the people, long after Catiline was really at the head of an insurgent army; and might furnish his partisans with grounds for attacking the administration of Cicero, and possibly might establish a common point on which the leaders of the regular popular party would not refuse to cooperate with them.

Cicero denounces Catiline in the Senate, and forces him to leave Rome and join his army in Etruria.

* Cicero, *pro L. Murænâ*, c. 25.
† Ibid. *in Catilinam*, i. c. 2.
‡ Ibid. *pro Murænâ*, c. 26.
§ Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 27. 30.
‖ Cicero, *in Catilinam*, i. c. 8.

* Cicero, *in Catilinam*, i. c. 4. Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 27.
† Cicero, *in Catilinam*, i. c. 4.
‡ Ibid. ii. c. 1. Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 32.

After leaving Rome, he waited for a short time in the neighbourhood of Arretium,* in order to organize the insurrection in that quarter; and then proceeded to the camp of Manlius near Fæsulæ, attended by his lictors as if he were a lawful magistrate of the Commonwealth. The better to maintain this character, he would not receive any of the slaves who offered to enlist in his army; although his agents in Apulia and Picenum were at this very time endeavouring to rekindle the war of Spartacus, by exciting the slaves every where to assert their freedom and rise in arms. But still his forces were so considerable, that the Senate, after declaring him and Manlius public enemies, directed the Consuls to levy soldiers, and, intrusting Cicero with the care of the city, commissioned his colleague, C. Antonius, to oppose Catiline in the field. The situation of Antonius on this occasion greatly resembled that of Marius, when he was ordered by the Senate to act against his old associate L. Saturninus. We have already mentioned that Antonius had been accused and condemned, some years before, for corruption and oppression in Greece, and that he had been expelled from the Senate by the Censors L. Gellius and Cn. Lentulus, in the year of Rome 683. From that time the profligacy of his life had connected him with Catiline, and other persons of similar character, and in the elections of the preceding year, Catiline had coalesced with him against the pretensions of Cicero; and his success was regarded by Catiline as a most favourable circumstance, even in the midst of his own disappointment.† Worthless as Antonius personally was, it was of importance to conciliate him to the cause of the existing Constitution, whilst he held the office of Consul; lest, if he openly quarrelled with his colleague, he might lend the sanction of the Consular name, as Cinna had done before him, to the projects of the enemies of the Government. Cicero, therefore, when the Consuls, as usual, were to receive by lot the care of some Province for the year following their Consulship, gave up to Antonius the government of Macedonia,‡ which had fallen to him, and was contented to receive in exchange the less desirable Province of Gaul; and by this attention, and by avoiding every thing that could give him offence, he induced Antonius to rest contented with the existing state of affairs, and kept him so distinct from the conspiracy, that he could with the less scruple obey the Senate in acting against it. The departure of Catiline had still left, however, a dangerous band of conspirators within the walls of Rome;§ who were, agreeably to his instructions, to set fire to the city in several places on a particular day, and to murder the principal magistrates and supporters of the Government during the confusion; while Catiline was to be ready with his army, in the neighbourhood, to cut off all who should escape the massacre and attempt to fly from Rome, and thus should put the finishing stroke to the revolution. Of the conspirators left behind in the Capital, the principal were P. Lentulus Sura, who had been Consul in the year 682, and had been expelled from the Senate, like C. Antonius, by the Censors in the year following, C. Cethegus, a man also of noble family, but of infamous life, L. Cassius Longinus, P. Autronius, L. Statilius, and P. Gabinius. Many other persons were connected with these; and it is said that a very large proportion of the young Nobility favoured their views, and were ready to assist them by murdering their own parents, when the time fixed for the massacre should arrive. In the mean time attempts were made to throw upon Cicero the odium of the war which had just broken out; and the signal for the execution of the plot was to be given by one of their party, L. Bestia, who was then Tribune of the people, and who was to inveigh against the tyranny of the Consul in a speech to be delivered in the forum. But the whole conspiracy was timely and completely discovered in a very remarkable manner. There happened to be at Rome some deputies from the Allobroges, a people of Transalpine Gaul,* who had been some years before added to the Roman dominions, and who had suffered as usual from the oppression of the provincial magistrates. About six or seven years before this period, they had especially complained of the exactions of Marius Fonteius, and he had been brought to trial on their accusation; and although he was warmly defended by Cicero, yet it was admitted that his government had been rigid; and that the Allobroges were now in a state of great distress, and had incurred a heavy public debt. Their deputies were sent to Rome, in the hopes of obtaining some relief from the Senate; but, finding that they had little to expect from this body, they were, after a time, reduced to despair; when one of the conspirators, who had formerly traded in Gaul, and was personally known to most of the chiefs of the country, addressed them in the forum, and, learning the hopeless state of their affairs, proposed to them, by degrees, that they should join in the conspiracy, telling them its views, and the names of some of the principal members, and promising, if they could excite their countrymen to take up arms against the Republic, that they should be perfectly freed from all their difficulties. The offer was tempting; but, on the other hand, the knowledge of so important a secret might enable them to purchase, without any hazard, an ample reward from the Government; and they accordingly disclosed the whole transaction to Q. Fabius Sanga, to whom their countrymen usually applied to further their interests when they had any business at Rome, and who lost no time in laying the information before Cicero. The Consul directed the Allobroges to keep up their correspondence with the conspirators, and to feign compliance with their wishes, that they might be able, at the proper time, to furnish him with some written proofs of the reality of the plot; for which purpose they were instructed to demand that the terms of their agreement should be given them in writing, with the signatures of the principal conspirators, in order that their countrymen in Gaul might know on whom they were to depend. Not only was this request complied with, but the deputies were further desired by Lentulus to visit the camp of Catiline on their way home, and there to confirm with him the alliance which they had con-

Antonius is ordered to march against the conspirators.

Attempt to corrupt the ambassadors of the Allobroges.

* Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 36. 44. 56.

† Ibid. c. 21. 26. Asconii *Argumentum in Ciceron. Orat. Fragm. in Togâ Candidâ.*

‡ Cicero, *in L. Pisonem*, c. 2. Plutarch, *in Cicerone*, c. 12.

§ Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 39. 43.

* Cicero, *in Catilinam*, iii. c. 2. Sallust, c. 40.

tracted with his associates; and T. Volturtius, a citizen of Croton, who was to accompany them, was charged by Lentulus with a letter, without any signature, which he was to deliver to Catiline. All these things being duly reported to Cicero, he ordered two of the Prætors to keep guard on the opposite sides of the Milvian bridge on the night fixed for the departure of the deputies.* The train of the Allobroges, accompanied by Volturtius, arrived at the bridge about two or three hours after midnight, on the morning of the third of December: they were instantly stopped by the guards, and, on the appearance of the Prætors, quietly surrendered themselves; all their papers were secured, and themselves, together with Volturtius, were taken to Cicero's house a little before sunrise.

Arrest of the ambassadors

Messages were immediately despatched to Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilius, and Gabinius, to require their attendance; and they all without any suspicion obeyed the summons. The Senate was ordered to meet in the temple of Concord; and there Volturtius, the Allobroges, and the arrested conspirators were successively brought forward. The first was encouraged to declare freely all that he knew; and upon his direct evidence, together with that of the Allobroges, confirmed by their own seals and handwriting, the conspirators either confessed their crime, or did not any longer venture to deny it. They were then committed to custody, Lentulus having first resigned the office of Prætor with which he was invested.

And of the chief conspirators.

Scarcely was the meeting of the Senate dissolved, when Cicero assembled the people in the forum, and there related to them, in detail, the objects of the conspiracy, and the manner in which it had been fully detected. With whatever disappointment the mere profligate rabble might have heard this statement, yet the majority of the people, even of those who on ordinary occasions opposed the Aristocratical interest, regarded the wickedness of the plot with horror, and felt thankful to Cicero, whose ability had discovered and destroyed it. Every one was incensed at the project of setting fire to the city,† which would have been as ruinous to the poor as to the rich; and, for a moment, all, but the most unprincipled of the community, sympathized with each other in the preservation of the Commonwealth. A slight attempt was made by some of the dependents of Lentulus to effect his rescue, and to call on the slaves to join them, and to hire the most notorious leaders of the lower people to excite a disturbance amongst them. But Cicero's vigilance baffled these designs, and the fate of the conspirators depended on the decision of the Senate, which assembled on the fifth of December, to determine on their punishment.

Feeling of the populace on the discovery of the plot.

Debate on the punishment of the conspirators.

D. Junius Silanus, who was at this time Consul elect, gave it as his opinion that the conspirators should be put to death; but C. Cæsar, not pretending to extenuate their guilt, but insisting only that death was by the Constitution of Rome an illegal punishment, proposed that their property should be confiscated, and that they should be condemned to perpetual imprisonment in some of the free towns of Italy. His speech is said to have produced a considerable impression; but Q. Catulus, L. Lucullus, C. Piso, and Cicero himself,* with most of the Senators of Consular dignity, still supported the opinion of Silanus. It was reserved, however, for M. Porcius Cato to move the Resolution which was finally carried; and in which he combined the highest panegyrics on the conduct of the Consul, with a vote that the conspirators should be put to death, according to the ancient customs of the Republic, as having been guilty of manifest treason. In compliance with this decree of the Senate, Cicero ordered Lentulus and his accomplices to be carried, on the very same evening, to a secret under-ground cell in the public prison, where they were successively strangled.

On no occasion were the faults of the Roman Constitution more mischievously displayed than in these proceedings. So ill framed were the laws, that the worst criminals could not legally receive that punishment which our natural sense of justice, no less than the maxims of state policy, declares to be the only adequate chastisement of the worst kinds of wickedness. Thus although justice and the public safety alike demanded the execution of the conspirators, yet these claims could only be satisfied by an assumption on the part of the Senate of a power to dispense with the laws, and by another appeal to abstract principles in order to justify a departure from the ordinances of the existing Constitution. The advantage thus offered to a popular leader was not lost upon Cæsar: he had now obtained a point on which the sincere but ill-judging friends of liberty might be induced to sympathize with the vilest supporters of sedition; and which might effectually terminate that short-lived harmony between honest men of all parties which had been produced by the first discovery of the conspiracy. It mattered nothing that no traces of a sanguinary or tyrannical spirit were to be found in Cicero's proceedings; that after the execution of five persons, all guilty of the most heinous crime on the clearest evidence, the justice of the Government was satisfied; and that its triumph was not stained, as in the case of the Gracchi, by any after acts of unwarrantable and disgraceful cruelty. Cæsar's ambition required that he should excite the resentment of the people against the Senate; and here, as on every other occasion, he sacrificed to it the welfare of his country.

Reflections on their execution.

The fate of Catiline himself† soon followed the punishment of his associates.‡ His force had at one

* Cicero, *in Catilinam*, iii. c. 2.
† Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 48.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum Epistolar.* lib. xii. epist. xxi.
† Sallust, *Catilina*, c. 56, *et seq.*
‡ The conspiracy of Catiline, as described by Sallust and Cicero, is considered by some persons to contain many improbabilities. It is incredible, say they, that a man like Catiline, unconnected with the regular popular party, should have seriously hoped to effect a revolution; nor can it be believed that any of the Nobility should have submitted themselves to the guidance of such a leader. Even if he had succeeded in setting fire to the city and destroying the principal Senators, the Prætor of the nearest Province would presently have marched against him, and would have crushed him with little difficulty. But they who argue thus, forget that Catiline was a Patrician of noble family; that he had been Prætor; and that he was considered by Cicero as his most dangerous competitor for the Consulship, when he was a candidate for that office. He had been known in Sylla's proscriptions as a man who scrupled at nothing; and there was a large party in Rome to whom such a character was the greatest recommendation, and who would gladly follow any one who possessed it. That this party was inconsiderable in point of political power is true; and they accordingly hoped to

period amounted nearly to twelve thousand men, but of these not more than a fourth part were regularly armed, so that he did not choose to venture a battle; but having occupied the line of the Apennines, he manœuvred his troops with considerable ability, sometimes threatening to march towards Rome, and at other times to retreat into Gaul, and never allowing the enemy to bring him to action. But the news of the detection of his accomplices in the city, soon caused a considerable desertion amongst his followers; and despairing of success from any offensive operations, he fell back upon the neighbourhood of Pistorium, by forced marches, through mountain-roads, hoping that thence he might effect his escape into Gaul without being discovered. But finding that his retreat was cut off by the army of the Prætor, Q. Metellus Celer, who suspecting his designs, had hastened to place himself on his proposed line of march, Catiline altered his plans, and prepared to fight with the Consul C. Antonius, who, with a considerable force, had been following him during his retreat. It happened that Antonius either was, or pretended to be, indisposed, so that the command devolved on M. Petreius his lieutenant, an experienced soldier, assisted by P. Sextius,* one of the Quæstors, who was warmly attached to Cicero, and was heartily desirous of destroying the remains of the conspiracy. Accordingly the army of the Republic did its duty, and the rebels, after a desperate resistance, were totally defeated. C. Manlius, Catiline's lieutenant, was killed before the battle was decided; and Catiline himself, when he saw that the rout of his followers was complete, is said to have rushed into the ranks of the enemy, and there to have been slain. Nothing has been recorded of him to lessen the abhorrence which the general wickedness of his life, and the peculiar atrocity of his designs against his country, have justly deserved, and have ever abundantly met with.

Defeat and death of Catiline.

From this time forwards the correspondence of Cicero with his different friends, furnishes us with so many materials for our History, that it becomes necessary, unless we would greatly exceed our limits, to notice only such as are of the greatest importance. When C. Cæsar endeavoured to save the accomplices of Catiline from their deserved fate, he was already Prætor elect for the following year; and M. Cato, who so successfully opposed him, was in like manner about to enter on the office of Tribune of the people. Of the family and early life of the former we have already spoken; and as we have now mentioned the name of his great opponent, we may take this opportunity of giving a slight sketch of his extraction also, and of the beginnings of his public career. M. Porcius Cato was the great grandson of Cato the Censor, and the son of M. Cato and Livia, the sister of M. Livius Drusus, and the divorced wife of Q. Servilius Cæpio, who perished in the war with the Italian allies. His father died when he was a child, and he was brought up in the house of his uncle M. Drusus;* where he is said to have given very early proofs of that resolute and even stubborn character which marked him through life. After the assassination of Drusus, he appears to have passed his time under the care of a tutor named Sarpedon; and his half brother Q. Cæpio, after having lost his father, seems to have been placed in the same hands. The lively affection which Cato entertained for his brother was a striking contrast to the general coldness of his nature; and even after his constitutional apathy had been confirmed by the precepts of the Stoic philosophy, he gave vent to the most violent expressions of grief at the death of Cæpio, and celebrated his funeral with a sumptuousness which was most opposite to his usual habits. But with this single sacrifice to the common feelings of humanity, he was in other respects, even in his early youth, so stern and reserved, that he is said rarely to have been seen to laugh; and so determined not to follow the vicious or absurd fashions of his age, that he ran into the opposite extreme of an indecent singularity, choosing in his dress the colour that was most unusual, and walking about with his personal appearance so neglected as to be utterly unworthy of his rank in the Commonwealth.† Yet he was not without feelings of anger; which he displayed towards Q. Cæcilius Metellus Scipio,‡ who had married the lady to whom he himself was engaged; and whom he attacked in consequence in a violently satirical poem, after he was persuaded by his friends to abandon his intention of obtaining redress in a court of law. He was carefully just in his conduct; and it is mentioned of him that when he was travelling through Asia as a private individual,§ he contented himself often with the entertainment of the common inns, instead of taxing the hospitality of the principal inhabitants; which, it seems, was the usual practice of the Roman Nobility in their journies through the Provinces. When the inns could not accommodate him, he applied to the magistrates to receive him; but as he used no imperious or threatening language, he frequently was treated with neglect. This is an odious picture of the ordinary tyranny of the Roman Government, and the debasement of character which such a system produced among those who suffered from it; nay, even Cato himself, is said to have been much offended when he was not treated with attention; and to have warned the magistrates that other Romans would not imitate his forbearance, but would exact by force a better reception. It is a wretched state of society when good men are proud of themselves merely for abstaining from acts of positive injustice.

Cæsar Prætor, Cato Tribune. Account of the early Life of Cato. U. C. 691.

effect their designs by fire and assassination, rather than by open force. But if Catiline could have once made himself master of the city, no one can doubt but that he would have found a majority in the Comitia ready, either from fear or sympathy in his projects, to elect him Consul or Dictator; and when thus invested with the title of a legal magistrate, and in possession of the seat of Government, he would, probably, have persuaded a very great part of the community to remain neutral, while his own active supporters, the profligate young Nobility, the needy plebeians, the discontented Italian allies, and the restless veterans of Sylla's armies, would have enabled him to defy the efforts of any neighbouring Prætor who might have been disposed to attack him. He might have held the Government as easily as Cinna and Carbo had done; and although Pompey might have imitated successfully the conduct of Sylla, in returning from Asia to revenge the cause of the Aristocracy, yet the chance of resisting him was not so hopeless as to dismay a set of desperate conspirators, who, in their calculations, would have been well contented if the probability of their failure was only a little greater than that of their success.

* Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 5.

* Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 1, &c.

† Ibid. c. 6.

‡ Ibid. c. 7.

§ Ibid. c. 12.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C 59.

In preparing himself to enter upon his political career at Rome, Cato had resolved to support the ancient Constitution of his country, and to resist what he regarded as the growing corruptions of the age in which he lived. From the pursuit of this object he was never diverted by any considerations of friendship, interest, or fear: but he did not follow it always with a cool and enlightened judgment; and his personal animosities and prejudices sometimes influenced him, insensibly perhaps to himself, in opposing, with excessive vehemence, those whom he deemed the enemies of the Commonwealth. The debate concerning the accomplices of Catiline was well calculated to display the predominant features of Cato's character: his civil courage and contempt of popularity, in braving the odium which was likely, owing to Cæsar's speech, to fall upon those who voted for the death of the criminals; his zealous support of the old authority of the Senate, and his abhorrence of those who sought to overturn it. But a very short time before, he had given a proof of his zeal, the wisdom of which was more questionable, in joining to prosecute L. Muræna, one of the Consuls elect, for bribery during his election; a charge which he could not substantiate, and which was likely to divide unseasonably the friends of the Constitution at a moment when their close union was so necessary. On the whole, however, the Senate looked forward to his services with sanguine hope during the ensuing year; and the support of one firm Tribune was particularly needed, as Q. Metellus Nepos, a friend of Pompey and a warm enemy of the Aristocracy, who was one of Cato's colleagues in the Tribuneship, was expected to employ his year of office in promoting measures most unwelcome to the party of the Senate.

Proceedings of Q. Metellus Nepos against the Aristocracy.

The first measure which was adopted, on Cato's recommendation, displayed a more politic and conciliating temper, than he usually appeared to possess. Already the poorest classes of the people began to murmur at the execution of Catiline's accomplices, and to complain that the Senate was prompt enough in repressing seditions, but never bestowed a thought on relieving the sufferings of the poorer citizens. Q. Metellus was disposed to support these discontents by charging Cicero with the illegal murder of Roman citizens without trial; and C. Cæsar, the idol of the populace, was ready to unite his intrigues and his eloquence to further the same purposes. Cato, therefore, advised the Senate to pass a Corn law,* by which the sum of 1250 talents was to be annually employed in purchasing corn for the maintenance of the poor: and the thankfulness with which this bounty was received, ought to have encouraged the Senate to devote their attention seriously to the discovery of some plan for the permanent improvement of the condition of the lower classes of the community. As for the attacks made by Metellus upon Cicero's Consulship, they had no other immediate effect than to draw from the Senate some strong resolutions,† by which every person who should presume to question the justice of the late executions, was declared an enemy to his country. Metellus after this did not venture to proceed any further; but he proposed a law for the recall of Pompey with his army, to remedy the existing grievances of the State; and when this measure was frustrated by the opposition of Cato, he left Rome, and withdrew to Pompey's army,* as if apprehending personal danger from the violence of his opponents. At the same time C. Cæsar was suspended by a decree of the Senate from the discharge of his office as Prætor;† but, on his submitting to their authority, and refusing the proffered aid of the populace to reinstate him by force, he was soon afterwards restored by another decree, and received many compliments in the Senate on his dutiful behaviour. The year then appears to have passed on in tolerable tranquillity, except that apprehensions were entertained by many lest Pompey, exasperated at the pretended affronts offered to Metellus, should be tempted to follow the example of Sylla, and cross over with his army into Italy to interfere by force with the Government. But Pompey was greatly wronged by these suspicions. He was ambitious, indeed, of exercising a commanding influence in the Commonwealth, and was gratified by seeing one of his lieutenants, M. Calpurnius Piso, elected Consul, when he sent him home from the army to be a candidate for that dignity, and had avowedly exerted all his interest in his favour. This, however, was the utmost extent of his wishes; and far from entertaining any treasonable or revengeful designs, he no sooner landed in Italy in the winter of this year,‡ than he disbanded his army, and repaired to Rome, attended only by a few of his friends. As he was not allowed to enter the city whilst laying claim to a Triumph, the people, in compliment to him, were assembled without the walls, and he there addressed them for the first time after an absence of six years. All parties were waiting with anxiety to hear his sentiments on the state of the Republic, and all, according to Cicero, were alike disappointed.§ But it may well be doubted whether it were really a just subject of blame in Pompey, that his speech did not espouse sufficiently the interests of any particular party to satisfy their expectations, or excite their applause.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

Return of Pompey to Rome.

A short time before the end of the year 691, an affair had taken place which, at the moment of Pompey's arrival, was attracting particularly the public attention. P. Clodius Pulcher, a young man of the highest Nobility, whose father and grandfather had both been Consuls, was detected in disguise in the house of C. Cæsar,|| during the celebration of certain mysteries, which were annually performed at the houses of some of the higher magistrates, and from which every person of the male sex was most carefully excluded. Clodius was a man of infamous life, and the cause commonly alleged for this act of profanation, was an adulterous intrigue, in which he was said to be engaged with Cæsar's wife.¶ The matter, however, was taken up very earnestly, and being mentioned in the Senate by Q. Conificius, was

P. Clodius is detected in Cæsar's house during the celebration of the mysteries of the Bona Dea.

* Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 26. *in Cæsare*, c. 8.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 49. edit. Leunclav.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 49. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 29.
† Suetonius, *in Julio Cæsare*, c. 16.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xiv. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 65.
§ *Ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xiv.
|| Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xii.
¶ Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 9. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 70.

submitted to the Pontifices, and by them pronounced to be an act of sacrilegious wickedness.* Upon this decision a motion was founded in the Senate, to bring Clodius to trial; and this gave occasion to some warm debates. The offender, from various causes, was provided with powerful supporters: his family-interest, probably, was extensive, and he had violently opposed Lucullus, and had encouraged the discontent of his soldiers against him,† whilst acting as that General's lieutenant in the war with Mithridates; by which conduct he had recommended himself both to the populace and to the partisans of Pompey, to whom Lucullus was equally odious. Besides there was probably a large portion of the young Nobility and of the profligate citizens of all ranks, who naturally sympathized with Clodius from similarity of character; and who would regard him as an injured man, when threatened with a prosecution for an act of irreligion. Accordingly, when it was proposed to the people that Clodius should be brought to trial, and that the Prætor should himself select a certain number of Judges to decide the cause with him,‡ M. Piso the Consul opposed the measure, and the popular party were so clamorous against it, that it was deemed adviseble to withdraw it. Q. Fufius,§ one of the Tribunes, then moved that Clodius should still be tried, but that the Judges, instead of being named by the Prætor, should be chosen as usual by lot from the different orders in whose hands the judicial power was then placed. This proposal was approved by the people, and the trial, from thenceforward, according to Cicero, became a mere mockery. The Judges, thus indiscriminately chosen, were men not inaccessible either to fear or to corruption. The rabble (by which term must be understood not the poorest, but the most profligate of the people, consisting in a great degree of the young Nobility) was clamorous for the acquittal of Clodius, and money was distributed so liberally by his friends, that sentence was pronounced in his favour by a majority of six votes out of fifty-six.

He is tried and acquitted. U. C. 692.

The trial of Clodius came on in the spring of the year 692, and C. Cæsar about the same time set out for Spain, which was allotted to him as his Province on the expiration of his Prætorship. He had divorced his wife on account of the suspicion which her character had incurred from the circumstances of the late profanation of the mysteries; but ever careful not to compromise his popularity, he had taken no part against Clodius,‖ and professed not to believe that he was guilty. His debts were so enormous,¶ that he could not leave Rome till some of his friends, amongst whom M. Crassus is particularly mentioned, became his sureties with his creditors for very considerable sums. When he was thus enabled to enter upon the government of his Province, he displayed the same ability, and the same unscrupulous waste of human lives for the purposes of his ambition, which distinguished his subsequent career. In order to retrieve his fortune, to gain a military reputation, and to entitle himself to the honour of a Triumph, he attacked some of the native tribes on the most frivolous pretences;* and thus enriched himself and his army, and gained the credit of a successful General, by the plunder and massacre of these poor barbarians. Probably, also, the spoils which he collected on this occasion enabled him to solicit and procure from the Senate an abatement of the taxes paid by the Province of Spain;† a favour which of course gained him numerous friends amongst the wealthy inhabitants of the seaports of that country. But while thus employed, his eyes were constantly fixed on the state of things at Rome. The prospect appeared favourable to his ambition, and accordingly, after an absence of about twelve months, he returned home to claim a Triumph for his victories, and to offer himself as a candidate for the Consulship.

Cæsar removes to Spain as his Province. His conduct during his command there. U. C. 692-3.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

The remainder of the year 692 had passed away unmarked by any thing of considerable importance; and L. Afranius and Q. Metellus Celer were chosen Consuls for the year following. Metellus, although the brother of the late Tribune Metellus Nepos, had yet shewn his attachment on several occasions to the Aristocratical party: he had, during his Prætorship, been the means of saving C. Rabirius, when tried for the murder of Saturninus; and when, after his Prætorship, he was appointed to the Province of Gaul, he had behaved with great zeal in supporting the Government, and in opposing Catiline in the field. Afranius owed his elevation entirely to the interest of Pompey; who, according to Cicero,‡ spent a large sum of money in securing votes in his favour. He is described as a man totally destitute of political influence,§ and so insignificant as to have been of little or no service in forwarding the views of his patron. It appears that Pompey at this time severely felt the jealousy with which he was regarded by the Aristocracy. His successive appointments to the command against the Pirates and against Mithridates had been carried in spite of the opposition of the Nobles; and in those commands he had given the greatest offence, first to Q. Metellus, when he interfered to save the Cretans from his cruelties, and afterwards to L. Lucullus, when he deprived him of the honour of finishing a war which he had so long been engaged in conducting. But both Metellus and Lucullus were men of great influence in the Senate; and now that Pompey was returned from Asia, they exerted themselves to prevent the ratification of his various acts:‖ it being requisite that all measures adopted by a General in settling the state of the conquered Provinces after a war, should receive the sanction of the Senate's authority. Mortified at this treatment, and thinking it an affront that his measures should be separately canvassed, and confirmed or annulled according to the pleasure of others, he connected himself with the party in opposition to the Senate; not intending, if we may judge from his general character, to follow the steps of Marius or Cinna, but rather fancying that he might avail himself of the support of the popular party, just so far as to force the Aristocracy to cease from opposing him; and that, by a dexterous management

State of affairs in Rome during his absence. U. C. 693.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xiii.
† Plutarch, *in Lucullo*, c. 34.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xiv.
§ Ibid. lib. i. epist. xvi.
‖ Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 10.
¶ Ibid. c. 11. Suetonius, c. 18

* Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 53.
† Hirtius, *de Bello Hispaniensi*, c. 42.
‡ *Ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xvi. sect. 7.
§ Cicero, *ubi supra*. Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 51, 52.
‖ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 66. Florus, lib. iv. c. 2.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

of the two contending interests in the State, he might be acknowledged by the general deference of all to be the first person in the Commonwealth, without raising himself by violence to a situation of actual supremacy. Amongst other things, he was particularly desirous to procure settlements of lands for the soldiers who had served under him; a reward which, if we may trust Plutarch's report,* he had on former occasions procured for those who had followed him in his early campaigns; and a measure which was sure to confer on a General the highest popularity. Accordingly L. Flavius, one of the Tribunes, as early as the month of January, brought forward an Agrarian law;† it having been judged expedient to extend the proposed grant of lands to the poorer citizens in general, as well as to the soldiers of Pompey, in order to make the resolution more acceptable to the people at large. It was intended that the lands to be thus distributed should be purchased by the revenue arising from Pompey's new conquests, which accordingly for the next five years was to be appropriated to this object.‡ This law, like every other of the same nature, was warmly opposed by the Aristocracy, headed by the Consul Metellus; and on the other hand it was supported by Pompey, as might be imagined, with all his interest. Cicero declared himself favourable to the principle of it, but proposed various modifications to prevent it from injuring the rights of individuals; and these alterations, he tells us, were favourably listened to by the people. The alarm of a war in Transalpine Gaul, which threatened the State about the beginning of March, drew off the public attention from the law; but when the prospect of affairs cleared up abroad, the internal disputes were renewed; and it appears, that they continued through a great part of the year, and that the resistance of the Aristocracy was so determined, that although L. Flavius on one occasion ordered the Consul Q. Metellus to be sent to prison for obstructing the progress of the law,§ yet he was finally unable to gain his object; and Pompey could neither obtain settlements for his soldiers, nor prevail upon the Senate to pass the desired confirmation of his acts in Asia.

Agrarian law of L. Flavius.

Cæsar returns from Spain.

In this state of affairs Cæsar returned from Spain about the middle of June, wishing at once to obtain a Triumph, and to offer himself as a candidate for the Consulship. But as the time of the elections was drawing near, and no officer was allowed to enter the city whilst waiting the permission of the Senate to Triumph, he petitioned that he might be admitted as a candidate in his absence.|| This, however, being opposed in the Senate, and particularly by Cato, Cæsar gave up all thoughts of his Triumph, and entering the city immediately commenced his canvass. He had already effected that famous coalition between Pompey, Crassus, and himself, which has been distinguished by the name of the Triumvirate, or "Commission of Three:" an appellation borrowed from the usual number of persons employed by the Senate as Commissioners for executing any particular service, and bestowed in mockery upon the three individuals, who were purposing to dispose of the whole government of the Commonwealth with no authority but their own ambition. The secret conditions of this union cannot of course be otherwise known than from the subsequent conduct of the parties who formed it: but we may conjecture that Cæsar was anxious to secure a military command on an extensive scale, which he might enjoy during several years, that he, too, as Pompey had done, might possess a veteran army attached to his person; and that he might employ it, as Pompey had *not* done, in procuring for himself whatever he might choose to demand. Pompey, on his part, offended with the Aristocracy, seeing that he might obtain, through Cæsar's support, that ratification of his acts in Asia, and those settlements for his soldiers, which had been so long denied him; and too vain to imagine that his own exploits, or his consideration among the people, could ever be rivalled; contemplating, besides, the immediate prospect of enjoying an undivided supremacy at Rome for some years, during the absence of Cæsar, and too willing to calculate that the danger, which is at a distance, may be timely dispelled by some unforeseen contingencies; Pompey, for all these reasons, listened to the advances of Cæsar with readiness and without suspicion. Crassus was, like Cæsar, ambitious of obtaining a military command, and perhaps flattered himself that, while the personal character of his two associates might direct their jealousy chiefly against one another, he might be able, by his immense wealth, to secure himself in the enjoyment of his greatness hereafter, even without their cooperation. But with whatever views these confederates were actuated, their coalition was as dangerous to the State as the exorbitance of the prizes which they secured to themselves, and the violence used in order to obtain them, were actually destructive of the existing Constitution of their country.

The first Triumvirate.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

Supported by such powerful assistants in addition to his own popularity, Cæsar was elected Consul without difficulty; the Aristocratical party succeeding, however, in giving him as a colleague M. Calpurnius Bibulus, on whose attachment to their cause they could fully depend. But it seems that the contending interests in the Republic were very unequally matched. On the Aristocratical side there was neither unanimity nor vigour. Q. Catulus was lately dead, and his high character and long habits of acting as the head of a party, rendered his loss particularly severe. Those who had succeeded to his station, L. Lucullus, Q. Hortensius, and others of less renown with posterity, were mostly engrossed, if we may believe Cicero,* with their own private luxuries, and allowed their public duties to lie neglected. M. Cicero was in many respects so situated as to regard the dissensions of his countrymen with unusual impartiality. His birth placed a barrier between him and the high Nobility, which they were never able entirely to forget; while, on the other hand, the principles on which he had always acted, and which he had more particularly enforced in his Consulship, rendered him an object of aversion to the violent popular party, and removed

Consulship of Cæsar and Bibulus. U. C. 694.

* *In Lucullo*, c. 34.

† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xviii. Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 52.

‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xix.

§ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxvii. p. 52. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. i.

|| Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 18. Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 13.

* *Ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. i.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

him from any participation in the ambitious schemes of the Triumvirate. But, according to his own statement,* the impolicy of his friends, in holding a tone of unseasonable severity, had so alienated from the cause of the Republic many of those whom it had been his endeavour in his public conduct to conciliate, that he considered the state of affairs utterly unpromising, and during the eventful year which was now about to commence, he absented himself almost entirely from the business of the Commonwealth. The most active defender of the Aristocratical cause was M. Cato; who, although he filled no magistracy, nor enjoyed any political rank, yet, by his birth, his unshaken integrity, and his great courage, had rendered himself a person of considerable importance. Towards Cæsar, he entertained a fixed animosity, which he retained to the very end of his life; and the notoriety of this feeling deprived his opposition perhaps of some of the weight to which it otherwise would have been entitled. But had Cato's influence been much greater than it was, it could have availed little against the united power of Pompey, Cæsar, and Crassus, supported as it was at present by the whole strength of the popular party, and arming itself unscrupulously with all those violent means which had been practised in former times by L. Saturninus, P. Sulpicius, Marius, or Sylla.

The Agrarian law of Cæsar.

We have said that Pompey had been unable to carry the Agrarian law of L. Flavius during the preceding year. The first fruits of his coalition with Cæsar were seen in the Agrarian law proposed by the new Consul early in the year, and by which it was proposed to grant settlements to twenty thousand citizens in Campania;† one of the richest districts in Italy, which had been let out under the Roman Government since the second Punic war, and which no former author of an Agrarian law, except the Tribune Rullus during the Consulship of Cicero, had ever ventured to give up to distribution among the people. The division of these lands among the settlers was to be committed to twenty Commissioners, who were to be invested with full powers to manage it as they thought proper. It appears from Dion Cassius, that Cæsar had at first designed to do little more than bring forward anew the law of Flavius; and that he submitted it to the Senate, endeavouring to procure their concurrence in it. But finding that body obstinate in opposing it, on no other grounds, it is said, but because it was an innovation, he resolved to propose it to the people in a more popular form, and to carry it by their authority alone. Bibulus his colleague, with three of the Tribunes, did all in their power to oppose it; and despairing of success by any other means, they endeavoured to break up the assembly from time to time by reporting that thunder had been heard;‡ an occurrence which, according to the law of Rome, should have immediately suspended the business of the forum. But P. Vatinius, a Tribune, entirely devoted to Cæsar, had declared on entering upon his office,§ that he would regard none of those obstructions which the Augurs might throw in the way of his measures by reporting their observations on the state of the heavens: and as he now was busily engaged in supporting the Agrarian law, he provided an armed rabble to abet him in his proceedings, and thus defying the opposition of his colleagues, and ordering Bibulus on one occasion to be sent to prison, and at another time driving him out of the forum by violence, he procured by these means the enactment of the law.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

It was after several similar riots, in which Bibulus found his life endangered, that he confined himself entirely to his own house,* and contented himself with issuing strong protests and invectives against the measures of his colleague. Cæsar thus finding himself relieved from all opposition, proceeded to fulfil the conditions of his union with Pompey, by procuring from the people a law ratifying all his acts:† and he seized the opportunity of gratifying the Equestrian order by another law, for the relief of the farmers of the revenue, who having, in their eagerness to obtain the contract,‡ offered too large a sum for the rent of the taxes in the newly conquered Provinces, had afterwards petitioned the Senate that this agreement might be relaxed a little in their favour. Their petition had been first presented towards the end of the year 692, and had been constantly rejected; Cato on all occasions speaking against it with great vehemence. It was now granted by the people through the influence of Cæsar; and thus the affections of a powerful body of men were alienated from the Aristocracy, at a time when their assistance was most needful.

Other laws of Cæsar.

These, however, were all of them measures with regard to which good and wise men might fairly differ, however much they condemned the violent means by which they were carried. It now remained that the Triumvirs should provide more directly for their own aggrandizement. Accordingly P. Vatinius moved before the people, that the Provinces of Cisalpine Gaul and Illyricum should be given to Cæsar for five years, with an army of three legions;§ although the disposal of such commands was vested, by the law, as it then stood, in the Senate alone. The people, as may be supposed, readily agreed to the grant; and the Senate, wishing perhaps to increase the weight of Cæsar's employments abroad, and to remove him further from the city, added to his government the Province of Transalpine Gaul, and voted him another legion. Meantime Pompey had connected himself more closely with Cæsar,‖ by marrying his daughter Julia; and Cæsar on his part married Calpurnia, the daughter of L. Piso; intending that his father-in-law Piso, and A. Gabinius, an old partisan of Pompey, should succeed in the following year to the Consulship. At the same time the adoption of P. Clodius into a plebeian family had been effected through the influence of Pompey and Cæsar,¶ in order that he might be able to be elected Tribune of the people. It is probable that he was considered generally as a useful instrument to keep the Aristocratical party in a state of depression and alarm: and Cæsar, it is said, offended by the manner in which Cicero spoke of the

The Province of Gaul given to Cæsar.

* *Ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. i. lib. i. epist. xvii. xviii.

† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 70. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. vii. Dion Cassius, lib. xxxviii. p. 59.

‡ Cicero, *in Vatinium*, c. 7. Dion Cassius, lib. xxxviii. p. 61.

§ Cicero, *in Vatinium*, c. 6.

* Cicero, *in Vatinium*, c. 9. *ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. xix. xx. xxi.

† Dion Cassius, lib. xxxviii. p. 62.

‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xvii. xviii. *pro Plancio*, c. 14.

§ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 22. Cicero, *in Vatinium*, c. 15. *de Provinciis Consular.* c. 12.

‖ Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 14.

¶ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. xii. *pro Domo*, c. 16. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 20.

Biography. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

Triumvirate, was disposed to cooperate with Clodius in those measures which were more particularly aimed against him personally. But the transactions which led to Cicero's exile belong more properly to the subsequent year; and the story of Cæsar's Consulship may be closed by observing, that after seeing Piso and Gabinius elected Consuls according to the wish of the Triumvirate, and leaving Clodius in possession of the Tribuneship, and bent on effecting the destruction of Cicero, he set out from Rome early in the spring of the year 695, to commence his long career of conquests in Gaul.*

* Cæsar, *de Bello Gallico*, lib. i. c. 5, 6.

At this point our narrative of the internal affairs of the Commonwealth may be allowed to pause; while the reader's attention is directed to a farther detail of the events which had previously occurred in Spain, to the operations of Cæsar in Gaul, and to those of Crassus in Parthia. The latter expedition indeed did not take place till a period somewhat later than that which we have now reached; but as it is quite distinct from the course of events at Rome, it may be a little anticipated, in order that the thread of our story may not be interrupted, as we proceed from the exile of Cicero to the actual beginning of the civil war.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 676. — A. C. 78. to U. C. 695. — A. C. 59.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXI.

OF SPAIN.

FROM U. C. 520. B. C. 234. TO U. C. 681. B. C. 73.

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73. Introduction.

Before we proceed in the domestic history of Rome, it will be necessary to retread our steps in order to narrate the fortunes of some of her Provinces. We begin with Spain. The historian of this quarter has uniformly had to lament the almost total want of information relative to its early inhabitants, as well as in regard to those rude beginnings of society and of government, which must have long preceded the times of the Carthaginians. It is generally believed that the Celtiberians, who were found by Hamilcar Barca in possession of Catalonia and the adjacent districts, were originally a Celtic tribe, who had migrated from the neighbouring Provinces of France, either for the purposes of commerce, or for the more simple object of obtaining a home and securing personal protection among the friendly natives of Iberia. It has been imagined, too, that the Phœnicians, to whom all the shores of the Mediterranean were familiarly known, were acquainted, at a very early period, with the mineral riches of Spain; but the Greek historians, to whom we are indebted for nearly all our knowledge of the ancient world, seem not to have taken a sufficient interest in the commercial enterprise of their Syrian neighbours, either to record their discoveries, or to ascertain the limits of their conquests. There is a tradition among certain authors, that the people of Tyre fixed a mercantile establishment in the vicinity of the modern Cadiz: and Herodotus informs us, that a colony of Greeks, at a remote æra, passed the pillars of Hercules; and, moreover, that, upon meeting with encouragement and protection from a native Prince, to whom he gives the name of Arganthonius, they proceeded to build, or to occupy, the maritime city of Tartessus; where they continued to cultivate the arts of peace, and set an example of successful industry for many generations.

Early history of Spain, and condition of the aboriginal inhabitants.

But it is, nevertheless, universally admitted, that very little is known of Spain until the period when the memorable contest between the rival Republics of Carthage and Rome rendered her richest Provinces the theatre of war; and which, by drawing the attention of the Latin historians to the progress of their arms, placed within their reach the means of becoming acquainted with the character of the people, with the general aspect of the country, and even in some measure with its natural productions. It is no doubt true, that the curious reader may glean from more ancient annals than those which record the events of the second Punic war, a few facts concerning the aboriginal inhabitants of Iberia; and learn from one author that they were brave but impolitic, ignorant of the arts of peace, and entirely occupied with the care of their armour and of their horses; the latter of which they are said to have valued more highly than their own blood. It is Strabo who tells us that the Spaniards painted or stained their bodies with various colours; that they delighted in long hair and in glittering ornaments of gold and silver; that their mountains abounded in mines of copper, as well as of the more precious metals; and that either from ignorance, or from the possession of uncommon wealth, they were observed to use large vessels and implements of silver for the most ordinary domestic purposes. Upon the whole, however, it is abundantly obvious, that the knowledge of the ancients, in regard to Spain, was extremely limited; and also that the few particulars which they had collected, relative to the inhabitants, denote a condition of the lowest barbarism; in which there was neither sufficient concert among the various tribes to prevent the invasion and settlement of foreigners, nor sufficient skill and docility to imitate the arts by which their several hordes were successively subdued.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

Invasion of Spain by Hamilcar Barca. U. C. 520. — B. C. 234.

It was soon after the conclusion of the first Punic war, and immediately upon suppressing the dangerous insurrection of the rebellious mercenaries, that Hamilcar Barca led an army into Spain; under the pretext, it is said, of protecting the Tyrian colonists, whom we have already mentioned, from the violence and injustice of their barbarian neighbours. This celebrated commander began by forming an extensive settlement on the coast, where he likewise built the town called Barceno, the modern Barcelona; and in the choice of a situation he could not have selected one more conveniently adapted, both for an easy intercourse with the mother country, and for securing at all times a large share of the metallic wealth of the Catalonian mountains. Polybius narrates that Hamilcar spent about nine years in Spain; in the course of which he extended very considerably the dominions and influence of Carthage. His policy and arms were equally successful; till, at length,

His death,

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

engaging in battle with an army composed of the bravest and most warlike of the native tribes, and exceeding greatly in number all the troops that he could bring into the field, he was defeated and slain.

Succession of Hasdrubal. U. C. 526. — B. C. 228.

Hasdrubal, the son-in-law of the great commander whose death we have just related, succeeded him in the management of the war, and in the general superintendence of the Carthaginian Province. But of the events which marked the commencement of Hasdrubal's government, we are not enabled to give any details; and it is only from the effects which his military movements produced on the minds of the Roman allies in Spain, that we are led to the conclusion, which is also confirmed by other considerations, that he must have subdued the confederate chiefs who took the field against his predecessor, and even added to the conquests which that General had achieved. His progress awakened the fears of the people of Saguntum; a city which is understood to have derived its origin from the commercial establishment of some Grecian colony, and which, at the period in question, enjoyed the alliance of Rome, and was entitled to claim the protection of that powerful and jealous state.

In the life of HANNIBAL we have already detailed the principal events in Spain during the early period of his military career, till the fall of Saguntum, at sufficient length to prevent the necessity of recapitulating them here.

U. C. 538. — B. C. 216.

After the capture of this city, the Senate at Rome did not entertain the most distant suspicion that their own territory was about to be invaded, but raised two Consular armies; of which, the one was destined to act in Spain, whilst the other was ordered to proceed against the African dominions of Carthage. Publius Cornelius Scipio was appointed to the command of the former; and this Consul, together with his brother Cneius Cornelius, who had been named his lieutenant, was already on his passage to his Province, when, happening to approach the coast of Gaul, he received the unexpected information that Hannibal, at the head of a powerful armament, was actually marching through that country on his way to Italy. Such news could not fail to influence the procedure of Publius. It now became his main object to intercept the Carthaginians, and, by bringing them to battle, to fix, if possible, the seat of war among the Gauls. For this purpose he immediately landed a part of the troops at Marseilles, and went in quest of the invader; instructing his brother to proceed with the remainder into Spain, to effect the reduction of that Province, and to reestablish in it, by dint of arms and of negotiation, the interests of the Commonwealth and the ascendency of their allies.

Hasdrubal commands in Spain.

When Hannibal marched out of Spain, he left to the command of his brother Hasdrubal a considerable body of troops, with a fleet of sixty ships to protect the coast; whilst he committed to the charge of Hanno all the country between the Iberus and the Pyrenean range, to keep open the passes of the mountains, and to protect the heavy baggage of the Italian army, which it had been found expedient to leave behind.

Cn. Cor. Scipio lands in Spain and defeats the Carthaginian fleet.

Cneius Cornelius, having disembarked his soldiers at Emporium, proceeded along the coast, reducing several towns in his line of march, and restoring the confidence of such of the native chiefs as had been disposed to attach themselves to the fortune of Rome. He is said to have gained, in the beginning of the campaign, a considerable advantage over the Carthaginian fleet, under the immediate command of Himilco, who had been sent to assist the councils of Hasdrubal. But if we may trust to the accuracy of Polybius, the success of Cn. Cornelius Scipio will appear to have been neither very brilliant, nor attended with any permanent effect. He assures us that as soon as Hasdrubal was informed of these transactions, he made haste to pass the Iberus with his army; and finding that the naval forces of the Romans had grown confident from their late success, were relaxed in their discipline, and forgetful of the usual precautions, he sent forward a body of eight thousand foot and a thousand horse; who, falling suddenly upon them, while they were dispersed over the face of the country, killed a great number, and drove the rest in confusion to their ships. Livy shews a strong inclination to magnify the exploits of his countrymen, and to exaggerate their triumphs; but Appian, who is on this occasion a more impartial authority, remarks, with an air of much truth and simplicity, that prior to the arrival of his brother Publius from Italy, the Roman commander achieved nothing that was worthy of being mentioned.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

Publius Cor. Scipio joins his brother, and gains advantages over the Carthaginians.

The value of Spain was first made manifest to the people of Rome, by the important supplies of men and treasure which Hannibal appeared to draw from it. Determined to cut off from him this source of power, the Senate resolved that Publius Cor. Scipio, to whom the Province of Spain was first allotted, should immediately proceed to resume his command at the head of a considerable reinforcement both of sea and land forces; directing, in the mean time, their main attention to the hostile designs of their invader, who had already pitched his camp on the banks of the Po. Nor did Publius disappoint the hopes of his Republic. Before this period the Romans had never attempted to carry their arms beyond the Iberus; thinking it sufficient to have obtained the nominal alliance of the barbarous tribes who dwelt towards the north and west, or to have stipulated for their forbearance. But now, their warlike operations were planned on a larger scale; and Publius, crossing the wonted boundary of his Province, is said to have subdued, or gained over to the cause of Rome, a great variety of nations, whose names and appearance were altogether new to his victorious troops. The present success of the Romans, however, was not confined to the progress of their arms; and there is an incident, connected with the fortune of the war, and mentioned by all the historians, which contributed not a little to strengthen their footing in Spain.

Anecdote of Abilox.

When Hannibal was preparing for his Italian expedition, he thought proper to secure the fidelity of his Spanish allies, by demanding the children of the principal families, in order to detain them in a fortified place, in the capacity of hostages, until the Romans should be finally expelled from their territory. A crafty Spaniard, to whom Livy gives the name of Abilox, and whom the readers of Polybius will recognise under the similar appellation of Abilyx, contrived to remove this impediment to the negotiations of the Roman Proconsul. He persuaded the Carthaginian General Bostar, who acted as the lieutenant of Hasdrubal, that humanity and good policy

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

alike required that, as his countrymen could no longer maintain their ascendency by the terror of their arms, he should deliver up to their parents the youths whom Hannibal had shut up in Sagumtum. Abilox was himself commissioned to carry this benevolent proposal into effect. Instead, however, of restoring the children immediately to their families, he carried them all to the Roman camp; reserving for Publius Scipio the pleasing and popular office of replacing the hostages under the roof of their fathers, and of thereby securing, for the interests of his country, the affections and cooperation of a large body of the native chiefs.

History has not preserved to us any detail of the proceedings which diversified the war in Spain during the early part of the year which we have noted in the margin. The two Scipios continued to make considerable progress when Hasdrubal, who alone of all the Carthaginian Generals appeared able to cope with them, received orders from his Government to march into Italy to the relief of his brother, now beginning to be hard pressed by the Consular armies. But the policy of the Romans required that Hannibal should not receive any reinforcements from Spain; and with this view Publius put his troops in motion to watch the steps of Hasdrubal, as he advanced towards the Pyrenees, brought him to an engagement in spite of his resolution to avoid it, and, finally, inflicted upon him so complete an overthrow, as to prevent him, for the present, from continuing his march into Italy.

U. C. 540. — B. C. 214. Hasdrubal defeated.

U. C. 543. — B. C. 211.

But the prosperity of the Romans was doomed to experience a grievous interruption. Three years had hardly elapsed when the Carthaginian force in Spain was so amply recruited, that they had no fewer than three armies in the field: one commanded by Hasdrubal the son of Gisgo, the second by Hasdrubal the brother of Hannibal, and the third by Mago, who seems to have joined the first of the Generals now named. The Roman leaders formed a plan for cutting them off separately, and in succession; and regarding Hasdrubal, the son of Hamilcar, as by far the most formidable of their antagonists, it was agreed between the two Scipios that Cneius, with the greater part of the legionary soldiers and a portion of the allies, should attack him, whilst Publius, with the remainder, composed of Roman and Italian auxiliaries, should watch the motions of the other Hasdrubal and of Mago. This resolution proved fatal to the cause of Rome. Publius found himself unequal to the combined armies which he had to oppose; for, besides the troops which fought under the standard of Carthage, there was a powerful body of Numidian cavalry, commanded by their Prince Masinissa, which galled the heavy-armed soldiers of the legion, and intercepted all the supplies of their camp. Livy describes, in language rendered eloquent by indignation, the annoyance and difficulties which were created by these barbarian horsemen. Nor were these the only dangers with which the Roman General had to contend. He was aware that Indibilis, one of the most spirited of the native chiefs, was at hand with seven or eight thousand men to increase the strength of the Carthaginians; and he could not fail to perceive that, were this junction once effected, he would be compelled to relinquish the field to an enemy so much superior to himself in numbers. Influenced by these considerations, he resolved to issue forth in the night and crush the force of Indibilis, before the latter could reach the encampment of the confederates; a measure which, as it failed to secure success, has been condemned as rash and inexpedient. A general engagement took place amidst the confusion of a nocturnal assault: the Numidian horse attacked the Romans whilst yet on their march; and the whole Carthaginian army, roused by the clamour of the onset, rushed from their entrenchments to support the arms of their allies. Publius fell in the battle, and his troops were put to the rout; of whom, says Livy, not one would have escaped, had not the approach of night saved the fugitives. Historians, like poets, are sometimes caught napping; and the reader of this passage, in the twenty-fifth book of the work to which we are now alluding, must have some curiosity to learn, how a fight, which commenced at midnight, (*medid nocte profectus, cum obviis hostibus manus conseruit*) could be terminated by the arrival of evening twilight.*

Defeat and death of Publius Scipio.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

The two victorious armies, having joined that which was under the command of Hasdrubal, the son of Hamilcar, marched immediately against Cneius, to put an end to the war by his defeat. He was already more than half vanquished by the desertion of the Spanish allies, who had been seduced by the Carthaginians, or recalled home by the news of a domestic quarrel. The battle which ensued was decisive of his fate. Attempting to retreat in the night, he was overtaken by the enemy, compelled to receive their attack in the most unfavourable circumstances, and ultimately defeated with the loss of his army and of his life. Appian informs us, that the Roman General, having fled with a few followers and taken refuge in a tower or fortress, was pursued by the furious barbarians and burnt to death within the walls; and Livy adds some probability to the same account, by stating that the place in which Cneius had shut himself up, was reduced by means of fire; after which, he and all his attendants were cruelly butchered by the conquerors.

The Carthaginian Generals unite and attack Cneius; who is likewise defeated and slain.

Spain now seemed lost to the Romans; their best commanders being killed, and their armies either cut in pieces or dispersed. In this crisis of their affairs, a gallant young officer, of the Equestrian order, assumed the conduct of the war; and, collecting the remains of the broken legions, prepared to maintain his ground against the overwhelming power of the Carthaginians, who were again advancing, under Hasdrubal, the son of Gisgo, to complete the conquest of the Spanish territory. We have the authority of Livy for asserting that this spirited youth soon afterwards succeeded in turning the tide of fortune in favour of his countrymen; that he attacked the Carthaginians, who had divided themselves into two camps and were secure, as they imagined, from any attempt on the part of the Romans, killed thirty-seven thousand of them, took nearly two thousand prisoners, and brought off an immense quantity of plunder.

Good conduct of Lucius Marcius.

These events took place in the year 212 before the Christian æra; and as it was not till the following year that Publius Cornelius Scipio, the son of Publius who

* Livy, xxv. 34. It may, perhaps, be said, that the battle lasted during the night and part of the following day; and that the pursuit continued till evening. This, improbable as it is, appears to be the only mode of reconciling the contradiction.

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

had lately fallen in battle, was appointed to the command in Spain, there is an interval of more than twelve months, which appears like a blank in the page of history. Appian, it is true, supplies some information in regard to that period, which may be thought sufficient to connect, at least, the chain of events. He tells us that Marcellus, who had recently served with much distinction in Sicily, was sent with M. Claudius to assume the Government in the Spanish Province; but, he adds, their success was so very indifferent, that the strength of the Carthaginians was not only greatly increased, but that nearly the whole country had again fallen under their dominion, whilst the wrecks of the Roman army were confined to the fortresses of the Pyrenean mountains. Livy, it is proper to observe, makes no mention of these appointments; and the inquisitive reader, who examines carefully into dates, will unquestionably find some difficulty in reconciling the statement of Appian with the proceedings which are recorded of Marcellus, almost at the same moment, whilst exercising a command in Sicily. But, in whatever way this obscurity may be removed, there is no doubt that, in the course of the year we have already named, young Scipio appeared in the field, to revenge the death of his father; to revive the fallen hopes of the army which had sustained so severe an overthrow; and to conquer for Rome that ascendency in Spain which she continued to hold till her power was destroyed by the irruptions of the northern invaders.

Statement of Appian in regard to Marcellus and Marcus Claudius.

Young Scipio elected Proconsul.

The Spanish Province had now fewer attractions for the ambition of Roman leaders than at any former period; and as none but a person of great ability was fit for the command, so, when the day appointed for the election of a Proconsul arrived, it appeared, to the great consternation of the people, that no candidate for this dangerous preferment had yet given in his name. Grief and dismay pervaded the whole assembly; when, on a sudden, a youth of twenty-four years of age presented himself to their choice, urging his pretensions with equal simplicity and confidence. The eyes of all the citizens were immediately attracted to Scipio, who, as the son of the late Proconsul, whose death was still so recent, called forth at once their sympathy and admiration. The election of the aspiring soldier was unanimous. Not only did all the Centuries agree in their votes, but, says Livy, every individual member of this popular assembly concurred in the decision, that the command in Spain should be conferred on Publius Scipio.

Character of Scipio.

This young man was already known by a variety of circumstances which recommended him greatly to public favour. At the age of seventeen, when just entering upon the military service, he had had the good fortune to rescue and preserve his father, who was on the point of being killed or taken by the enemy, on the river Ticinus. Being afterwards engaged in the battle of Cannæ, and one of a band of young men who had forced their way to Canusium, he prevented the execution of a design which they had formed to abandon Italy; obliging them all to bind themselves by an oath, that they would remain and contend for the fortunes of their country till the last.

Upon the arrival of Scipio in Spain, with a reinforcement of ten thousand men and thirty armed ships, he found the remains of his vanquished countrymen shut up within a narrow compass in the neighbourhood of the Pyrenees. As the season was far advanced, he refrained from undertaking any military expedition till the ensuing spring; and satisfied himself with fixing his head-quarters at the modern town of Tarragona, and with using the utmost exertion to obtain accurate intelligence, in regard to the strength and distribution of the enemy's forces. He learned that they had deposited their principal stores at New Carthage, which they had, at the same time, garrisoned with a thousand men; separating their army, for the present, into three divisions, of which none was nearer the position of their magazines than a march of ten days. Scipio himself was, indeed, still farther from New Carthage than the distance just specified, being removed from it not less than three hundred miles. He nevertheless conceived the project of surprising it; trusting to the negligence of his enemies, and confiding in the hope that he would be able to accomplish the greater part of his march before his design could be suspected, or any measure adopted to prevent its success. His stratagem was crowned with the most complete triumph. The town fell into his hands, together with the immense stores which it contained; and the Carthaginians, finding themselves outwitted by a mere youth, began to perceive that they would have to contend anew for the possession of a country, which they had allowed themselves to consider as a permanent nursery for their armies, and as one of the main sources of wealth to the parent State.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

He arrives in Spain, and takes New Carthage by surprise. U. C. 544. — B. C. 210.

It appears that about the time of Scipio's arrival in Spain, the Carthaginian Generals were busily occupied in preparing a reinforcement for Hannibal in Italy. The best of their troops, with all the supplies and apparatus necessary for accomplishing an arduous march across the Pyrenees and the Alps, were collected and placed under the charge of Hasdrubal the son of Hamilcar. The other Hasdrubal, the son of Gisgo, was likewise intrusted with the command of an army still more numerous, the object of which was to employ the attention of the Romans, and to aid the advance of the former towards the confines of Gaul. The position of Scipio at Tarragona, to which he had returned after the reduction of New Carthage, was regarded as a material obstacle to the accomplishment of this important measure. To withdraw him, therefore, from his station, the Carthaginian commanders set their whole force in motion towards the coast, apparently with the settled determination to recover New Carthage at every hazard, as being in itself a place of considerable consequence, and a necessary point of communication with the seat of Government in Africa. Hasdrubal, the son of Hamilcar, whose division of the army was farthest advanced, took a post on the river Bætis, with the seeming intention of commencing the siege; a movement which so much excited the apprehensions of the Roman General for his recent conquest, that he immediately began his march, in order to risk a battle with the brother of Hannibal, rather than relinquish the possession of a maritime city, whose name was connected with his earliest honours.

Defeats Hasdrubal, who had threatened New Carthage.

As the sole object of Hasdrubal's stratagem was to secure an undisturbed march to the Pyrenees, he allowed the semblance of a victory to Scipio, and retreated with a slow and measured pace before the Romans, who could not fail to be surprised at the facility of their triumph. Scipio, who to all the

Hasdrubal leaves Spain and carries his army into Italy

ardour of youth joined much of the caution of more advanced life, abstained from pursuing an enemy who had evidently retired without being defeated; and being justly apprehensive that, by a forward movement, he might be placed between the lines of two powerful armies, each of which, he had reason to believe, was in correspondence with the other, he recalled his victorious soldiers to their standards, and resolved to await the progress of events. Meantime Hasdrubal crossed the Iberus, and directed his steps towards the Pyrenees; of which, as soon as the Roman General was aware, he despatched some light troops to watch the progress of his antagonist; and finding that there was no longer any doubt of his intention to reinforce Hannibal in Italy, he sent information to Rome, apprizing the Senate that, if the passage through the Alps could be a second time accomplished, they would soon have to contend with another Carthaginian army, commanded by another son of the renowned Hamilcar.

In this transaction, as Dr. Ferguson remarks, Scipio may appear to have been overreached; and in respect to the address of his enemy, there is no doubt that, admitting the object they pursued to be of sufficient consequence to be preferred to the reputation of victory, and to be attainable even under the loss and discouragement of a defeat, the plan was by them ably laid and carried into execution. But even in this supposition, Scipio must be acquitted of any mistake or defect of conduct. He advanced to cover an important station, which the enemy might have seized, if he had not taken this measure. He took advantage of their separation to strike a decisive blow; and, probably, to disconcert any immediate project of offensive war. On a discovery of their march into Italy, what remained for him to do was not neglected; the enemy were carefully observed, and seasonable intelligence was sent to Rome of their apparent intentions.

Moderation and humanity of Scipio.

But the character of Scipio rests on a better foundation than the conjectural inferences of an historian, whose judgment was confined to the examination of a few unconnected events, without any knowledge of the particular views and motives whence they proceeded. His fame, as it respects the Spanish war, is supported on the ground of undisputed military talent, and on a series of splendid victories, which led, in the first instance, to the complete expulsion of the Carthaginians, and afterwards to the entire conquest of Spain. His moderation and humanity, too, have been highly extolled. His conduct towards the hostages whom he found at New Carthage, and that continence which has become proverbial towards the noble ladies who fell into his hands upon its reduction, is praised by all historians as a fine example of liberality and self-command; and is represented, at the same time, as having had a very great effect in paving the way for his subsequent progress as a conqueror.

Gains several advantages, and brings the war to a successful issue. U. C. 548. — B. C 206.

Having gained several advantages over the Carthaginian armies, both in person and also by means of the able services of his lieutenant Lælius, his success was exposed to a momentary interruption, owing, as well to the disaffection of his troops, as to the revolt of Mandonius and Andobalis, (or Indibilis) two native chiefs, who had formerly been guilty of the same perfidious conduct towards his enemies. Polybius, who seems to have derived great delight from describing any particular battle, as well as from expounding the principles of the military art at large, sets forth in the following terms, the arrangements of Scipio in his encounter with Andobalis. He informs us, in the first place, that the Roman General had resolved not to employ Spaniard against Spaniard, but to reserve the glory of finishing the war to the legionary soldiers under his immediate command. A march of ten days, says he, brought him to the banks of the Iberus, which, having passed, he immediately found himself in the presence of the enemy, with only a narrow valley in front to divide the camps. On the following day, after having instructed Lælius to hold the cavalry in readiness, he succeeded in bringing on an action, by tempting the well-known cupidity of the Spaniards; who, seeing a great number of cattle driven into the valley, rushed forth to seize the prey, and thereby exposed themselves to the meditated attack of the Romans. A sharp skirmish ensued with nearly equal success, when Lælius, who stood prepared with the horsemen, fell suddenly upon the barbarians, and slaughtered their scattered bands. The Spaniards, enraged by the loss which they had already sustained, and dreading the effect of it upon the minds of their impetuous but inconstant followers, formed the resolution of hazarding a general engagement on the same disadvantageous ground which they had already occupied. Scipio, on his part, was neither less prepared, nor less desirous to come to a decisive action. Guided, however, in his movements by those of his unskilful adversaries, he allowed them to descend into the plain and form their ranks; upon which he advanced with his veteran infantry to attack that part of the Spanish force which was stationed nearest to the foot of the mountains. Lælius, meantime, having conducted his cavalry along the hills that extended from the camp to the valley, assailed the enemy's horse in the rear, and kept them so closely engaged, that they could afford no aid to the foot, already pressed by the heavy-armed Romans. The barbarians, finding themselves thus mastered and confined by the superior tactics of Scipio, became at once furious with disappointed rage, and incapable of listening to command. The cavalry in particular, the most efficient portion of their army, pent up between the rocks and their own foot, and thrown into disorder by the difficulties of their situation, committed greater havoc upon the lines of their countrymen, than was inflicted by the Romans. The result of such a conflict could not be long in suspense. The Spaniards, who had descended into the valley, were nearly all destroyed; and it was only those who were drawn up at the foot of the hills who had it in their power to seek their safety in flight. Among these Andobalis found means to escape, and afterwards to convey himself and a small body of attendants to a fortified place, in which he eluded the pursuit of the conquerors.

Mandonius, the other leader of this revolt, made his peace with Scipio, on condition of paying to the conqueror a certain sum of money; and as the disaffected had no longer any hope of opposing with success the established ascendency of the Roman power, the war was considered at an end, and the victorious General forthwith took his departure for Italy.

Recapitulation of minor events.

We have purposely omitted some of the minor incidents which diversified the progress of hostilities in Spain. We have not mentioned, for example, that Scipio found it necessary to cross over into Africa, in

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

order to counteract the daring projects of Syphax, who had abandoned his alliance with the Romans, and attacked the Kingdom of Masinissa; the latter having now likewise changed sides and turned his arms against the Carthaginians. Nor did we think it necessary to detain the reader with the sieges of Illiturgi and Castulo; in the former of which the Romans tarnished not a little the glory of their name, by the indiscriminate slaughter of the inhabitants as soon as the place fell into their hands. The reduction of Astapa, a town situated on the river Bætis, was, perhaps, more worthy of the reader's notice, as illustrating the ferocious character and invincible love of liberty which, at that period, distinguished the people of Spain. Having resisted the progress of the Romans with all the skill and bravery usually exhibited on such occasions, the inhabitants of Astapa resolved to die rather than yield to their more civilized foe: and with this view they bound themselves by an oath, to employ against their own lives the fire and the sword which might happen to prove ineffectual in their last desperate effort upon the camp of the besiegers. A furious sally was accordingly made from the gates, which even the steady valour of the Romans with difficulty resisted; and it was not till after a most bloody and obstinate conflict that such of the townsmen as survived returned within their walls to accomplish their tremendous vow. Their women and children were included in the horrible immolation; and whole families of unresisting females and tender infants were first mangled with the swords of their husbands or fathers, and then thrown in heaps on a pile of wood and consumed in the flames.

When Scipio returned from the Spanish campaign, he was met by the Senate outside the walls, in the temple of Bellona, where he described to the conscript fathers the nature and extent of his services, the number of battles he had fought, the commanders against whom he had taken the field, and the happy condition in which he had left the Province. He afterwards entered the city and deposited in the public treasury the sum of 14,342 Roman pounds of silver, besides a large amount in coin; and his merits in every respect were accounted so high, both by the Senate and the people, that he would have obtained a Triumph, had there been any instance of that honour having been conferred on a General not yet invested with a public magistracy.

U. C. 549. — B. C. 205.

The command in Spain was now intrusted to Lucius Lentulus and Lucius Manlius Acidinus; and these officers had soon to lead their troops into the field to quash a fresh insurrection on the part of the natives, who had been induced to take up arms by Andobalis. A single battle, however, terminated the war. The restless chief, whom we have just named, was killed at the head of his savage followers; whilst Mandonius and other leaders of distinction, who were known to have fomented the disaffection of the multitude, were delivered up into the hands of the Romans and punished with death. The vanquished Spaniards were further compelled, in order to obtain the peace which they now found it necessary to solicit, to pay double tribute for one year; to supply the army with corn during six months; to provide clothing and other conveniences for the soldiers who were quartered in the conquered districts; and to yield hostages for about thirty of their tribes or nations.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73. — U. C. 556. — B. C. 298.

The Romans, nevertheless, were not allowed to maintain an undisturbed possession of any part of Spain; and so far were they from finding that the expulsion of the Carthaginians had secured the conquest of that strong country, that they soon perceived the war was only about to commence. They even found it necessary to divide the peninsula into two Provinces, called the Nearer and the Farther Spain, and to appoint separate commanders for each; and yet, as Livy informs us, while Lentulus enjoyed an Ovation for the success which he had gained in the latter, Sempronius the Proconsul, who had led an army into the remoter districts, was defeated and slain, with a very heavy loss of officers and men.

During eight or nine successive years from the date last noted in the margin, the progress of hostilities was not marked by any great event. The Roman Generals were for the most part annually relieved, and their armies annually recruited from Italy. But the natural strength of the country afforded many facilities to the hardy inhabitants both for defence and assault; and we accordingly find that, although the pages of the Roman History are crowded with triumphs and victories gained by their commanders in Spain, the course of war was seldom interrupted, and their success rarely permanent. Though often defeated, the Spaniards still renewed the contest. Concession on their part did not imply that they were vanquished; and even a formal treaty with their enemies did not dispose their minds to peace, or preclude them from seizing the earliest advantage which promised revenge, or even seemed to favour the restoration of their independence. Upwards of a hundred towns, on one occasion, tendered their submission to Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus; and yet his successors in command found not that the number of their foes was diminished, or that the battles, in which they were successively engaged, were less frequent or less bloody.

Spain, a country favourable for renewing and protracting war.

Ambition of the Romans.

It has, indeed, been maintained by several writers on the affairs of Rome, that, till after the conquest of Macedonia, the western Republic did not so much aim at the extension of her dominion in foreign countries, as at the defence of her own possessions in Italy; and that it was only in pursuance of the latter object that she was incidentally led to accomplish the former. In Spain, for example, where the Romans still continued to meet with a determined resistance, they had hitherto acted principally on the defensive; but after the defeat of Perseus, and the reduction of his kingdom, their ambition seems to have enlarged, and their avarice to have acquired new strength. The acquisition of a large revenue from Macedonia first taught them that war might be carried on without domestic taxation; and from this period, it has been remarked, their progress was distinguished by a succession of unprovoked hostilities, which they contrived to excite on their frontiers; not, as formerly, in defence of their own possessions, but for the enlargement of a territory already much too extensive. In Spain, more particularly, they now pressed upon the natives and provoked their opposition, with no other view than that they might enrich themselves by plunder, and gratify the people of Rome with new accessions to their dominions, or by an overrated list of tributaries. The invading legions now advancing to the Tagus,

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

endeavoured to penetrate beyond the mountains from which that river takes its source; till, by awakening the fears of the strong and resolute inhabitants of Lusitania and Gallicia, they involved themselves in a long train of sanguinary wars, the details of which are nowhere preserved, and which are only known to History by their general result.

Placed at a distance from the inspection of the Government, the Roman leaders, actuated not less by avarice than by ambition, were ever seeking fresh occasions to quarrel with the natives, in order to get possession of their imaginary treasures; and in their negotiations, too, with the Chiefs and townships, they had recourse to such arts of treachery, and to such flagrant breaches of faith, as clearly shewed that what they could not gain by force of arms, they were determined to secure by deceit and extortion. For instance, a town having surrendered by capitulation to a Roman Proconsul, of the name of Lucullus, the inhabitants, notwithstanding, in open violation of the treaty, were plundered by his order, and many of them afterwards put to the sword. A similar act of perfidious cruelty was soon after perpetrated by Galba, who commanded in Lusitania, or what was called the Ulterior Province of Spain. This conduct, so disgraceful to the name of Rome, and so much at variance with the principles upon which the Senate professed to regulate the public actions of her representatives, instead of furthering the progress of their arms, roused against them the most formidable opposition, and soon thereafter shook the foundations of their power in both the Iberian Provinces.

Extortion of their Generals.

Appearance of Viriathus.

No sooner were the Romans involved in the third Punic war than the Lusitanians, incensed by the treachery of Galba which has just been alluded to, assembled in numerous parties under Viriathus, and made preparations for avenging the cause of their country. The Chief now named had gained their admiration and confidence, first as a distinguished hunter, and afterwards as a captain of banditti; and the qualities of mind and body which fitted him for these hardy occupations, recommended him to the oppressed and desperate provincials, as the most proper person to lead their willing bands against their faithless invaders. Nor did this rude commander disappoint the hopes that were entertained of him. He knew so well how to employ the impetuous courage of his barbarian troops against the disciplined ranks to which they were opposed, that he converted their very deficiency, in those arts which constitute the excellence of a trained soldier, into the means of success in most of their operations. With him, an apparent rout was the ordinary prelude to a more violent attack; and he usually endeavoured, by pretended flights and disorderly movements, to draw his enemy into a rash pursuit, and then seized, with irresistible address and valour, the advantages which he himself had created.

His character.

He defeats Vitilius and other two Prætors.

The Prætor Vitilius marched against him with about ten thousand men; but was almost immediately defeated and killed, together with not less than four thousand of his troops. Another Prætor was forthwith despatched to quell this insurrection, intrusted with an army more numerous than the last, and including a powerful body of fifteen hundred horse. His success, however, was not more gratifying to the Senate than that of his predecessor. He was overcome in a pitched battle, losing not only a great number of his men, but likewise a considerable extent of territory. A third commander, of the same rank as the two former, was ordered to proceed against the Lusitanian; and he, like the others, fell under the weight of his arms, or the success of his stratagems. At length, after the termination of the war with Carthage, the Romans thought it expedient to send the Consul Quintus Fabius into Spain, in order to recover their affairs in the further Province, and to deliver them from the increasing apprehensions which the progress of Viriathus had not failed to excite. The Consular army was led with greater skill, or under better auspices; for Fabius is said to have obtained several important victories over his enterprising antagonist, and even to have reconquered much of the ground which the Prætorian commanders had lost. Nor did the fortune of war forsake the Consul by whom Fabius was succeeded. Quintus Cæcilius Metellus, an officer of great bravery and talent, followed up the advantages which had been already gained, and compelling Viriathus to act entirely on the defensive, he reduced under the Roman power a vast number of cities as well as the whole of what was called Tarraconian Spain. But Metellus was not permitted to finish the war, which he shewed himself so able to conduct to a successful issue. Intrigue, which now began to supersede at Rome the claims of merit and the most brilliant proofs of military skill, gave to Quintus Pompeius the command in Lusitania, and thereby revived the hopes and retrieved the affairs of the followers of Viriathus.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

Q. Fabius checks his arms.

The new Consul, instead of directing his force to the subjugation of the Lusitanian hunter, who still kept the field, and was ever ready for the most desperate undertakings, had the weakness to provoke the hostility of the Termantines and Numantines, and thereby to involve himself in a quarrel which ultimately covered him with disgrace and defeat. These two small communities, which had hitherto remained independent, were desirous to continue in a state of neutrality, and for this purpose offered every fair and reasonable concession to the Roman General. But Pompeius declared that he would not be satisfied unless they delivered up their arms; as no other security, he said, could remove the suspicion which possessed his mind, that they intended secretly to cooperate with his enemies. War was the immediate consequence; and the Consul made haste to punish the obstinacy of the Numantines, by investing their city with his whole army.

Quintus Pompeius unsuccessful in his attempt on the Numantines and Termantines.

The proceedings of this Pompeius appear to have been equally inconsiderate in their origin and unsuccessful in their result. He was driven from before Numantia with considerable loss, both of men and of reputation. Upon this he removed his camp, and sat down under the walls of Termantia, where his operations were attended with still worse success. The people of that city sallied forth against him, before his arrangements were completely formed, slew nearly a thousand of his soldiers, took a convoy which had been intended for the supply of his army, and destroyed a numerous detachment of horse, which they contrived to decoy into the passes of the mountains.

Meanwhile Servilius, who now served in Spain with the rank of Proconsul, carried on the war against Viriathus; and this he did with so little ability, and with such a remarkable want of circumspection, that

Servilius defeated by Viriathus.

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

he allowed himself to be surrounded by that spirited chieftain, by whom he was soon compelled to sue for peace. The terms proposed by the Lusitanian were extremely moderate. He confined himself to the reasonable demand, that he should be permitted to retain whatever portion of the country he already possessed, promising to respect the claims of the Romans as masters of all the rest. Servilius gladly acceded to these conditions; and the peace founded upon them was afterwards formally ratified by the Senate and people of Rome.

Pompeius again fails in his attempt upon Numantia.

The following year, Pompeius, who was continued in his command, renewed his operations against the people of Numantia. He hoped to reduce the town by turning aside the course of the river Durius, or Douro, from which it was supplied with water; but in attempting to realize this project he lost so many of his men, that, finding himself unable any longer to contend with an enemy whose valour was more than equalled by their skill, he was content to make peace on much more unfavourable terms than they had originally offered to him.

Viriathus had, in the mean time, assumed somewhat of the state and formality of a sovereign Prince, observing faithfully his treaty with the Romans, and holding himself not unprepared to protect both the people and the territory which the chance of war had committed to his charge. Such a character at the head of an independent State could not fail to embitter the regret of the commanders whose arms he had baffled, and of the country whose ambitious schemes he had so long defeated. The Romans, accordingly, sought to create an occasion which might afford a pretext for the renewal of hostilities; and Quintus Servilius Cæpio, who is said to have courted this appointment, was sent against him at the head of a powerful army. Viriathus, whose forces were far inferior to those of the new Consul, had recourse to negotiation; and seemed willing to avert the storm which impended over him, by making a considerable sacrifice to the cupidity of his adversaries. Cæpio demanded that he should surrender at discretion, and commit himself to the generosity or justice of the Senate; a proposal which the Lusitanian chief spurned with the utmost indignation, and declared his resolution to abide by the hazard of the sword. But the fate of Viriathus was already determined. Two faithless attendants, won by the bribes and promises of the Consul, murdered their master as he lay asleep; and in this way was brought to a conclusion, an eventful contest which had lasted more than fourteen years, and in which the native valour of the rude Iberian repeatedly triumphed over the discipline of the Roman legions, as well as over the experience and genius of some of their best commanders.

Assassination of Viriathus. U. C. 614. — B. C. 140.

While these events were occurring in the western parts of Spain, the eastern division was under the charge of the elder Cato, of the elder Tiberius Gracchus, and of other officers, who respectively endeavoured to secure what their countrymen had already conquered, and even to add to the extent of their dominions. As both Cato and Gracchus obtained a Triumph, we are justified in concluding that there must have been several battles in the districts in which they commanded; but as the more minute facts and circumstances connected with these conflicts have eluded the industry of historians, it would be worse than a waste of time for us to attempt to supply the deficiency.

Spain. From U. C. 599. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

The death of Viriathus opened once more a wider field to the ambition and curiosity of the Romans. In little more than a year after that event, according to some writers, (though Appian places it a year or two before it,) Brutus conducted one of their armies across the Durius, and advanced even to the very coast of Gallicia: whence they reported, with more than the embellishment and exaggeration of ordinary travellers, that the sun at his setting was seen to sink into the western ocean, and to be extinguished in the waves with a mighty noise. But the principal undertaking which employed the Roman arms, after they were relieved from the opposition of Viriathus, was a renewed attack upon the city of Numantia. The Consul Popilius was instructed to employ his troops in this nefarious service, in open violation of the treaty which his predecessor had contracted; and his success was such as to make a fit return for the treacherous views in which his attempt originated: The Numantines, rushing from their gates, inflicted such a discomfiture on the whole Roman army, that it was no longer able to keep the field; nor was the independence of that gallant people threatened with another siege, until a new Consul and a fresh levy had restored courage to the enemy's hearts, and numbers to their ranks.

Brutus leads an army into Gallicia.

Popilius attacks Numantia and is repulsed.

Mancinus renews the attack, and is defeated with great loss.

Mancinus, who succeeded Popilius both as Consul and commandant of the forces employed against Numantia, was doomed to sustain reverses still more severe than those which have just been described. The army under his charge, which consisted of more than thirty thousand men, was totally routed by less than one third of their number. Twenty thousand fell in the battle; and the remainder, with their General, were surrounded by the Numantines in such a manner, that they could neither retreat nor advance, and consequently must all have perished by famine, or by the sword, had not their enemy, with more generosity than they were wont to experience from the Romans, set them at liberty, on condition that a treaty should be concluded and ratified by the Senate. But the Roman Government refused to sanction the stipulations of their Consul. On the contrary, they not only declared the treaty to be null and void, but insisted, at the same time, upon delivering up Mancinus, together with Tiberius Gracchus his Quæstor, into the hands of the Numantines, that they might suffer in their persons for the failure of an engagement which they had no power to fulfil. Gracchus appealed to the people and was acquitted; whilst Mancinus, who acquiesced in the sentence of the Senate, was presented naked and in chains at the gates of Numantia. But the citizens refused to receive the victim thus offered to their resentment. They denied that a breach of public faith could be expiated by the death of a single individual; and insisted that, if the treaty was not to be ratified, they had a claim not for one man, but for the ten thousand whom, in reliance upon Roman honour, they had permitted to escape and to return to the service of their country. At length, after the Consul had remained a whole day before the city, Furius, who now commanded in the Roman camp, ordered him to be brought back; but he himself did not think it prudent to hazard an engagement with the accomplished warriors of Numantia, either

Consents to a treaty which the Senate will not sanction.

History. From B. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

to avenge the disgrace of a friend, or to retrieve the reputation of the legions, which had been so often compelled to turn their backs before the victorious weapons of a barbarous town. Neither did Calpurnius Piso, who succeeded Furius in Spain, venture to approach the walls of Numantia. He preferred the safer employment of driving away booty from the lands of the Pallantinians; and he spent what remained of his term of service in winter quarters, which he took up in the district of Carpetia.

Description of Numantia.

Fifty years had now elapsed since the commencement of those wars which the Romans found it necessary to wage with the natives of Spain, and in particular with Viriathus and the people of Numantia. This city, which makes so conspicuous a figure in the latter part of this History, was the capital of a small nation, situated among the mountains of Old Castile, and containing no more than seven or eight thousand inhabitants. The town itself appears to have been placed on a strong point of land, where one of the tributary branches of the Douro forms its confluence with that river; both of which streams having very high banks, rendered the post on two of its sides of very difficult access, whilst, on the third side, it was fortified with a rampart and ditch. The inhabitants, though few in number, were greatly distinguished by their valour, were reputed the best horsemen in Spain, and were, at least, equal, in the use of the pointed-sword and shield, (weapons which were originally borrowed from that country,) to the Romans themselves. They had beaten several armies commanded by able Generals, reduced two Consuls to the necessity of suing for peace, and they had lately seen at their gates one of those distinguished magistrates, of whose life and liberty they were the acknowledged masters.

Scipio Æmilianus appointed to the command in Spain.

Mortified with repeated disappointment, as well as with the duration of a war, of which the difficulties increased in proportion to its length, the Roman people had now recourse to the tried abilities of Scipio Æmilianus, the conqueror of Carthage. Upon the arrival of this renowned soldier in Spain, he found, it is said, the Roman army at once extremely relaxed in courage, and sunk into a state of the greatest insubordination. Disheartened by numerous defeats, they were alarmed at the sight of the Spaniards, whose long hair, painted faces, and savage yells had made a deep impression upon their imaginations.

U. C. 621. — B. C. 133.

Scipio began by reforming the manners of the camp, and by reviving in the breasts of the soldiers that spirit and confidence of which late events had deprived them; himself setting the example of every military virtue, and being the first to submit to every necessary privation. Though at the head of superior numbers, he declined a battle with the triumphant Celtiberians; thinking it wiser to exhaust their ardent valour by expectation, and to drain their resources by a protracted contest. He had been joined on his march to Numantia by the celebrated Jugurtha, the grandson of Masinissa, who brought to the Romans a reinforcement of twelve elephants, with a considerable body of Numidian horse, archers, and slingers. But Scipio, though now at the head of sixty thousand men, did not attempt to storm the town. His object was to reduce it by famine, or to waste the strength of its defenders by useless sallies and constant watching; and in this line of policy his measures were so judicious, and his vigilance so unremittingly exercised, that no efforts of the enemy were able to divert him from his purpose, or to defeat his arrangements. Five aged warriors, attended each by a son, undertook to pass in the night through the lines of the besiegers, in order to solicit aid from the neighbouring nations; and having prevailed on the people of Lutia to embark in their cause, a hope was now entertained that Numantia might yet be saved. But Scipio, who was informed of the intended relief, adopted effectual means to prevent its execution. He hastened to Lutia at the head of a competent force, surprised the inhabitants in their preparations, and demanding that four hundred of the young men should be delivered up to him, he gave orders that their hands should be immediately struck off.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

The Numantines, after this disappointment, pressed with famine, and having no longer any hopes of relief, addressed the Roman Chief with the view of obtaining favourable conditions. He required an unrestricted submission; and would grant no terms that did not imply a complete surrender of their persons, their property, and their arms. This answer confirmed them in their resolution to die, either in defence of their walls, or amid the ramparts of their assailants. The end of the miserable scene, which was now fast approaching, is variously described by different authors; but it is agreed on all hands, that the inhabitants of Numantia, after having endured the most dreadful privations, perished almost to a man, rather than consent to see the Romans in possession of their city, or yield themselves the slaves of that detested nation. Their town was levelled with the ground; the spirit of the surrounding states was broken by the sight of the desolation with which that brave people was visited; and in the ashes of Numantia was extinguished the last spark of Spanish independence.

Fall of Numantia.

Sertorius retires into Spain, and raises his standard against Sylla. U. C. 677. — B. C. 77.

The tranquillity of the Roman Government in Spain appears not to have suffered any interruption, except by the temporary inroad of the Cimbrian hordes, till the times of Marius and Sylla. The adherents of the latter commander, having obtained a complete ascendency, attempted to destroy the powerful faction which had supported the pretensions of his rival: and as among those Sertorius had acted a conspicuous part under the Consulate of Marius, he became an object of the bitterest jealousy and resentment to Sylla and his numerous followers. Sertorius had served in Spain in the capacity of Prætor, and knew well the interests and views of that country; he no sooner perceived, therefore, that the cause of his patron was lost at Rome than he crossed the Pyrenees, unfurled his flag against the dominating faction, proclaimed protection to all his fellow-citizens, who, like himself, were dissatisfied with the condition of things at home, and declared his resolution to dispute with the ruling party the possession of the Spanish Provinces.

As soon as Sylla was informed of this rebellion, he sent into Spain a considerable army, under Caius Annius, with orders to crush the insurgent forces. Sertorius, aware that he would not be allowed to occupy in peace so important a province, despatched Julius Salinator with six thousand men to guard the passes of the Alps, and to watch the movements of his adversaries. Annius, having procured the death of Julius, made his way through the mountains, and appearing in the plain with an overwhelming prepon-

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

derancy, compelled the Prætor of Marius to seek for safety in Africa. Pursued by bad fortune, even to the wilds of Mauritania, Sertorius was reduced to the necessity of again putting to sea; but being unable to effect a relanding in Spain, he strengthened his little fleet by the addition of some of the Cilician Pirates, and made a descent on the island of Ivica, in which Annius had placed a small garrison. The lieutenant of Sylla made haste to succour his insular colony, and, sailing for Ivica with a strong squadron of armed ships, was resolved to bring Sertorius to battle. A storm prevented the engagement; most of the ships were driven ashore, or swallowed up in the waves; and Sertorius, who had with difficulty escaped from the fury of the tempest, bore away with a few small vessels for the Straits of Gibraltar, and landing near the mouth of the Guadalquiver, refreshed his men on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. It was on that occasion that, fatigued by the vicissitudes of a hard fortune and filled with gloomy views as to the future, he is said to have listened to the romantic description of certain sailors, who charmed his ears with the delights and peaceful security which belonged to a group of happy islands lying scattered at a convenient distance in the western sea. He would have retired to that fabled paradise, had not the Cilician rovers, who preferred a more enterprising life, refused to accompany him, and sailed back to the coast of Africa.

Sertorius sails for Africa.

Sertorius in like manner returned into the Mediterranean, and commenced hostilities against an African Prince whom he knew to be in alliance with the Romans. Having defeated this petty sovereign, whose name appears to have been Asculis, he was preparing to enjoy the fruits of his success, when he was informed that Pacianus, who had been sent by Sylla to assist the barbarian, was already marching to attack his conqueror. Upon this intelligence Sertorius put his troops in motion to meet this new enemy; and, although greatly inferior in number of men, he resolutely sustained the attack of Pacianus, and defeated him, with the loss of his life and the capture of nearly his whole army.

Is invited by the Lusitanians to command their armies.

The reputation acquired by this victory retrieved the affairs of Sertorius. The Lusitanians, irritated by the conduct of Annius, resolved to throw off the yoke, and inviting the conqueror of Pacianus to assume the command of their army, they took the field against the deputy of Sylla, and set the whole power of Rome at defiance. The most brilliant success attended the arms of Sertorius. With two thousand six hundred men, whom he called Romans, (though of these seven hundred were Africans,) and an addition of four thousand light-armed Lusitanians and seven hundred horse, he carried on the war against four Roman Generals, who had a hundred and twenty thousand foot, six thousand horse, two thousand archers and slingers, and cities without number under their command. Of the officers opposed to him, he beat Cotta at sea, in the straits over againt Mellaria, near the modern Trafalgar: he defeated Phidius, who had the chief command in Bætica, now Andalusia, and killed four thousand Romans, on the banks of the river from which that Province takes its name. By his Quæstor he vanquished Domitius and Lucius Manlius, Proconsul of the Hither Spain: he likewise slew Thoranius, one of the officers sent against him by Metellus, and cut off the whole army under his command. Even Metellus himself, one of the most experienced and successful Generals of his age, was not a match for Sertorius, in the species of warfare which the Lusitanians waged under his direction. Constantly changing his post, and flying from one fastness to another with a small body of active men, he cut off the Romans in every quarter, without allowing them time to make any arrangement for their defence, or even to see the enemy under whose hands their numbers were so rapidly reduced. If they began to march, says Plutarch, he was on the wing to harass them; and if they sat still, he galled them in such a manner that they were quickly forced to quit their ground. If they invested a town, he soon made his appearance, and by intercepting their convoys, besieged as it were the besiegers. In short, he combined in his character all the activity and hardiness of savage life, with the policy and military skill of a Roman General.

Gains advantages over the Romans.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

He attempts to civilize the Spaniards.

Nor did Sertorius think it enough to fight the battles of the Spaniards: he also undertook to establish amongst them the habits and advantages of civilisation. He taught their soldiers all the more useful parts of Roman tactics; he founded schools for the education of youth; distinguished the meritorious by marks of his approbation; and even introduced among the higher orders the dress of Roman citizens. But his attention was soon called away from these pleasing occupations to encounter the pressure of an augmented host, conducted by the celebrated Pompey, who had been invested with the rank of Proconsul, and sent from Rome to employ his splendid talents against this successful rebel.

Is joined by the army of Perpenna.

The strength of Sertorius had been in the mean time considerably increased by the accession of an army of upwards of thirty thousand men, under Perpenna Vento, who had likewise intended to take refuge in Spain from the persecutions inflicted upon his party by the tools of Sylla. He was at the same time supplied with an additional motive to exert himself to the utmost; for, as Plutarch informs us, as long as he carried on the war against Metellus, his success was generally ascribed to the age and inactivity of his adversary, who had to contend with a bold young man, at the head of troops so light, that they might pass rather for a party of marauders than a regular army. But, when Pompey had passed the Pyrenees and Sertorius had taken post against him, every art of generalship, on both sides, was put in practice; and yet, even then, observes the same author, it appeared that, in point both of attack and of defence, Sertorius had the advantage. An opportunity very soon occurred which enabled the latter to exhibit a single instance of his skill and resources. He had laid siege to Lauron, the modern Liria, which Pompey advanced with his whole army to relieve. The attention of both parties was fixed on the result; for, if Sertorius had earned a high name by his exploits in Lusitania, and by his repeated victories over Metellus, his opponent, on the other hand, had attained, under the discerning eye of Sylla, and even before he had reached the years of manhood, the appellation of Pompey the Great.

Takes the city of Lauron.

There was a hill at some distance from the walls of Lauron, the possession of which might be very annoying to the garrison of that city. Sertorius hastened to seize it, and Pompey to prevent him,

History. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

but the former gained the post. Pompey, however, sat down near it with great satisfaction, thinking that he had been singularly fortunate in cutting the enemy off from the town; and under this impression he even sent a message to the Lauronites, assuring them that they might be perfectly easy, and sit quietly upon their walls and see him besiege Sertorius. When that warrior was informed of this boastful observation, he only laughed and said, "I will teach the pupil of Sylla, that a General ought to look behind him as well as before." At the same time he shewed to the besieged a body of six thousand foot which he had in his camp to attack Pompey in the rear, while he himself advanced to assail him in front. Sertorius took the town and reduced it to ashes; and though Pompey (to use the strong expression of the historian,) was near enough to have warmed his hands at the flame, he dared not quit his post for fear of being surrounded, but was compelled to witness the discomfiture of his allies, and the utter demolition of their city.

But Sertorius, though successful wherever he commanded in person, sustained soon after the event now mentioned, a considerable loss in the defeat of his Quæstor Herennius, whom Metellus overcame in battle with great slaughter. Afraid lest the conqueror should join the camp of Pompey, Sertorius made haste to attack the latter, who had taken up a position on the banks of the Sucro. Nor did the pupil of Sylla shew any inclination to decline the combat: on the contrary, unwilling that Metellus should share in the honour of victory over so powerful an antagonist, he engaged in battle at the approach of night; though perfectly convinced that, whether successful or vanquished, the ensuing darkness could not but prove disadvantageous to him. Each General was victorious in that wing which he first commanded, and the issue of the fight seemed balanced in a doubtful equality, when Sertorius, having driven his immediate antagonist from the field, placed himself at the head of the division which had been repulsed by Pompey, and renewing the conflict with his usual valour, at length compelled that celebrated leader to consult his safety by a rapid flight. Pompey had a very narrow escape, his horse being taken and himself slightly wounded by the African cavalry who pursued him. The victory, however, was not regarded by either army as decisive; and each was accordingly prepared to renew the struggle at the dawn of the following day. But Metellus had come up during the night; which when Sertorius observed he commenced a retreat, observing, with a gay and sarcastic air, "If that old woman had not interposed, I would have flogged the boy well, and sent him back to school at Rome."

Battle between Pompey and Sertorius.

After a short interval, another battle was fought with similar success, though Pompey and Metellus had united both their arms and their counsels against Sertorius. On either side, signal acts of valour were performed. Memmius, Pompey's best officer, fell in the hottest of the fight. Sertorius, if we may believe Plutarch, carried all before him, and, through heaps of slain, made his way to Metellus, who manfully withstood him, and fought with a vigour above his years, till he was borne down by the stroke of a spear. The Romans, perceiving the danger of their General, rallied to save him, under the influence of shame as well as of humanity, and renewing the fight with indescribable fury, they not only repulsed the victorious barbarians, but even succeeded in restoring the fortune of the day.

Spain. From U. C. 520. — B. C. 234. to U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

A second battle.

Sertorius, upon this, found it expedient to occupy a stronghold in the mountains, whither he seems to have been followed by Pompey and Metellus. Escaping however from their pursuit, he made his way into Lusitania, where he once more raised such a powerful force as enabled him to appear again in the field, and to oppose himself to the united standards of his warlike countrymen. He recommenced his operations against them, both by sea and land, cutting off their convoys, hemming in their quarters, and waylaying their foraging parties, insomuch that the Roman commanders deemed it advisable to separate; the one retiring into Gaul, and the other taking up his winter station in the modern Province of Biscay.

Murder of Sertorius and defeat of Perpenna. U. C. 681. — B. C. 73.

A fate similar to that of Viriathus was about to terminate the career of the more celebrated Sertorius, after having, for more than ten years, withstood successfully all the power of Rome. Perpenna, who had some time before led an army into Spain and joined his ranks, at length conspired against him and procured his death. This murderer, it should seem, was impatient of the ascendency which his master had acquired, and more particularly of his boundless popularity among the troops; and, as his ambition aspired to the command of the brave soldiers who had so often foiled the arms of Pompey and driven the combined army of Romans to the foot of the Pyrenees, he had no sooner accomplished his nefarious object, than he announced himself as the successor of Sertorius. But he soon proved as unfit for the duties, as he was unworthy of the honour attached to that high office. Pompey, upon hearing that his formidable antagonist was no more, attacked the traitor, whom he easily defeated. He was taken prisoner, and afterwards executed as an enemy to his country; and in this way ended a war which at one time threatened the overthrow of the whole fabric of the Roman power in Spain.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXII.

SKETCH OF ANCIENT GAUL TILL ITS FINAL SUBJUGATION BY C. JULIUS CÆSAR.

FROM A. M. 3404. A. C. 600. TO U. C. 704. A. C. 50.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Difficulties of tracing the descent of ancient nations, especially in the western world.

In tracing the origin of ancient nations, great difficulties present themselves to the historian, not only from the want of authentic records and permanent documents in the earlier ages, but from the irregular manner in which population took place, and the erroneous maxims which have been founded upon insufficient premises and inconclusive evidence. The antiquity of many European nations has been called in question, and the existence of a prior race has been hastily assumed, on no better ground than the discovery of remains indicating a higher degree of civilisation than is known to have prevailed at some subsequent period; whereas the most superficial acquaintance with the habits of colonists, exposed to the hardships and difficulties of a new settlement and an unreclaimed country, teaches us, that all the luxuries and refinements, and even the useful arts of life, must, for several generations, undergo a retrograde movement, until the acquisition of plenty and security gives leisure for the cultivation of science and of mechanism. The forefathers of the tribes, which at this day inhabit the wilds of North America, brought with them, from Asia, implements and ornaments, which their descendants have never been able to imitate, and knowledge which has been nearly lost in the confusion of barbarous traditions. Nor is it less unskilful to conclude that, because the stream of population flowed westward over Europe from its primitive source, it must necessarily have proceeded in a direct and uniform course without deviations or refluxes; or that the more eastern people are always the more ancient: the fact appears to be that, in the spreading of mankind, distance is less an obstacle than barren soil, or trackless forests, or deep morasses; and that great rivers, and unbroken chains of rocky mountains, form a more insurmountable barrier than seas. And it should not be forgotten that, if the tribes which migrated from the east frequently drove onward recent settlers, and possessed themselves of their lands, they were also sometimes defeated in the attempt, and obliged to turn aside and seek a home elsewhere; and that sometimes also the dispossessed people, instead of moving westward in search of unappropriated countries, turned back toward the land of their fathers, and gained a settlement by force of arms.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Ancient Gaul peopled before Germany

Thus it is highly probable that Ancient Gaul was peopled before Germany, and by an elder branch of that great Cushite family,* which has everywhere asserted its superiority over the other families of the earth. For Germany which, from its deep and rapid rivers subject to violent inundations, its impenetrable forests, and severe climate, offered little inducement to attempt a passage through it, appears to have been at length occupied by a colony of Sacæ, or Saxons,† distinguished by personal peculiarities which they still retain, and by detachments of Getæ, or Goths, who were expelled from some earlier settlement. But Gaul was, in the first instance, peopled from Italy or Sicily, and by sea; and its first inhabitants were of the more ancient race of Celts, supposed to have been Cimbri, or Cimmerii,‡ driven from their original abode by an irruption of the Scythians, and wandering over Europe in search of a new and undisputed home.

Uncertainty of chronolo

The date of this migration is extremely uncertain. Homer mentions Cimmerians, who possessed Scythia before the irruption of the Scythæ, though of the Scythians themselves he gives no account; and this silence tends to confirm the assertion of Herodotus, that the invasion of these redoubted warriors was posterior by some centuries to the siege of Troy. Sir William Jones§ has shewn that Europe was probably not peopled at all till from twelve to fifteen centuries before the Christian æra; and all traditions of an earlier date, such as that the Umbri,‖ a people of Gaul, invaded Italy in the year B. C. 1912, (that is only four hundred and seventy years after the flood,) and that they sent colonies into Spain¶ about two hundred and fifty years later, must be considered either as erroneous in point of time, or as altogether fabulous.

---

* See Faber's *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, vol. ii. Jones's (Sir Wm.) Works, vol. i. Camden's *Geog.* Cumberland's *Origines Gentium.* Hale's *Origin of Mankind, passim.*

† Σάκαι γενεῆ Σκύθαι.—Chærilus.

‡ Herodotus, *Melpomene.* Diod. Sic. lib. ii. and *Saggio sulla storia de' antichi popoli d'Italia.*

§ Works, vol. i.

‖ Isidor. *Orig.* ix. 2. Herodot. i. Dion. Halicarn. i. 1.

¶ Strabo, ii. iv. Plin. iii. 1. From the mixture of Celts and Iberians is said to have sprung the race of Celtiberians. Lucan, *Phars.* iv. 8.

History. From A.M. 3404. — A.C. 600. to A.C. 704. — A.C. 50. B.C. 1300.

But whatever obscurity hangs over the route by which the Celts arrived in Gaul, or the order in which they settled themselves, there exists no doubt respecting the purity of their Celtic origin; since they were remarkably distinguished from their German neighbours, by customs which speak another root.

Celtic origin of the Gauls.

It would, however, be vain to expect any thing like uniformity in the testimonies of ancient history to this faint outline of their origin. On the contrary, nothing can be more loose, and even contradictory, than the language of most authors on these subjects. The Germans, and all the nations of western Europe, are not unfrequently included under the indefinite appellation of Celts; whilst the Gauls and Celts are mentioned by the same writer,* sometimes as distinct races, and sometimes as identified with each other. But Cæsar,† and the Latin authorities who have followed him, all agree with Strabo‡ in affirming the Rhine to be the eastern boundary of the Celts, whom he § repeatedly distinguishes from the German race in the most marked manner.

Divisions of ancient Gaul.

The vast and fertile country occupied by the Celts was at that time, like many other parts of Europe, subject to frequent overflowings of its rivers, apparently succeeded, in some instances, by irruptions of the sea; and many of those fine alluvial plains,‖ which now form the most beautiful, as well as the richest portion of France, were at that period either immense shallow lakes, or deep marshes, which rendered the communication between the settlers in different parts of the country often difficult and dangerous. Hence arose, in very early times, but at what precise period is not known, a division of the nation into three great heads of Aquitanian, Celtic, and Belgic Gauls, occupying respectively the southern, midland, and northern regions of France;¶ and these seem again to have been subdivided into an infinite number of small independent States, governed by their own magistrates, and united only by a species of federal union resembling the Amphictyonic system of Greece. The form of government, in the little Republics, was strictly Aristocratical; the whole power and property of the State being lodged in the hands of the Priests and of the Nobles, among whom the Chief was dignified with the title of King; and his office, which was simply that of President of the Council in peace, and General in war, was, in most instances, elective; though, in some cases, it was hereditary.** The practice of choosing a Chief or President extended itself throughout all the ramifications of Gallic society, and formed a feature, not only in the Constitutions of the separate Republics, but in every hamlet, and even in each family; and Cæsar†† is probably right in supposing it to be the original or patriarchal form of government among mankind; although, in its first institution, it was necessarily hereditary, and became elective only in consequence of a supposed equality of right among several claimants. As an individual was chosen to preside over each Republic, so, in the general assembly of the States, one powerful and distinguished people, assuming to be the elder branch of the great family, was selected to take precedence of the rest; and the contest for this precedence,* gave rise in Gaul, as in Greece, to the most mischievous jealousies and intrigues among those greater States which were ambitious of the distinction, and among the smaller Republics which espoused their cause, and depended on their protection.

Gaul. From A.M. 3404. — A.C. 600. to A.C. 704. — A.C. 50.

Congress of the States.

The great Council or Diet of the States was not held at any stated period, but was called only in the event of a war or other public danger threatening the whole community, and consisted of deputies from each of the Republics. The assemblies which were summoned on less important occasions, comprised all the Nobles of the States interested in the discussion; whose punctual attendance was ensured by a law inflicting death upon him who should be last at the place of meeting: they were called together by the sound of a kind of rude trumpet, and came armed to the conference. The custom of holding these assemblies in the open air was continued down to a late period.†

Notwithstanding the pains which some modern authors‡ have taken to make it appear that the people had a great share of power allowed them by these institutions, it is perfectly clear that the populace, in all the States, were entirely excluded from any share in the government,§ and from the Councils of all kinds, (*—nihil audet, et nullo adhibetur consilio.* Cæs. *Bell. Gall.* vi. 13.—*In hos eadem omnia sunt jura quæ dominis in servos.*) and that the Nobles alone formed those Parliaments which have been represented as savouring of democracy. In no country was the ascendency of the privileged orders more complete, nor the subserviency of their vassals more unqualified. The Nobles, whom Cæsar calls Knights, from their appearing generally on horseback, were distinguished by the number of their retainers, whom they called their clan, and who followed them to the field on foot, armed in an inferior manner; and the only check‖ to the arbitrary exercise of their power over these clients was the facility which they enjoyed of gaining admission into the train of some other Chief, whenever they became discontented with their own. The devotion of the retainers to their patron¶ was, however, generally such as to warrant the conclusion that their rights were respected, and that their happiness was consulted; for many instances are on record of an attachment to the feudal Chieftain, which surpasses the most superstitious sense of duty.

Druids.

But the most remarkable part of the Celtic constitution was the Ecclesiastical Nobility, (generally known by the name of Druids, derived from the Celtic *dĕru*,** an oak,) who were held in the highest veneration, and enjoyed the most ample power and pri-

* Viz. Dion Cassius, Appian, Suidas, &c.
† *De Bello Gallico.*
‡ Lib. iii. et iv. § Lib. i. ii. et vii.
‖ Considerable tracts of country in France are to this day preserved from inundations by embankments. In Touraine the Loire is above the level of the adjoining vallies for forty miles together.
¶ Amm. Marcell. lib. xv. c. 11. Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* lib. i. c. 1.
** Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* lib. vi. 13.
†† *Bell. Gall.* vi. 11.

* Ibid. i. 31. Strabo, iv.
† *Bell. Gall.* v. 56. vi. 13. vii. 21. Liv. xxi. 20. Strabo, iv.
‡ *Hist. des Gaulois*, vol. iii. *et passim*, &c. *Introd. to Ll. Hém*, p. 54, &c.
§ Polyb. ii.
‖ *Plebes pène servorum loco habetur.* Cæsar, ibid.
¶ Polyb. ii. Nichol. *Damasc. apud Athen.* vi. 13.
** The *e* is pronounced very short like the Hebrew *sceva*. Gr. Δρῦς.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

vileges. They were divided, like all ancient hierarchies, into three distinct orders, and bore a resemblance universally acknowledged, though variously accounted for, to the Persian magi, and to the other forms of Oriental priesthood which emanated from the same source. The highest order, which had the government and superintendence of the rest, were styled, by way of eminence, the Druids; the second class were called the Bards, and were principally employed in the task of public instruction, which, to assist the memory, was, for the most part, conveyed in verse, and consisted of a Genesis,* or account of the origin of gods and men; moral and religious doctrines and traditions; and histories. The lowest description of divines were called Euvates or Battics, whose office it was to deliver the responses of the oracles, and to attend upon the people who consulted them. These are the original divisions of Druidism, as said to have been instituted by Samothes, or Semnothes, brother to Gomer the son of Japhet, to whom some authors† have endeavoured to trace the Celtic family; the other distinctions which prevailed among them, were of a later date, and arose from their intercourse with the Greeks and Romans.‡

"The *first* order of the Nobility, according to Cæsar,§ was that of Priesthood; the Military Nobles occupying the second rank."‖ To the Druids was intrusted, not merely the whole dispensation of religious rites and ceremonies, but the education of youth and the administration of justice, which they enforced by holding over the laity the power of excommunication; a curse equal in effect to the leprosy among the Jews, or to the plague in more modern times; for the offender was excluded from all society, and deprived of the protection of the laws.

The highest order of Druids enjoyed vast revenues, and are said to have lived in great splendour; "their palaces exceeded in magnificence and extent those of the Kings themselves, and they received the homage of the people seated on golden thrones."¶ They were exempt from all personal service in war, as well as from any share in the public burdens; and their sanction was requisite to every undertaking civil or military.** They formed a Cabinet Council, without whose advice the King could not conclude either peace or war; nor was his election complete till he had received consecration at their hands. Their Supreme Court of Appeal, the *jus ultimum* of the Celts, was held in a spot between the Seine and the Loire, where those rivers approach nearest to each other, which was supposed to be the centre of Gaul; and the President had the title of Arch-Druid, with many important rights and powers relating to the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs.

The female Druids were also divided into three classes, differing in the degrees of their supposed sanctity. The most austere bound themselves to a life of strict celibacy, and devoted themselves entirely to divine services; those of the second order were permitted to enter into the state of matrimony, but simply with a view to raising up children; they met their husbands only once in the year, and spent the rest of their time in attendance at the temples; the last sort, who were not held in any high estimation, lived wholly with their families, and are not distinguishable from other women. It was from the first class only that the *Fatidicæ*, or inspired prophetesses were selected.*

Gaul. From A. M. 3404 — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Female Druids.

The education of youth consisted of two distinct branches. The Druids kept public schools for the instruction of all the children of the Nobility, and the course of learning there taught was considered an indispensable qualification for every public station. But the education for those who were designed to become members of the order, was conducted with the greatest pains and secrecy. The disciples were kept apart from all other society for twenty years, and were compelled every year to learn a thousand verses from the lips of their teacher, (for they were not permitted to be written,) so that, at the end of their term, they were required to repeat perfectly the whole twenty thousand: the discipline was extremely severe; and, during the whole course of their education, all intercourse with their parents was strictly forbidden.†

Educati

Learnin

Of the extent of knowledge among the Druids it is difficult to form any very satisfactory conjecture, since few records remain of their early literature. But there seems reason to conclude that, previous to their intercourse with the Greeks, whose alphabet they adopted, their science was confined within the limits which it had attained in the east before their emigration. Their computation of time and their knowledge of Astronomy‡ were purely Chaldean; their Botany was merely experimental, and mixed up with superstitious opinions, strongly resembling those which are so beautifully recorded in the *Georgics* of Virgil, and which may be traced through Sicily and Greece to the same Oriental origin. Much has been said of their skill in Anatomy, which their human sacrifices gave them an opportunity of studying to singular advantage;§ but if it be true that they attained some theoretical knowledge of the human frame, it did not produce any considerable skill in the practice of surgery.

Moralit and doc trines.

Their moral doctrines were such as generally prevail in a barbarous state of society: they taught their disciples to be faithful, obedient, honourable, just, and brave; but they permitted them, at the same time, to be rapacious, sensual, and cruel; they preserved peace and good order within the pale of their own clan, but added the most savage horrors to the miseries of war. They held, most devotedly, the immortality of the soul; and they seem also to have entertained a belief of the reappearance of distinguished persons after a certain period,‖ similar to the

* All ancient nations appear to have had their Genesis in verse. Herodotus mentions that the ancient Persians used to chant a Theogony at their sacrifices. *Clio* 132. And the *Theogony* of Hesiod is evidently a compilation from older poems of the same kind.

† Camden, *Geog.* ‡ *Rel. des Gaul.* p. 388.

§ *Loc. cit.*

‖ The Royal Family wore seven stripes in their robes, the Druids six, the secular Nobles five. Toland, *Hist.*

¶ This description seems as if borrowed from some of their own poetry. Dion Chrysostom, *de Recus.*

** Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. 30.

* Borlase, *Antiq. Corn.* xi.

† Gollut. *Mem.* xxviii.

‡ See Livy, lib. xliv. 37. Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* lib. vi. Pomp. Mela, iii. 2.

§ Galtruch, *Poet. Hist.* iii. 4.

‖ Faber, *Origin Pagan Idol.* vol. iii.

History. From A.M. 3404. — A.C. 600. to U.C. 704. — A.C. 50.

doctrine of the Brahmins,* which has been mistaken by several writers for the Pythagorean transmigration;† but the great mass of mankind were thought to depart, after life, into an intermediate state, a sort of *Crepusculum Deorum*, in which they were to continue till the general conflagration of the Universe; from the ruins of which a new Creation was to arise out of the sea, when the brave and the virtuous should enjoy perfect bliss, and the wicked and fearful should undergo eternal punishment. But although this simple belief prevailed among the Druids themselves, especially before their intercourse with the Romans, yet, in delivering their doctrines to the laity, they involved them in the same mysterious veil of allegorical mythology to which Pagan idolatry and superstition have been uniformly indebted for their origin.

Their Gods.

The Deities which they worshipped were, as Cæsar has remarked, much the same with those venerated by other heathen nations;‡ that is to say, they had, in common with the rest of mankind, exaggerated the reverence in which they held their ancestors, till it had become idolatry; and they had, at the same time, deified the heavenly host, and particularly the Sun and Moon. These Gods had so many names, and appeared in so many characters, that the best authors are not perfectly agreed in the accounts which they give of them; and the difficulty is greatly increased by the gradual, but not uniform, progress of superstition, which has occasioned numerous contradictions among the Druids themselves, in different ages and countries. Cæsar, who, from his intimacy with the Archdruid Divitiacus, possessed the most authentic and ample information on this subject, represents the religion of Gaul as existing in a more ripened state of Polytheism than we find it to have been in Britain at a later period; and it is not probable that the tenets of the early settlers in Gaul should be gathered more accurately from other sources than from his luminous *Commentaries*. The names most celebrated among them were Teutates,§ the Taautes, Thaut, or Theut, of eastern Europe, sometimes called Mercurius-Teutates, Hesus,‖ Belenus,¶ Taranis,** Minerva,†† Dis,‡‡ and Hercules.§§ They had, beside these, a vast number of inferior divinities, things as well as persons, which they regarded with a religious veneration. They worshipped, or at least paid extraordinary honours to Lakes and Mountains.‖‖ Groves of oaks are supposed to have been their first temples. Indeed many learned writers¶¶ have maintained an opinion, that the early Druids in Gaul had no other places of worship than the sacred groves, and the lakes in which they administered the initiatory rite of immersion. But, however the Druids might have contented themselves with natural temples for a few years, whilst they had no settled residence, Mr. Faber* has shewn that, even during this period, they carried with them portable arks or tabernacles enclosing the arcana of their religion; and no sooner had they obtained a permanent establishment, than they incurred incalculable labour and expense in the erection of those vast masses of rock, which have raised the admiration of all succeeding ages, and which have been distinctly ranged in three classes.† The simple round or octagonal temples of *unhewn* stone;‡ those which were enclosed in the form of a serpent, and have received the technical appellation of *Dracontia*; and those which are called alate temples. These, and all other Celtic places of worship, were, by the principles of their superstition, open at top to the view of the heavens.

Their places of worship.

Gaul. From A.M. 3404. — A.C. 600. to U.C. 704. — A.C. 50.

Among their religious rites, we read of the expressive ceremony of baptism; a sacrament of bread and wine;§ an extraordinary reverence paid to the egg of the serpent, to the leaves and acorns of the oak,‖ and, above all, to the mistletoe, which was cut off from the parent tree with a golden knife, never used for any other purpose, received by a Druid with his hand covered and his face averted, and conveyed to the temple with great rejoicings, in a car drawn by two white heifers which had never been yoked;¶ an opinion that bloody sacrifices were essential to the expiation of offences,** and a custom of sprinkling them with salt, flour, and incense;†† the horrid practice of human sacrifices, and of sprinkling the blood of the victims to atone for the shedding of blood:‡‡ of these, with many other rites and doctrines, a full detail and examination would belong more properly to an express treatise on the subject, than to the present brief outline of the early History of Gaul.

Their worship.

General character of the Gauls.

The people in general, of all classes, were distinguished by the loftiness and symmetry of their figures,§§ (which Cæsar attributes to their simple but nourishing diet, and to their active life in the open air,) as well as by their strength, hardihood, and courage;‖‖ nor were the women excluded from those pursuits which tend to harden the frame and brace the animal spirits. The beauty of their complexions has been celebrated by poets as well as by historians,¶¶ and has in all ages formed a striking characteristic of the Celtic race, who are every where recognised by their white skins,*** auburn or red hair,††† blue but fiery eyes, and harsh loud voices.‡‡‡ But though the Gauls were undoubtedly robust and brave, they were deficient in that patient endurance of fatigue and danger which constitutes good soldiers: they were, according

* Maurice, *Ind. Ant.* &c.
† Val. Max. ii. 6. Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* vi. Diod. Sic. v.
‡ *De his (Dis majoribus) eandem ferè quam reliquæ gentes habent opinionem.* Cæsar, *ibid.*
§ Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* vi. 17. Lactantius, i. 21. Lucan, *Phars.* i. 445.
‖ Cæs. ibid. Flor. ii. 4. ¶ Cæs. *ibid.*
** Id. ibid. †† Polyb. ii.
‡‡ Cæs. vi. 18. Tacitus, *German.* ii. Strabo, iii. *et* x.
§§ Amm. Marcell. xv. 9.
‖‖ Borlase, *Antiq. Corn.* c. 16.
¶¶ Keysler, *Antiq. Septent.*

* *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, vol. ii.
† See Dr. Stukeley's *Abury*. pp. 8, 9. 97, *et passim.*
‡ βάθρον τοῦ ἁγιάσματος. *Œd. Col.* 101. cf. *Exod.* xx. 25.
§ Plin. xxiv. 11. ‖ Ibid. xvi. 44.
¶ *Numb.* xix. 2. *Deut.* xxi. 3. 1 *Sam.* vi. 7.
** *Heb.* ix. 22.
†† Toland, *Alex. ab Alex.* xvii. 4.
‡‡ *Numb.* xxxv. 33. Strabo, iv. Diod. Sic. Tacit. *Annal.* xiv.
§§ Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* ii. 30. i. 1. vi. 21. Diod. Sic. iv. v.
‖‖ Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* liii. Amm. Marcellin. xv. 12.
¶¶ Virg. *Æn.* viii. 660. Sil. It. iv. 151. Diod. Sic. v. Liv. xxxviii. 17. 21.
*** Virg. *Æn.* viii. 659. Claudian. *passim.*
††† Lucan, *Phars.* vii. 231.
‡‡‡ Livy, v. 37, 38. Diod. Sic. v.

History.

From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

vileges. They were divided, like all ancient hierarchies, into three distinct orders, and bore a r semblance universally acknowledged, though riously accounted for, to the Persian magi, and to other forms of Oriental priesthood which em from the same source. The highest order, had the government and superintendence of t were styled, by way of eminence, the Dru second class were called the Bards, and cipally employed in the task of public which, to assist the memory, was, for th conveyed in verse, and consisted of a account of the origin of gods and m religious doctrines and traditions The lowest description of divines w or Battics, whose office it was to d of the oracles, and to attend consulted them. These are of Druidism, as said to ha Samothes, or Semnothes, bro of Japhet, to whom some au to trace the Celtic family; which prevailed among th and arose from their int and Romans.‡

"The *first* order of Cæsar,§ was that of Pri occupying the second r intrusted, not merely t ligious rites and cerem youth and the adminis enforced by holding ov communication; a cur among the Jews, or to times; for the offender and deprived of the pro

The highest order of and are said to have " their palaces exceeded those of the Kings themsel homage of the people seate They were exempt from all as well as from any share and their sanction was requisi civil or military.** They for without whose advice the Kin either peace or war; nor was till he had received consecrati Their Supreme Court of Appeal, th Celts, was held in a spot between Loire, where those rivers approach other, which was supposed to be the ce and the President had the title of Arch many important rights and powers relati regulation of ecclesiastical affairs.

* All ancient nations appear to have had their Genesis in Herodotus mentions that the ancient Persians used to ch Theogony at their sacrifices. *Clio* 132. And the *Theogon* Hesiod is evidently a compilation from older poems of t same kind.

† Camden, *Geog.* ‡ *Rel. des Gaul*, p. 388.

§ *Loc. cit.*

‖ The Royal Family wore seven stripes in their robes, the Druids six, the secular Nobles five. Toland, *Hist.*

¶ This description seems as if borrowed from some of their own poetry. Dion Chrysostom, *de Recus.*

** Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. 30.

History. doctrine of the by several w... Fro... but the ... A.M. after the... 3404. ... ... A.C. ... 600. ...

...e in the habit
... much more
...ets, and rings,
...m with other
...th sexes, these
...sion, and were
...ities.†
...r the most rigid
... little better than
...ere able to bear
...rriageable; after
...e parents wholly
...ers, they consulted
...parties: the father
...quet, to which the
...o whom she deigned
... successful candidate.
...ited with any religious
...s considered essential
...ve his daughter a me-
...er ages, the bridegroom

...nded with more pomp
... preceded, in the case of
...est of the relatives, who
... of the death before the
... take place; when, if any
... widow, she was burned to
...most cruel torments. It has
... was sometimes consigned
... verdict against her, simply
... would thus accompany her
...world: for the same reason,
... even, occasionally, some of
...e favourite horses, dogs, and
... most essential property of the
... with him, whilst the friends
...into the flames such tokens as
...carry with him in remembrance
...bs of the ancient Gauls which
...red in France, bear witness that
...not always thought necessary for
...ners, bracelets, and other articles
... in them, which retain no marks
...epulchres are constructed of huge
...n rack, upon which grotesque figures
...udely sculptured.
...ing that war and the chase formed the
...yment of this brave and high spirited
...markable that either from defect of
... or from bigoted attachment to the
... they never made any con-
... manufacture of arms,
... Their unwieldy broad-
... ered, as frequently to be-
... it was necessary to straighten
... and their bucklers were so nar-
... could take aim at the body on
... Besides these, they carried a long

...c. 4. p. 309.
...9.
...c.
...v. Livy, xxii. 46. xxxviii. 21.

spear, or two javelins;* and the inferior people were armed with the long-bow and the sling. Some of them used a barbed dart, which Cæsar calls *materis*, and a short sword curved both ways, with two points, which inflicted a wound difficult of cure. Others carried an iron mace, such as was still used in the Low Countries in the time of Louis XI., and a poleaxe. But, however differing in their offensive weapons, most of the Nobles wore the casque, breastplate, and broad belt, which are characteristic of the Celtic warrior. As all this class fought on horseback, the cavalry was always much better appointed than the infantry: each horseman was attended by a small retinue, whose business it was to assist him in the combat, and to carry him from the field when wounded; and so faithfully did these clansmen† discharge their duty, that they were frequently all slain round the corpse of their lord. In action, the weaker and worse armed troops formed the front rank, in order that they might be restrained from flight by the firmer line which was drawn up in their rear; and probably, also, that the lives of the common people, which were little valued, might be first sacrificed to the onset of the enemy. Beyond this, they appear to have possessed no tactics, and to have trusted for success to a desperate valour, which preferred death to subjection, and rushed upon danger with furious impetuosity. They bore defeat, when unavoidable, with equanimity, and triumphed in victory with intemperate revelry and riotous debauchery; but there is no fair ground for the supposition that they ever fed upon the flesh of their enemies.

Gaul. From A.M. 3404. — A.C. 600. to A.C. 704. — A.C. 58.

That this slight sketch of the habits and manners of the ancient Gauls contains many particulars not accurately synchronizing with each other, is highly probable: for, previous to the time of Cæsar, we have little more than occasional hints respecting the state of the country, and the history of its inhabitants; and, at the time when that General became acquainted with them, considerable changes had taken place in their religion and civil polity, in consequence of their intercourse with several neighbouring nations; and these changes, which were effected principally in the southern Provinces, and spread gradually into the interior, occasioned differences among the various tribes which are by no means satisfactorily recorded.

Uncertainty respecting the ancient state of Gaul.

But though we have no very distinct information respecting the earliest ages of Gaul, it may be gathered, from intimations scattered through a multitude of authors, that its population increased with more than usual rapidity, and soon began to vent its redundancies in numerous colonies, which established themselves in the north of Spain and Italy, as well as in Germany and in Britain. This last country, according to Camden, they originally peopled; but his opinion is contradicted by the testimony of Cæsar and of Tacitus, and is rendered improbable by the well-known fact that the priests of Gaul looked up to the Druidical colleges in Britain as to their *alma mater*, and recognised the authority of their still higher antiquity. The tendency to emigration was encouraged by the

Early emigrations.

* Virg. *Æn.* viii. 661. The *sparus* and the poisoned arrows were only used in the chase.

† Cæsar calls them *soldurii*, *undè Angl.* soldiers.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

to Cæsar,* lazy and desultory in their labours, and much addicted to sleep; in consequence of which they were inclined to obesity, though corpulency was held disgraceful among them. Their first onset is described as furious, and almost irresistible; but if the enemy happened to sustain or elude it, they could with difficulty be brought to renew the charge, and were easily defeated.† Like all savages, they were immoderately fond of fermented liquors, and would barter their most valued possessions to gratify their passion for drunkenness;‡ they appear to have indulged in vainglorious boasting,§ in violence, cruelty, rapacity, and superstition.

Among their virtues have been reckoned that faithful hospitality and lavish generosity which mark the earlier stages of society, and the address with which they conducted themselves in their negotiations with the most polished nations. But their most celebrated excellence was courage, in which even the softer sex emulated the dauntless intrepidity of the men; and neither extreme youth nor age‖ were considered as exemptions from the toils and dangers of arms. War was indeed their business and their pleasure, the scope of their education, the employment of their lives, the theme of their conversation, their consolation and hope in death; and the right of conquest was by them looked upon as the only title to their lands and possessions of every kind.

Habits of life among the people.

Their habits of life were extremely simple. Their habitations, before the founding of Marseilles opened a connection with more polished nations, were little more than rude improvements on, or ruder imitations of the natural shelter afforded by caves and woods; and even down to a late period they were remarkable for the inartificial construction of their dwellings. Diodorus Siculus,¶ indeed, has asserted that there existed in Gaul cities of a more ancient date than Marseilles; but though there was probably some real foundation for the mythological story, that Hercules built Alisia** when he defeated the robber Tauriscus, these early cities must be understood as mere collections of temporary cabins, like the booths of the Scythian Nomades, deserving of mention only as marking the first population of the country. But a greater degree of ingenuity was exercised in the construction of those vast subterranean pits†† in which they concealed the produce of their precarious agriculture, and which occasionally served as places of retreat for themselves and their families when pressed by a powerful enemy. The care with which air and moisture were excluded, and the art with which the entrances were contrived, rendered them excellent granaries as well as secure hiding-places: some of them are said to exist at the present day,‡‡ and to be used by the peasants, in certain parts of France, instead of barns, to house the harvest. The Gauls are also thought to have been the inventors of water-mills, which certainly existed in their country* long before their general introduction into Greece and Italy; but in the early ages of the settlements they were content, like other wild nations, to bruise their corn between two stones rubbed together with the hand. The meal thus produced, together with an abundant supply of milk, game, and fish,† rendered the means of life plentiful and easy of attainment, and occasioned that dislike to labour and impatience of privation, for which all the Gallic tribes were noted. Instead of salt they made use of charcoal steeped in sea water,‡ with which they cured the flesh of the wild boar and other provisions. They took their meals seated upon the hides of wild beasts§ stretched along the floor, in the same apartment in which the victuals were dressed, in order that the guests might inspect the process; and it was customary for the younger members of the family to wait at table. The board was raised a little from the ground, and the dishes were of costly materials. The workmanship of the carved wooden drinking bowls is said to have displayed the same sort of curious ingenuity which still distinguishes those in use among the peasants of Norway; but the Gauls who had performed any achievement in war, or in hunting, drank out of the skulls of the slain, or the horns of the Urus, the most formidable object of the chase in their country. The nobles entertained at their tables the second order of Druids, called Bards, who sang, during the repast, Celtic verses in honour of their lineage, and celebrated their warlike exploits. In their public festivities, which appear to have been of frequent occurrence,‖ great attention was paid to place the guests according to their rank; the King, or, in his absence, the first Noble presiding at the board, and every one being served by a henchman, who bore his shield as he stood behind him. The most renowned warrior was entitled to the first cut;¶ and if more than one claimed this honour, the dispute was adjusted on the spot by an appeal to arms. Excessive drinking commonly followed; after which they slept in the open air, or under the shelter of their cabins, with no other bed than a shakedown of straw or of hides. The latter material, for several ages, formed their only habiliments, until their commerce with other nations taught them to manufacture their wool, and to cultivate both hemp and flax. The principal articles of dress were the *sagum*, or mantle, with or without sleeves, the tunic or vest which was worn under it, the large Cossack trowsers which came down over the feet, and a fur cap of a conical shape; but the common people went very slightly clad and barefooted, and the children were naked, or nearly so, at all seasons. The sexes were little distinguished in their clothes; but some of the women wore a long tunic or petticoat which reached to the ancles, and a sort of apron over it, and their bonnets appear sometimes to have been formed with a view to taste and fashion. There are no traces of their having adopted the custom of smearing their skins with paint

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50

* *Bell. Gall.* iii. 19, *et passim.*

† Florus, ii. 4. Oros. v. 16. Polyb. iii. Plutarch, *in Crasso.* This is said to be the character of French soldiers down to the present time.

‡ Diod. Sic. v. Pliny, xiv. 22.

§ Dion Cassius, *passim.* Aulus Gellius, ix. 11. 13.

‖ Cæs. *Bell. Gall.* vi. 11. Hirt. *de Bell. Gall.* viii. 15. Amm. Marcell. xv. 12.

¶ Lib. iv. ** *Al.* Alexia.

†† Varro, *de re rust.* lvii. lxiii. Columella, i. 6.

‡‡ *Hist. des Gaulois*, tom. ii. c. 4. p. 289.

* Ausonius, *Mosell.* 362.

† Plin. ix. x. xi. according to whom (ix. 18.) they were dainty in their choice of food.

‡ Varro, i. 7. Plin. xxxi. 7.

§ Diod. Sic. v. Strabo. iv. Livy, xxxiii. 24. Athenæus, iv. 13.

‖ Athenæus, iv. 13. ¶ *Ibid.* iv. 17.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to A. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

of various colours; but the women were in the habit of anointing themselves with substances much more offensive.* The taste for chains, bracelets, and rings, chiefly of gold, was common to them with other nations; and, among the Nobles of both sexes, these ornaments were worn in great profusion, and were even hung upon the statues of their deities.†

Marriage.

The children were brought up under the most rigid discipline, and were in a condition little better than that of servants, till the males were able to bear arms, and the females became marriageable; after which period the authority of the parents wholly ceased. In bestowing their daughters, they consulted merely the inclination of the parties: the father invited all the suitors to a banquet, to which the daughter was admitted, and he, to whom she deigned to hand a cup of water, was the successful candidate.

The marriage was not celebrated with any religious ceremonies, nor were any forms considered essential to the contract: the father gave his daughter a moderate portion, which, in latter ages, the bridegroom settled upon her.

Funerals.

Their funerals‡ were attended with more pomp and circumstance, and were preceded, in the case of persons of rank, by an inquest of the relatives, who reported the probable cause of the death before the interment was permitted to take place; when, if any suspicion arose against the widow, she was burned to death, after suffering the most cruel torments. It has been said that the widow was sometimes consigned to the pile, without any verdict against her, simply from a belief that she would thus accompany her husband to the other world: for the same reason, the principal slaves, and even, occasionally, some of the free clansmen, the favourite horses, dogs, and armour, and the other most essential property of the deceased, were burnt with him, whilst the friends who attended threw into the flames such tokens as they wished him to carry with him in remembrance of them. The tombs of the ancient Gauls which have been discovered in France§ bear witness that combustion was not always thought necessary for these purposes, urns, bracelets, and other articles having been found in them, which retain no marks of fire. These sepulchres are constructed of huge masses of unhewn rock, upon which grotesque figures of animals are rudely sculptured.

Armour and weapons.

Notwithstanding that war and the chase formed the principal employment of this brave and high spirited people, it is remarkable that either from defect of mechanical skill, or from bigoted attachment to the usages of ancient times, they never made any considerable improvement in the manufacture of arms, or in military discipline. Their unwieldy broad-swords were so badly tempered, as frequently to become bent in action, so that it was necessary to straighten them again by the foot; and their bucklers were so narrow, that the Romans could take aim at the body on each side of them. Besides these, they carried a long spear, or two javelins;* and the inferior people were armed with the long-bow and the sling. Some of them used a barbed dart, which Cæsar calls *materis*, and a short sword curved both ways, with two points, which inflicted a wound difficult of cure. Others carried an iron mace, such as was still used in the Low Countries in the time of Louis XI., and a poleaxe. But, however differing in their offensive weapons, most of the Nobles wore the casque, breast-plate, and broad belt, which are characteristic of the Celtic warrior. As all this class fought on horseback, the cavalry was always much better appointed than the infantry: each horseman was attended by a small retinue, whose business it was to assist him in the combat, and to carry him from the field when wounded; and so faithfully did these clansmen† discharge their duty, that they were frequently all slain round the corpse of their lord. In action, the weaker and worse armed troops formed the front rank, in order that they might be restrained from flight by the firmer line which was drawn up in their rear; and probably, also, that the lives of the common people, which were little valued, might be first sacrificed to the onset of the enemy. Beyond this, they appear to have possessed no tactics, and to have trusted for success to a desperate valour, which preferred death to subjection, and rushed upon danger with furious impetuosity. They bore defeat, when unavoidable, with equanimity, and triumphed in victory with intemperate revelry and riotous debauchery; but there is no fair ground for the supposition that they ever fed upon the flesh of their enemies.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to A. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Uncertainty respecting the ancient state of Gaul.

That this slight sketch of the habits and manners of the ancient Gauls contains many particulars not accurately synchronizing with each other, is highly probable: for, previous to the time of Cæsar, we have little more than occasional hints respecting the state of the country, and the history of its inhabitants; and, at the time when that General became acquainted with them, considerable changes had taken place in their religion and civil polity, in consequence of their intercourse with several neighbouring nations; and these changes, which were effected principally in the southern Provinces, and spread gradually into the interior, occasioned differences among the various tribes which are by no means satisfactorily recorded.

Early emigrations.

But though we have no very distinct information respecting the earliest ages of Gaul, it may be gathered, from intimations scattered through a multitude of authors, that its population increased with more than usual rapidity, and soon began to vent its redundancies in numerous colonies, which established themselves in the north of Spain and Italy, as well as in Germany and in Britain. This last country, according to Camden, they originally peopled; but his opinion is contradicted by the testimony of Cæsar and of Tacitus, and is rendered improbable by the well-known fact that the priests of Gaul looked up to the Druidical colleges in Britain as to their *alma mater*, and recognised the authority of their still higher antiquity. The tendency to emigration was encouraged by the

* *Hist. des Gaulois*, tom. ii. c. 4. p. 269.
† Florus, ii. 4.
‡ Cæsar, *de Bello Gall.* vi. 19.
§ Montfaucon, *Ant.* v. 2, &c.
‖ Polyb. ii. *et* iii. Diod. Sic. v. Livy, xxii. 46. xxxviii. 21. Strabo, iv. &c.

* Virg. *Æn.* viii. 661. The *sparus* and the poisoned arrows were only used in the chase.
† Cæsar calls them *soldurii*, *undè Angl.* soldiers.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

commercial* intercourse which was maintained with the Phœnicians, the Etruscans, the Carthaginians, and the Sicilian Greeks, by the tribes on the coast of the Mediterranean sea, and even at a greater distance. And to the same cause may be traced the worship of Isis, as well as other observances and customs, of Egyptian origin, which became intermingled with the Druidical superstitions of the southern Gauls. The coast trade was for a long period carried on merely by the annual arrival of mercantile vessels, when the raw produce of the country was bartered for such coarse manufactures as suited the rude state of society among the natives; but about the year 600 B. C. a colony of Phocæans,† from the shores of Asia Minor, under the conduct of Protis and Simus, landed near the mouth of the Rhone, with the design of settling in Gaul. It happened that, at the moment of their arrival, Nannus King of the Salii‡ was about to dispose of his daughter in marriage, and, according to the custom of the country, he had invited to a banquet all who were desirous of his alliance. The strangers were of course admitted to share in his hospitality; and the Princess Gyptis,§ most unexpectedly, bestowed the cup of water, which was to indicate her preference, upon Protis,|| who is said to have been remarkably handsome. The King, however unwillingly, adhered to the ancient habits of his race, and bestowed the hand of his daughter upon the adventurous Greek, who, soon afterwards, built the celebrated city Massilia (Marseilles), and made it the emporium of Gallic commerce, and the seat of its early literature and civilisation.¶

Foundation of Marseilles. OL. 45.

But although Nannus himself remained, as long as he lived, the faithful ally of the new settlers, the Ligures and other neighbouring tribes entertained an extreme jealousy of their designs, and eagerly watched for an opportunity of expelling them from the country. In the figurative style of savages, they declared that a too liberal shepherd** had permitted a suppliant wolf to make a kennel in his fold, and to deposit her whelps; but that, when the young should be grown up, the suppliant tone would be changed for menaces and robbery. These apprehensions were shared by the Salii themselves; and, upon the demise of their King, Comanus his successor determined to surprise and destroy Marseilles. For this purpose, under pretence of attending at a public festival, a considerable party of Salian warriors introduced themselves into the town, armed after the custom of their country; whilst the King, with a formidable army, lay concealed behind an eminence at a short distance, till night and the confusion and carelessness usual on such occasions, should favour the attempt. It happened, however, that a young female Gaul, to whom the plot was communicated, had an intrigue with an officer in the Grecian service, and, in order to save her lover from the general massacre which was intended, she acquainted him with the secret. By this timely information the city was saved, the intruders were seized and put to death, and an ambuscade being prepared, Comanus was decoyed into it and slain, with about seven thousand of his troops.

The Gauls attempt to destroy it. B. C. 600.

This narrow escape proved a salutary warning to the Greeks that they must depend for their safety upon their own courage and vigilance; and they immediately set about strengthening their fortifications and improving their armoury: they established a strict police, and rigidly examined all aliens who entered the city; and they applied themselves, with great diligence, to augment their navy and to extend their commerce. By these means Marseilles soon became a flourishing and powerful colony; and not only repelled repeated attacks of the Gauls, but was also enabled to wrest from them a considerable territory, and to erect several fortified places in its neighbourhood. In a war which ensued with Carthage, the Massilians gained several naval victories, and concluded peace on terms highly favourable to themselves; and they maintained a close alliance with Rome, as well as with the commercial cities in Spain.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Second attempt to destroy Marseilles. B. C. 368.

The increasing riches and power of the colony, which had for some time overawed the neighbouring States, no less excited their cupidity, and tempted them to form an extensive confederacy to seize and plunder it, about the same time that a similar attempt was successful under Brennus against Rome.* But Catumandus, the Chief whom they elected to command the expedition, was unworthy of their choice. The Greeks, alarmed by the formidable force assembled against them, contrived to tamper with him; and he was induced to declare that Minerva had warned him in a dream to desist from the enterprise. The superstitious Gauls immediately offered conditions of peace to the Massilians; and when the ambassadors were admitted into the city, Catumandus affected to recognise, in the statue of Minerva, the figure who had appeared to him by night. The peace, concluded under these auspices, appears to have led to something like a friendly intercourse between the parties; and the Gauls, however slowly, began, from this period, to imbibe something of the civilisation of their neighbours, which, in process of time, spread itself throughout their country, and occasioned that admixture of Grecian arts and superstitions, with Celtic rudeness and Druidical simplicity, which is observable in the description left us by Cæsar.

Expeditio of the Gauls. B. C. 588.†

At the period of the foundation of Marseilles by the Phocæans, that portion of Gaul particularly called Celtic was united under the powerful tribe of the Bituriges, whose King Ambigatus‡ passed for the most warlike and politic of the feudal Sovereigns of his time. But, in his old age, finding his numerous and factious Nobles averse from the quiet which suited his years, and apprehensive that their discontents might produce serious consequences to his government, he proposed that those who were desirous of a more active life should volunteer to go in search of adventures under his two spirited and enterprising nephews Bellovesus and Sigovesus. An hundred thousand Celts, of various tribes, joyfully accepted the proposal, and were divided into two armies under the command of the Princes, who, according to the prevalent custom of the age, were

* Polyb. ii. † Justin. xliii. *al* 539. B. C.
‡ *Al.* Salvii vel Salluvii, Gr. Σαλύες, &c.
§ *Al.* Petta. || *Al.* Euxenus.
¶ See *Histoire Littéraire de la France par des Religieux Bénédictins. Dissert. Prélim.* p. 42, &c.
** Justin. *loc. cit.*

* Justin. *loc. cit.* † *Al.* 660, *nonnulli* 622.
‡ Vide Liv. v. 34.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

determined respecting the course to be taken by the flight of birds.* Sigovesus, marching towards the Rhine, forced his way through Germany, penetrated the vast Hercinian forests, and finally settling in Hungary, laid the foundation of a power which became, in after times, so formidable in that part of Europe. But Bellovesus, more fortunate in the lot assigned him by the augurs, assembling the hardy tribes who inhabited the northern part of Gaul,† directed his march towards the Alps, of which the tremendous precipices, at first sight, discouraged the equestrian warriors of Normandy, accustomed to rely upon the strength and fleetness of their horses. But while they wandered at the foot of this immense ridge of rocks, they became acquainted with the romantic history of the Phocæans, and learnt their success in repelling the attack of Comanus.‡ This event Bellovesus artfully converted into an omen of future fortune to themselves, and induced his followers to pass the Alps, by way of Turin. A battle ensued with the Etruscans near the river Ticinus,§ in which the Gauls were victorious, and made themselves masters of Insubria, where they founded the city of Mediolanum.‖ The key of Italy was now gained; and a fresh army, under the conduct of Elitovius, followed the footsteps of Bellovesus, and by his assistance¶ driving out the Etruscans and the Umbri, themselves said to be of Gallic origin, occupied all the north of Italy, which thence obtained the name of Cisalpine Gaul.** Other adventurers followed, and completed the expulsion of the Italian inhabitants, extending their ravages as far as Clusium, and eventually to Rome itself.†† For nearly two centuries, however, they appear to have occupied this fine tract of country without profiting by the advantages which it held out for acquiring the arts and habits of civilized life; they retained the wild manners which they brought from their native land, and were only known to their southern neighbours as formidable freebooters, who frequently infested all the States between the Alps and the Apennines, (which latter boundary they do not appear to have crossed,‡‡) and whose incursions it was both difficult and dangerous to repel.§§ But about the year B. C. 388 they again began to find their territories too narrow for their still increasing population; and they invaded the demesne of the Clusians, advancing to the walls of the city‖‖ in great numbers under the command of a Chief, whom the Latin writers call Brennus.¶¶ Their success in this expedition, their capture of Rome, and their final expulsion by Camillus, have already been related in the History of the Great Italian Republic, (Life of CAMILLUS, vol. ix. 649.)

Attack of the Gauls upon Clusium.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

In that portion of our Biography, we have adopted the commonly received account; but in what manner the Gauls really retired from Rome, whether driven away with great slaughter by Camillus, whilst debating upon the amount of the ransom,* or treacherously massacred by the Romans in a state of intoxication,† or whether they returned peaceably with the fruits of their conquest into their own country,‡ are points as yet undecided by any conclusive evidence,§ and more material to the character of the Romans than to the History of Cisalpine Gaul. It seems probable that the Gauls did not arrive at home in full force; for, excepting a trifling campaign against the Veneti, in which little worthy of notice occurred, we hear nothing of them for twenty years,‖ till their sudden, and, it should appear, unprovoked march upon Rome, B. C. 367, when they were again defeated by the venerable Dictator Camillus with severe loss, and driven into Apulia, in which country they formed an inconsiderable settlement. From this time they continued almost every year to infest Rome, and repeatedly maintained doubtful combats, under its very walls, with the whole army of the enemy; but at length, having sustained several important defeats, they concluded a treaty, which was observed with little interruption for fifty years; and during that period, they turned their marauding enterprises against the Venetians and other northern States.

Second attack upon Rome.

B. C. 349.

Renewal of hostilities. B. C. 295.

The riches of Etruria, however, drew them again nearer to Rome; and the Etrurians, an unwarlike race, consented to be plundered both of land and money to purchase an alliance with the invaders; who having, in like manner, engaged the Samnites and the Umbri to make common cause with them, once more declared war against the Romans, and opened the campaign by cutting in pieces a Roman legion near Clusium. So complete was the slaughter that the Consuls were only apprized of their loss on seeing the Senones, who had achieved the exploit, with the heads of the soldiers dangling at their saddle-bows, according to the barbarous mode of triumph usual among the Celtic tribes. The Consuls, having manœuvred so as to detach the Etruscan and Umbrian troops, marched to avenge the insult; and a bloody battle ensued with the Gauls and Samnites, in which the impetuosity of Celtic valour appeared once more likely to destroy the rising power of Rome: but the celebrated self-devotion of the Consul Decius turned the fortune of the day, and the invaders were so entirely routed, that they made no attempt to renew the contest for more than ten years.

Defeat of the Romans B. C. 284.

After this period they again marched into Tuscany, and laid siege to Aretinum,¶ a colony of Rome. A large army was sent to its relief; but the Senones, taking advantage of an error of the General, fell suddenly upon them, and thirteen thousand Romans, among whom was the Consul himself, were left dead

* Justin. xxiv. 4. Other authorities say 300,000.

† Livy states these to have been the Bituriges, Arverni, Senones, Ædui, Ambarri, Carnutes, and Aulerci, v. 34. the greater part of whom disdained to march on foot, and were consequently ill adapted for crossing the Alps.

‡ Some authors assert that Bellovesus assisted the Greeks; and Plutarch will have it that the taste which the Gauls obtained of the wines and fruits of Italy, determined them to invade it. (*In Camillo.*) Pliny, xii. 1. hints at something of the same kind.

§ The Tesino. ‖ Milan.

¶ The people who followed Elitovius were the Cenomani; the Salluvii, Boii, and Lingones succeeded. Livy, v. 35.

** Justin speaks of the numerous cities founded by the Gauls in Italy, xx. 5. But from the account of Livy, *loc. cit.* and from Pliny, iii. 5. and Florus, i. 13. it may rather be inferred that they took them from the Etrurians.

†† Livy, *loc. cit.* ‡‡ Ibid.

§§ Florus, i. 13. ‖‖ Chiusi.

¶¶ *Brenn* is a Celtic word signifying "*the General.*"

* Liv. v. 48, 49. † Polyæn. *Strateg.* viii. 25.

‡ Orosius, ii. 19. Polyb. i. and ii.

§ See this subject fully and ably discussed in *Hist. des Gaulois*, tom. i. c. 6.

‖ Appian, *de Bello Gallico.* It was in this interval that they entered into an alliance with Dionysius I. of Sicily. Florus, xx. 5.

¶ Arezzo.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

upon the field; the number of prisoners also was considerable, and the Senate sent legates to treat for their ransom; but the Gauls, declaring that the Romans had too often broken the law of nations to be entitled to its protection, put the legates to death. But the power and the resources of Rome were no longer to be defied with impunity: the Consul Dolabella was despatched to meet the victorious Senones, who were advancing upon Rome, and he not only defeated them in a pitched battle, but pursued them into their own territory, and there built, in the heart of their possessions, the city of Sena, the first Roman colony in Cisalpine Gaul. The Boii, alarmed by this encroachment, formed an extensive confederacy of the Celtic tribes to resist the growing dominion of Rome: they were defeated, with their Etruscan allies, near the Vadimonian lake, and compelled to retire. The attempt was renewed in the succeeding year; but the spirit of the Celts was broken, and the Italians had become accustomed to brave their savage arts of intimidation: they were again beaten, and obliged to sue for peace, which fear and necessity, rather than inclination, preserved inviolate for nearly half a century.

B. C. 283.

From this period we may date the decline of the Cisalpine Gauls, who were gradually driven to greater distances from the limits of the Roman Republic, and forced to retire towards the foot of the Alps; nor had they, for many years, sufficient courage to unite with the various nations who courted their assistance until the year B. C. 237, when the arrival of a numerous army from Transalpine Gaul infused fresh spirits into their increasing population, and once more tempted them to invade the Roman territory. Whilst they were engaged in the siege of a border town, the two parties quarrelled respecting the division of the expected booty, and the Roman legions which had been sent to oppose them remained quiet spectators of a furious combat between the Italian and Gallic Celts, which ended in the retreat of both to the foot of the Alps.* It is probable that this disaster might have produced a longer suspension of hostilities, had not Rome herself provoked a renewal of the war by decreeing to divide the Picene district, which had belonged to the Senones, among the disbanded veterans of her own army. The Cisalpine Gauls were all alarmed at this arbitrary violation of their boundary,† and they formed a league to repel it; in which were included two powerful tribes of the Gesatæ, under their respective Kings Congolitanus and Anerastus. The preparations, on both sides, were made on the largest scale, and the most serious apprehensions were entertained for the fate of Rome, although defended by an army of three hundred thousand men.‡ The Cenomani alone, forgetting their origin, and irritated by the recent dissensions among the Gauls, followed the Roman standard.

Reinforcement of Transalpine Gauls. B. C. 237.

B. C. 232.

At length the gathered storm moved slowly onwards and advanced into Etruria, where, meeting with no opposition, the Gauls plundered the country and marched upon Clusium. Here they learned that the Roman legions had passed them by another route, and were already far in their rear; upon which they hastily faced about, and returned towards their own country to meet the enemy. The two armies met about sunset, and each prepared for a decisive engagement next morning; but the Gauls, under the able management of Anerastus,* deceived the Roman Prætor, and drawing him into an incautious and hasty pursuit, defeated him near Fæsulæ with the loss of six thousand men. Satisfied with this advantage, and with the immense plunder which they had collected, they prudently resolved to march home; and though the Consul Æmilius hovered on their rear and harassed their foragers, they must have effected their purpose, had not the other Consul unexpectedly landed on the coast of Pisæ, and thus placed them between two enemies. In the first instance, the fierce courage of the Gauls prevailed over the disadvantage of their situation, and making head against both armies, they repelled the newly-landed forces, and slew the Consul, whose head decorated the saddle-bows of Anerastus; but the steady discipline and superior armour of the Romans was finally successful, and the Gauls were totally routed: the King Congolitanus fell in the battle, and forty thousand Gauls lay dead on the field, ten thousand yielded themselves to the conquerors, and Anerastus himself, disdaining to fall into their hands, having escaped with great difficulty from the scene of action, threw himself upon his own sword. The Roman army, though it had suffered severely from the desperate fierceness of the Celtic cavalry, laid waste the country of the Boii, and returned home loaded with spoils.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

The victorious Republic determined to pursue its advantages; and, early in the next year, both Consuls crossed the Po, for the first time, and obliged the Boii to submit to the Roman yoke. In the succeeding campaign, the Insubrians and Gesatæ were defeated with a great loss, particularly of prisoners, and were compelled to sue for peace, which was denied them; and Marcellus, in the beginning of the following spring, completed the overthrow of the Cisalpine Gauls at Clastidium, where the King Viridomarus fell by the hand of the Roman commander,† and Milan itself became the prize of the victor.

The strength the Gau broken B. C 224

B. C. 22

But though the power of resistance was broken, the animosity of the Celts was by no means subdued, and the Romans found it necessary to bridle their incursions, by erecting strong fortresses upon the border, and within the territory of the Boii. These measures led to frequent revolts, in which, though occasionally successful, the Gauls continued to lose ground, until the arrival of Hannibal in Italy afforded them a brief respite from Roman encroachments, and an opportunity of avenging themselves upon their ancient enemy the Consul Flaminius, who fell by the hand of Ducarius, an Insubrian Nobleman,‡ at the famous battle of Thrasymene.

B. C. 225.

B. 2

Their hopes fell with those of Carthage, in whose disasters they shared; but, however weakened, they persisted in their system of hostility to the Romans, and took every opportunity of harassing their marches and counteracting their movements; till the more turbulent tribes were either cut off or driven out of Italy, and the others, after being for some years deprived of

B. 19

* Eutropius, iii.
† Polyb. ii. Orosius, iv. 13. Diod. Sic. xxv. 3.
‡ *Epitome Livii*, xx.

* *Al.* Aneriestes.
† Plutarch, *in Marcello.* Val. Max. iii. 2. Virg. Æn. vi. fin.
‡ Liv. xxii. 6. Silius Italicus calls him a Boian, v. 644.

their arms, became incorporated with the neighbouring States, and entirely subjected to Rome. Some time after this was effected, the Transalpine Gauls made one or two unsuccessful efforts to establish colonies in the north of Italy; but the attempt served only to prove that the time was past for contending with the overwhelming power of Rome.

From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

In the mean while, during upwards of four hundred years that the Celtic warriors thus maintained themselves in Italy, the descendants of that numerous party who followed Sigovesus through Germany established themselves on the banks of the Danube, and founded the formidable, though uncivilised States of Pannonia, which became the scourge of all the neighbouring nations from their marauding habits, impenetrable fastnesses, and bloody ferocity. They were in some measure repressed by the energetic measures of Philip of Macedon, and were even compelled to sue for terms of accommodation to his son Alexander the Great:* but their humiliation was merely temporary; and in less than thirty years afterwards, we find them invading Greece in two formidable bodies, and spreading terror wherever they marched. The only potentate who shewed any disposition to resist the payment of this *black-mail*, (demanded by the predatory tribes of Celts, in all parts of the world, and for so many ages,) was Ptolemy Ceraunus† of Macedon, who fell a victim to the contempt which he evinced for his barbarous enemies, and lost both his army and his life. Sosthenes, who succeeded to his military command, acted with greater prudence; and collecting all the forces which could be mustered in Macedon, obliged the Gauls to retire. But they returned the ensuing year in much greater numbers, and led by a more spirited Chief;‡ and after defeating Sosthenes, who fell in the action, they plundered the whole kingdom of Macedon. Stimulated rather than sated with booty, they advanced into Phocis, their General having a design to seize the immense wealth contained in the temple at Delphi. To animate his troops to so audacious an undertaking, he turned their superstitious scruples into ridicule; and he obviated their more substantial apprehensions by displaying to them the Greek prisoners whom he had taken, and pointing out the disproportion between their slightly formed limbs, and the lofty stature and personal prowess of the Celt; above all, he painted in glowing colours the accumulated treasures which would enrich all who should share in the enterprise. Notwithstanding these encouragements, twenty thousand of his army refused to march under his command, and choosing other leaders sought their fortune in less hazardous exploits. But the main body, eagerly anticipating the rich reward of sacrilege, crossed the Sperchius, where a vain endeavour was made by the Greeks to oppose their progress, and advanced to Heraclea, burning and pillaging every place in their way; but, failing in their attempt upon that town, they marched for the pass of Thermopylæ, in order to pass into Greece. The name of Thermopylæ, however, the scene of their ancient glories, animated the Grecian troops who defended the pass, and the Gauls were repulsed with considerable loss. A similar result attended their efforts a few days afterwards to force the passage by Mount Œta; and their General was obliged to detach a division, with orders to ravage, in the most bloody and barbarous manner,* the country of the brave defenders of Greece. The scheme perfectly succeeded. The Œtolian troops, shocked and enraged at the horrors which were passing in Ætolia, left Thermopylæ, to avenge themselves on the marauders, and fought with such desperate and reckless rage, that they fell victims to their own violence. The army of defence being thus weakened, the Gauls, partly by treachery and partly by force, passed into Greece by Mount Œta.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Though ferocious, and sometimes brutal, the Gauls were a religious people; and Apollo was only another name for Belenus,† or Belis, the object of their peculiar veneration. Hence, as the siege of Delphi was protracted by the valiant efforts of its small corps of defenders, every trifling incident appalled the courage and smote the conscience of the besiegers: thunder seemed to speak the indignation of heaven; wind and rain appeared weapons of divine vengeance; the stones rolled down from the heights by the garrison were supposed to be hurled by no human hand; and the Greeks were not slow to take advantage of these frequent panics, which rendered their sallies at once secure to themselves and destructive to the Gauls. At length the General himself was severely wounded, and it was resolved to raise the siege. Such of the sick and wounded as could not be removed, preferred death to captivity, and, according to the general practice of their nation, obtained it from the hands of their comrades; the wounded chief himself requested the same boon, but his strength, his courage, and his talents had proved so serviceable, that his men resolved, at all risks, to carry him with them. He was, however, too proud to survive the complete disappointment of his schemes, and he chose to fall upon his own sword.

They invade Greece. B. C. 279.

Total destruction of the Gauls. B. C. 278.

The army, destitute of a leader competent to meet the dangers and difficulties which surrounded them, were harassed and intercepted on every side by the indignant Greeks, till, of that vast multitude, scarce ten thousand reached the camp which they had left near the banks of the Sperchius; and, in their attempt to cross the river, this miserable remnant was cut off to a man.‡

The Gauls invade Macedonia. B. C. 277.

The army, which had been left at home by the prudent precaution of their late Chief, was no sooner informed of the slaughter of their countrymen, than a hasty resolution was taken to avenge their blood. With this intention eighteen thousand men marched into Macedonia, and sent a message to Antigonus Gonatas, demanding the payment of tribute. The wily monarch received the heralds with a wanton display of wealth and luxury, and took

---

* Diod. Sic. xvii.

† Id. xxii. 3. Justin. xxiv. 4. Polyb. ix.

‡ Belgius and Brennus, which are considered by the Greek and Roman writers as proper names of men, appear rather to be local or official denominations.

* Pausanias, *in Phocia*.

† Borlase, *Antiq.* ii. p. 104.

‡ Doubts have been expressed respecting the accuracy of this statement, on the ground that the remnant of the army of Brennus afterwards made a conspicuous figure both in Thrace and in Asia. But the Gauls, who so distinguished themselves, had quitted the main army immediately *before* the attempt upon Delphi, in which they refused to participate. Livy, xxxviii. 16. Polyb. iv.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

upon the field; the number of prisoners also was considerable, and the Senate sent legates to treat for their ransom; but the Gauls, declaring that the Romans had too often broken the law of nations to be entitled to its protection, put the legates to death. But the power and the resources of Rome were no longer to be defied with impunity: the Consul Dolabella was despatched to meet the victorious Senones, who were advancing upon Rome, and he not only defeated them in a pitched battle, but pursued them into their own territory, and there built, in the heart of their possessions, the city of Sena, the first Roman colony in Cisalpine Gaul. The Boii, alarmed by this encroachment, formed an extensive confederacy of the Celtic tribes to resist the growing dominion of Rome: they were defeated, with their Etruscan allies, near the Vadimonian lake, and compelled to retire. The attempt was renewed in the succeeding year; but the spirit of the Celts was broken, and the Italians had become accustomed to brave their savage arts of intimidation: they were again beaten, and obliged to sue for peace, which fear and necessity, rather than inclination, preserved inviolate for nearly half a century.

B. C. 283.

From this period we may date the decline of the Cisalpine Gauls, who were gradually driven to greater distances from the limits of the Roman Republic, and forced to retire towards the foot of the Alps; nor had they, for many years, sufficient courage to unite with the various nations who courted their assistance until the year B. C. 237, when the arrival of a numerous army from Transalpine Gaul infused fresh spirits into their increasing population, and once more tempted them to invade the Roman territory. Whilst they were engaged in the siege of a border town, the two parties quarrelled respecting the division of the expected booty, and the Roman legions which had been sent to oppose them remained quiet spectators of a furious combat between the Italian and Gallic Celts, which ended in the retreat of both to the foot of the Alps.* It is probable that this disaster might have produced a longer suspension of hostilities, had not Rome herself provoked a renewal of the war by decreeing to divide the Picene district, which had belonged to the Senones, among the disbanded veterans of her own army. The Cisalpine Gauls were all alarmed at this arbitrary violation of their boundary,† and they formed a league to repel it; in which were included two powerful tribes of the Gesatæ, under their respective Kings Congolitanus and Anerastus. The preparations, on both sides, were made on the largest scale, and the most serious apprehensions were entertained for the fate of Rome, although defended by an army of three hundred thousand men.‡ The Cenomani alone, forgetting their origin, and irritated by the recent dissensions among the Gauls, followed the Roman standard.

Reinforcement of Transalpine Gauls. B. C. 237.

B. C. 232.

At length the gathered storm moved slowly onwards and advanced into Etruria, where, meeting with no opposition, the Gauls plundered the country and marched upon Clusium. Here they learned that the Roman legions had passed them by another route, and were already far in their rear; upon which they hastily faced about, and returned towards their own country to meet the enemy. The two armies met about sunset, and each prepared for a decisive engagement next morning; but the Gauls, under the able management of Anerastus,* deceived the Roman Prætor, and drawing him into an incautious and hasty pursuit, defeated him near Fæsulæ with the loss of six thousand men. Satisfied with this advantage, and with the immense plunder which they had collected, they prudently resolved to march home; and though the Consul Æmilius hovered on their rear and harassed their foragers, they must have effected their purpose, had not the other Consul unexpectedly landed on the coast of Pisæ, and thus placed them between two enemies. In the first instance, the fierce courage of the Gauls prevailed over the disadvantage of their situation, and making head against both armies, they repelled the newly-landed forces, and slew the Consul, whose head decorated the saddle-bows of Anerastus; but the steady discipline and superior armour of the Romans was finally successful, and the Gauls were totally routed: the King Congolitanus fell in the battle, and forty thousand Gauls lay dead on the field, ten thousand yielded themselves to the conquerors, and Anerastus himself, disdaining to fall into their hands, having escaped with great difficulty from the scene of action, threw himself upon his own sword. The Roman army, though it had suffered severely from the desperate fierceness of the Celtic cavalry, laid waste the country of the Boii, and returned home loaded with spoils.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

The victorious Republic determined to pursue its advantages; and, early in the next year, both Consuls crossed the Po, for the first time, and obliged the Boii to submit to the Roman yoke. In the succeeding campaign, the Insubrians and Gesatæ were defeated with a great loss, particularly of prisoners, and were compelled to sue for peace, which was denied them; and Marcellus, in the beginning of the following spring, completed the overthrow of the Cisalpine Gauls at Clastidium, where the King Viridomarus fell by the hand of the Roman commander,† and Milan itself became the prize of the victor.

The strength of the Gauls broken. B. C. 224.

B. C. 222.

But though the power of resistance was broken, the animosity of the Celts was by no means subdued, and the Romans found it necessary to bridle their incursions, by erecting strong fortresses upon the border, and within the territory of the Boii. These measures led to frequent revolts, in which, though occasionally successful, the Gauls continued to lose ground, until the arrival of Hannibal in Italy afforded them a brief respite from Roman encroachments, and an opportunity of avenging themselves upon their ancient enemy the Consul Flaminius, who fell by the hand of Ducarius, an Insubrian Nobleman,‡ at the famous battle of Thrasymene.

B. C. 203.

Their hopes fell with those of Carthage, in whose disasters they shared; but, however weakened, they persisted in their system of hostility to the Romans, and took every opportunity of harassing their marches and counteracting their movements; till the more turbulent tribes were either cut off or driven out of Italy, and the others, after being for some years deprived of

B. C. 190.

* Eutropius, iii.

† Polyb. ii. Orosius, iv. 13. Diod. Sic. xxv. 3.

‡ *Epitome Livii*, xx.

* *Al.* Aneriestes.

† Plutarch, *in Marcello.* Val. Max. iii. 2. Virg. *Æn.* vi. *fin.*

‡ Liv. xxii. 6. Silius Italicus calls him a Boian, v. 654.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

their arms, became incorporated with the neighbouring States, and entirely subjected to Rome. Some time after this was effected, the Transalpine Gauls made one or two unsuccessful efforts to establish colonies in the north of Italy; but the attempt served only to prove that the time was past for contending with the overwhelming power of Rome.

In the mean while, during upwards of four hundred years that the Celtic warriors thus maintained themselves in Italy, the descendants of that numerous party who followed Sigovesus through Germany established themselves on the banks of the Danube, and founded the formidable, though uncivilised States of Pannonia, which became the scourge of all the neighbouring nations from their marauding habits, impenetrable fastnesses, and bloody ferocity. They were in some measure repressed by the energetic measures of Philip of Macedon, and were even compelled to sue for terms of accommodation to his son Alexander the Great:* but their humiliation was merely temporary; and in less than thirty years afterwards, we find them invading Greece in two formidable bodies, and spreading terror wherever they marched. The only potentate who shewed any disposition to resist the payment of this *black-mail*, (demanded by the predatory tribes of Celts, in all parts of the world, and for so many ages,) was Ptolemy Ceraunus† of Macedon, who felt a victim to the contempt which he evinced for his barbarous enemies, and lost both his army and his life. Sosthenes, who succeeded to his military command, acted with greater prudence; and collecting all the forces which could be mustered in Macedon, obliged the Gauls to retire. But they returned the ensuing year in much greater numbers, and led by a more spirited Chief;‡ and after defeating Sosthenes, who fell in the action, they plundered the whole kingdom of Macedon. Stimulated rather than sated with booty, they advanced into Phocis, their General having a design to seize the immense wealth contained in the temple at Delphi. To animate his troops to so audacious an undertaking, he turned their superstitious scruples into ridicule; and he obviated their more substantial apprehensions by displaying to them the Greek prisoners whom he had taken, and pointing out the disproportion between their slightly formed limbs, and the lofty stature and personal prowess of the Celt; above all, he painted in glowing colours the accumulated treasures which would enrich all who should share in the enterprise. Notwithstanding these encouragements, twenty thousand of his army refused to march under his command, and choosing other leaders sought their fortune in less hazardous exploits. But the main body, eagerly anticipating the rich reward of sacrilege, crossed the Sperchius, where a vain endeavour was made by the Greeks to oppose their progress, and advanced to Heraclea, burning and pillaging every place in their way; but, failing in their attempt upon that town, they marched for the pass of Thermopylæ, in order to pass into Greece. The name of Thermopylæ, however, the scene of their ancient glories, animated the Grecian troops who defended the pass, and the Gauls were repulsed with considerable loss. A similar result attended their efforts a few days afterwards to force the passage by Mount Œta; and their General was obliged to detach a division, with orders to ravage, in the most bloody and barbarous manner,* the country of the brave defenders of Greece. The scheme perfectly succeeded. The Gallian troops, shocked and enraged at the horrors which were passing in Ætolia, left Thermopylæ, to avenge themselves on the marauders, and fought with such desperate and reckless rage, that they fell victims to their own violence. The army of defence being thus weakened, the Gauls, partly by treachery and partly by force, passed into Greece by Mount Œta.

Though ferocious, and sometimes brutal, the Gauls were a religious people; and Apollo was only another name for Belenus,† or Belis, the object of their peculiar veneration. Hence, as the siege of Delphi was protracted by the valiant efforts of its small corps of defenders, every trifling incident appalled the courage and smote the conscience of the besiegers: thunder seemed to speak the indignation of heaven; wind and rain appeared weapons of divine vengeance; the stones rolled down from the heights by the garrison were supposed to be hurled by no human hand; and the Greeks were not slow to take advantage of these frequent panics, which rendered their sallies at once secure to themselves and destructive to the Gauls. At length the General himself was severely wounded, and it was resolved to raise the siege. Such of the sick and wounded as could not be removed, preferred death to captivity, and, according to the general practice of their nation, obtained it from the hands of their comrades; the wounded chief himself requested the same boon, but his strength, his courage, and his talents had proved so serviceable, that his men resolved, at all risks, to carry him with them. He was, however, too proud to survive the complete disappointment of his schemes, and he chose to fall upon his own sword.

They invade Greece. B. C. 279.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Total destruction of the Gauls. B. C. 278.

The army, destitute of a leader competent to meet the dangers and difficulties which surrounded them, were harassed and intercepted on every side by the indignant Greeks, till, of that vast multitude, scarce ten thousand reached the camp which they had left near the banks of the Sperchius; and, in their attempt to cross the river, this miserable remnant was cut off to a man.‡

The Gauls invade Macedonia. B. C. 277.

The army, which had been left at home by the prudent precaution of their late Chief, was no sooner informed of the slaughter of their countrymen, than a hasty resolution was taken to avenge their blood. With this intention eighteen thousand men marched into Macedonia, and sent a message to Antigonus Gonatas, demanding the payment of tribute. The wily monarch received the heralds with a wanton display of wealth and luxury, and took

* Died. Sic. xvii.

† Id. xxii. 3. Justin. xxiv. 4. Polyb. ix.

‡ Belgius and Brennus, which are considered by the Greek and Roman writers as proper names of men, appear rather to be local or official denominations.

* Pausanius, *in Phocia*.

† Borlase, *Antiq.* ii. p. 104.

‡ Doubts have been expressed respecting the accuracy of this statement, on the ground that the remnant of the army of Brennus afterwards made a conspicuous figure both in Thrace and in Asia. But the Gauls, who so distinguished themselves, had quitted the main army immediately *before* the attempt upon Delphi, in which they refused to participate. Livy, xxxviii. 16. Polyb. iv.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50. B. C. 272.

care that no appearance of vigilance or discipline should be observed in his camp. The cupidity of the Gauls rendered them the easy dupes of this stratagem. They advanced the very next night, expecting to surprise the convivial Greeks, and to carry off all their treasure. They found the camp unguarded, and were proceeding in all the disorder of successful spoil, when the Macedonian troops, drawn up in order of battle, suddenly appeared, and gave them so severe a lesson, that they were glad to sue for peace on any terms: and we find them afterwards engaged as mercenaries in the wars which ensued between Pyrrhus King of Epirus and the Sovereigns of Macedon and Sparta, until they disgusted their employer by violating the tombs of the ancient Kings of Macedon in search of concealed treasures.

Colonies of the Gauls.

It has been considered incredible that, after so many losses, the Gauls should still have had a redundant population, and have been enabled to send out numerous armies. But the wonder, in a great measure, ceases, when it is recollected that this wandering people had no local attachments and few peaceable occupations, and that war and plunder were their business and their pleasure. Their habits of life, too, were such as tended to a rapid increase of numbers, and the destruction of a few thousands was easily replaced by reinforcements from more distant tribes.

It was during the period of the severe losses sustained in Macedon and in Greece, that the Gauls planted several of their most flourishing colonies. One division of those who refused to participate in the siege of Delphi are supposed to have settled near the confluence of the Savus with the Danube, where they became formidable under the name of Galli Scordiscæ.* Another party, about twenty thousand strong, having chosen Comontorius for their General, marched into Thrace, and, after a variety of successful adventures, made themselves masters of the Propontis, plundered Byzantium, and founded the Kingdom of Tylis, so long the oppressor of Thrace. Nor were the bounds of Europe large enough for their ambition: being invited into Asia in a civil war between two brothers, each of whom pretended to the throne of Bithynia, the ancient race of Celts once more passed into the land of their remote ancestors, and, taking possession of a considerable tract of country between Phrygia and the Euxine sea, became the founders of a Kingdom called by the Greeks, in common with the mother country of Gaul, Galatia;† which grew, by means of its bold and hardy mercenaries, to be the arbiter of all the neighbouring States, and the disposer of the diadems of Asia: even the monarchs of Syria did not disdain to purchase their protection by the payment of tribute. The first Asiatic Prince who resisted these Celtic exactions was Attalus King of Pergamus. This spirited monarch deprived them of a claim hitherto undisputed, and at the same time of their reputation for invincibility; but his example had little effect upon the effeminate people of the east, over whom Galatia still continued to exercise its accustomed oppressions, when the Romans defeated Antiochus King of Syria in the year B. C. 189. Manlius the Roman General defeated them in several severe actions, and drove them beyond the Halys; but, upon their submission, he restored them their independence, under a stipulation that they should entirely relinquish their marauding habits. This condition, though not long strictly observed, contributed to introduce among them a greater degree of civilisation than had hitherto existed in any purely Celtic colony; and in the time of Deiotarus, the well known ally of Mithridates (B. C. 86.), and afterwards of Pompey (B. C. 63.), and the clients of Cicero, they could no longer be called a barbarous people. Galatia became a Roman Province under Augustus (B. C. 25.), but long retained many of its national peculiarities, and its Celtic tongue. A variety of smaller colonies sprung up in various parts of Europe, especially along the course of the Danube, and every where maintained the same character for courage and ferocity. Their habits of plunder and promptitude to slaughter rendered them objects of terror even to the Romans; and their irritability and violence made them regarded with suspicion and dread whenever they were engaged as mercenaries; nor was their power finally extinguished in Germany till towards the close of the third century.

B. C. 241.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Affairs of Gaul.

Whilst the Gauls thus spread the terror of their name throughout Europe, and even in the east, their efforts at home to defend themselves from the ambition of Rome, though displaying at least equal bravery, were not attended with the same good fortune. In the first rencontres which they had with the Roman arms upon their own ground, the tribes which inhabited the Alps sustained three several defeats in defending the gold mines of their native mountains;* but though the Romans succeeded in their immediate object, they effected no permanent settlement in the Gallic territory.

From B. C. 166. to B. C. 118.

That important object was first attained in consequence of an embassy from the Massilian Phocæans, who were reduced to the greatest danger by the persevering hostility of the Salii and the Ligures, assisted by some of the neighbouring tribes.† The Consul Opimius was immediately despatched into Gaul, where he totally defeated the Salian allies, disarmed the most formidable among them, and assigned a large portion of their territory to the rescued Massilians. Having thus once opened a way for themselves into Transalpine Gaul, the Senate only waited for a decent pretext to secure a strong station within it, with a view to more extensive conquests. The next application for relief from the Massilians was eagerly embraced, and two Consuls successively avenged their cause by the complete subjugation of the Salii, and at the same time fulfilled the politic views of the Senate, by founding a Roman colony at Aquæ Sextiæ,‡ from which they might begin their future operations. No time was lost in availing themselves of the opportunity thus afforded. In the very same year, another Consul arrived in Gaul, and finding the Ædui engaged in a feudal war with the Allobroges and the Avernians,§ he artfully fomented

Roman stations in Gaul. B. C. 123.

* Livy, xli. 19. Strabo, 7. Florus, iii. 4.

† Strabo, xii. Livy, xxxviii. 12. 40. The principal tribes of Galatia, otherwise called Gallogræcia, were the Tectosagæ, the Tolistoboii, and the Trocmi. Smaller divisions of four other tribes joined the colony.

* Livy, *Epit.* xlvi. liii. Dion Cass. *Excerpt.* Strabo, iv. Orosius, v. 4. 14.

† Polyb. *Excerpt.* cxxxi. cxxxiv. Livy, *Epit.* xlvii.

‡ Aix.

§ The country is still called Auvergne.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

this intestine contest, and, with the genuine policy of his country, contrived to weaken both parties, whilst he affected to espouse the cause of the Ædui. In a battle which ensued with the allies near Vandalium,* the Romans boast of having defeated them, with the loss of twenty thousand killed and three thousand prisoners; but in this, as in other cases, considerable allowance should doubtless be made, in the numbers of the slain, for the unblushing mendacity of the conquerors.

Expedition of Fabius. B. C. 121.

The Avernians had given great offence to the Senate, by their presumption in sending an ambassador to Rome to intercede for the Salii, nearly the whole of whose territory had been arbitrarily assigned to the Massilians. This personage arrived with a retinue of Bards and feudal dependents, and with a pack of hounds in his train; but he found Republican Rome already beginning to arrogate to itself the right of distributing, at pleasure, dominions of States and Princes; and his embassy served only as an excuse, such as it was, to the Senate for sending the Consul Q. Fabius Maximus, with thirty thousand men, against Bituitus King of Auvergne, whom he totally defeated; and, by means of the basest treachery,† made him his prisoner and exposed him in his Triumph. Congentiatus, the son of this Prince, who shared his captivity, was carefully educated at Rome; and when he was supposed to have entirely lost all his native spirit of royalty, and to have imbibed a slavish submission to Rome, he was sent home to be nominally restored to his father's throne, but to become, in effect, the agent of the Senate.

The States of Gaul reduced to Provinces. B. C. 118.

The Romans, meanwhile, had thought fit to grant peace,‡ as they termed it, to the Allobroges, Avernians, and other States in the neighbourhood; in plain language, they had reduced them to the form of a Roman Province, which they entitled Gallia Narbonensis,§ from the metropolis which they erected in it.

Twelve years afterwards, the Province was enlarged by the addition of Tolosa,‖ which Cæpio took from the Tectosagæ with a vast treasure, the greater part of which, being in the temple of Minerva, brought upon the Consul the guilt and penalty of sacrilege; the vengeance of the goddess, or rather his own conscience, pursued him through life, and "the gold of Tolosa" became a proverb expressive of the disastrous consequences of ill-gotten wealth.¶

Invasion of the northern Celts. B. C. 113. 109.

The progress of the Romans in reducing Gaul was for a time arrested by a formidable irruption of the Cimmerii or Cimbri and Teutones, families of the purest and most ancient Celtic origin, from the northern regions of Europe. These wild warriors, after defeating the Roman armies with tremendous slaughter in other Provinces, turned their victorious arms against Narbonian Gaul, and being eagerly joined by several of the independent Gallic nations,* they reduced the Province to extreme distress; accumulated an immense booty; routed several Roman armies with prodigious slaughter; encouraged the Gauls to rise upon the republican garrisons; and, for upwards of eleven years, ravaged the whole country without meeting with any effectual resistance, except from the Belgæ, who bravely defended their frontier, and the Celtiberi, who drove them back out of Spain.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Suppressed by Marius. B. C. 102.

At length, however, the Senate found a General capable of overcoming the invaders in the field, and restrained by no feelings of humanity from the full execution of their vindictive purposes. Marius defeated, in several bloody battles, the independent Gauls who had joined with the Cimbri, and subsequently the Cimbri themselves; and he followed up his victories by massacres so merciless, that several tribes of Gaul became utterly extinct. The numbers thus murdered in cold blood are, as is usual with the Romans, reckoned among the killed in battle; and they were so vast, according to some authors, as to have perceptibly enriched the soil with human blood, and occasioned a great increase of produce. Gaul thus enfeebled, offered little resistance to the ambition of the Roman Senate. A trifling insurrection of the Salii, ten years after the destruction of the northern hordes, was easily quelled, and answered no better purpose than to afford the conquerors a pretext for further encroachments, which were still more extended by Pompey during the short period of his command in that country. But, though suppressed, the people were by no means reconciled to their servitude, and were anxiously on the watch for every opportunity of throwing off the yoke. The Servile and Catilinarian wars excited the most lively interest, and for a time gave them some hopes of their emancipation; but the assistance which they ventured to afford the rebels, though it served to prolong the struggle, produced no advantage to themselves.

B. C. 76.

All these circumstances had effected so great a change in the relations of Gaul, had so weakened and disorganized the system, and broken the spirit of the native inhabitants, that they were more ready to join with a foreign army to avenge themselves upon each other, than to unite in the common cause against the enemies of their independence. This disunion had, in a great measure, been brought about by the intrigues of Rome; and a man was at this juncture sent into Gaul, every way qualified to take advantage of it. Cæsar was artful, bold, enterprising, and cautious, of unbounded ambition, restless activity, and unmixed selfishness; restrained by no fear of gods or men, bound by no principles, and subject to no prejudices, his whole powers and all his feelings were concentrated upon one point—his own aggrandizement.

Cæsar takes the command in Gaul. B. C. 59.

At the period of his taking the command in Gaul, the Helvetians had for some months been maturing a scheme, first suggested by an ambitious but trea-

* *Hodie* Avignon.

† Val. Max. ix. 6. The details of the action are so ridiculously exaggerated as to be altogether unworthy of notice. According to the Roman accounts the loss of the victors was *fifteen men*, and that of the vanquished from 120,000 to 200,000! the other particulars mentioned are equally gross.

‡ "*Solitâ clementiâ!*"

§ Comprehending Provence, Dauphiné, Savoy, and great part of Languedoc. *Narbo Cæsaribus ferax crevadis.*

‖ *Hodie* Toulouse.

¶ The amount of the plunder is variously reported; the lowest computation is more than two millions of English money.

* The Ambrones, Tigurini, and Tugini.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

cherous Chief among them named Orgetorigix,* who became the victim of his own perfidy, for extending their power by that sort of armed emigration to which the Celts have always manifested a strong propensity. From Helvetia there were only two practicable roads; the one by the bridge of Geneva, through the country of the Allobroges, which presented considerable difficulties, the other a more safe and easy march through the territories of the Sequani. The Helvetians, having burnt their own houses and destroyed their granaries, to leave themselves no hope in the abandonment of their wild enterprise, victualled themselves for three months, and trusting that their movements had escaped observation, took the road to Geneva; but Cæsar had full information of their plans, and had not only destroyed the bridge, but had also fortified the western bank of the Rhone,† so that they found it impracticable to force the passage. Disappointed on this side, they turned their course northwards, and by the intercession of Dumnorix, Chief of the Ædui,‡ they with some difficulty obtained permission to pass through the country of the Sequani;§ and the first use which they made of this indulgence, was to plunder the territory of the Ædui, by whose influence they had procured it. Arrived on the banks of the Arar,‖ they consumed three weeks in constructing canoes to cross that deep and sluggish stream, and only three of the four Helvetian clans had passed it, when Cæsar suddenly fell upon their rear, and, profiting by their situation, cut to pieces the Tigurini¶ who remained behind. The consternation of the surviving clans was complete, when the next day Cæsar threw a bridge over the stream, and in a few hours performed that which they had failed to complete in so many days.

B. C. 58.

But the ancient courage of the Celtic Nobility was not extinguished. The whole body of the Roman cavalry was charged and put to the rout by five hundred Helvetian cavaliers; and though Cæsar affects to sneer at the arrogance which they assumed on the occasion, it is clearly to be inferred from his own narrative, that he found it prudent to avoid an engagement on equal terms, and to wait for some favourable occasion. Such an opportunity was not long wanted: after a bloody combat, in which skill and science at length prevailed over all the efforts of fierce impetuosity, the Helvetians were defeated with horrible carnage, and the survivors were glad to be permitted to return to their deserted homes, as the reputed allies of Rome. The Boii who served in their army were suffered to remain among the Ædui, who willingly recruited their exhausted population with these brave and hardy warriors.

The Helvetians and Ariovistus conquered.

Cæsar profited by his victory to sow jealousy and dissatisfaction among all the most powerful tribes of Gaul; and so artfully did he contrive to tame this haughty and intrepid race, that they began to solicit his assistance against each other, as well as his protection against foreign invaders; and the rest of the summer was employed in repelling a powerful body of German marauders, who, under the conduct of Ariovistus, had spread terror and desolation among the Sequani.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

But, though the southern part of Gaul was thus subjugated, the Romans were as yet but little known and less feared among the ruder and more ferocious tribes of the north; and Cæsar was seriously alarmed by the intelligence of an extensive confederacy formed among the Belgians to maintain their independence. These wild tribes, inhabiting vast and nearly trackless forests, had conveyed their families and their property to the small inaccessible islands with which their immense morasses abounded, and were resolved to oppose the progress of the Roman armies to the last man. Nor, though several ages behind southern Gaul in luxury and learning, were they deficient in military skill: Cæsar found all the passes either fortified, or broken up, and every obstacle thrown in his way which the most determined resolution directed by an enlightened uniformity of design could suggest. But the discipline and the tactics of the Romans had at this period attained their highest perfection; and the only effect of the intrepidity of the Belgians was a slaughter almost incredible. The success of the invaders, however, was by no means unvaried: the Suessones repulsed them in an attempt to storm Noviodunum; and the Nervii,* the most savage and formidable of the Belgian clans, fought so desperately, that, on one occasion, the Roman cavalry was totally routed, the legions were exposed to the most imminent hazard, and the star of Cæsar had well nigh set for ever. But, with his usual presence of mind and good fortune, he retrieved the day, and, (to adopt his own favourite vaunt,) "with his usual clemency," he avenged himself by a massacre of the Nervians, which almost amounted to extermination.

Belgic war. B. C. 57.

Subjugation of the northern and western tribes of Gauls. B. C. 57.

While Cæsar thus destroyed rather than subdued the unoffending people of Belgium, the various independent tribes, who inhabited the country adjoining the western coast, were, in a similar manner, reduced by his lieutenants; so that, in the short space of two campaigns, he had overrun nearly the whole of Gaul, and so crippled its powers of resistance, that every tribe within the Rhine had submitted, for the present, to the terms which he was pleased to dictate; and even some nations, who lay beyond that river, were induced to avert the dreaded storm by soliciting the alliance of Rome. Some symptoms of independence, however, still lingered among the maritime people of the western coast, whom commerce had rendered skilful in navigation, and who possessed strong fortresses, and a powerful navy. Accordingly, early in the next summer, Cæsar directed his operations against the Veneti, the principal of these tribes, and finding it too arduous an undertaking to reduce them on shore, he resolved to engage them at sea: his usual fortune attending him, a sudden calm, accompanied by a heavy swell, rendered their ships so unmanageable, that the Romans destroyed them one by one. He then extended his ravages again into the north, where he met with little effectual opposition, whilst his officers suppressed, without difficulty, the risings of a few malecontents in the south and east, and the conquest of the country appeared so complete, that Cæsar, after repressing the incursions of the Germans, crossed the sea into Britain.

Cæsar defeats the Veneti. B. C. 56.

B. C. 55.

* Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* i. 2, *et seq.*
† The remains of these works are still discernible.
‡ Autunois.
§ Franche Comté.
‖ Saône.
¶ People of Zurich.
* People of Cambray.

History. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704 — A. C. 50.

From this period the History of the Gauls, as a distinct people, ceases, and Gaul itself becomes a limb of the gigantic Roman Empire. But though subdued, the natives still wore their chains indignantly, and eagerly seized every delusive appearance of an opportunity to burst them. The most audacious of these insurrections was headed by Ambiorix, a Chief among the Belgians, who surprised and cut to pieces two divisions of the Roman army, induced the Nervians to join him, and had nearly effected the destruction of the troops under the command of Q. Cicero, when Cæsar, by forced marches, opportunely arrived to their relief. But a much more extensive conspiracy was formed, two years afterwards, under Vercingetorix, who seduced into it, not only those nations who were alone kept in subjection by force of arms, but several others also, and amongst them the Ædui, who had hitherto submitted with apparent willingness, and had even assisted in extending the conquests of Rome. The extraordinary talents and dauntless intrepidity of Vercingetorix revived for a time the ancient spirit of the Celts, and the fortune of Cæsar himself seemed obscured in the brilliancy of their achievements. The Roman army was compelled to retreat, after sustaining severe losses, and had the Senate then recalled Cæsar, Gaul would have recovered her independence: but that great commander, ever fertile in resources, and accustomed to extricate himself from the most difficult embarrassments, drew his legions, with astonishing rapidity, out of Germany, marched to meet the insurgents, and, after an obstinately contested battle, in which he is said to have lost his sword,* defeated and drove them into Alisia, the ancient capital of Celtic Gaul.† In this strong place Vercingetorix, still at the head of seventy thousand men, defended himself till famine compelled him to surrender. Reduced to the last extremity, the highminded Celt, arrayed in his gorgeous panoply, and mounted upon a high mettled charger, whose port and stature were as lofty as his own, rode out to throw himself upon the boasted clemency and generosity of Cæsar, with whom he had formerly lived on terms of intimacy. So striking was this last exhibition of Gallic military splendour, that Cæsar is said to have trembled at his approach; but, if he felt momentary terror, he avenged himself by ordering Vercingetorix to be seized and ironed, and, after dragging him behind his triumphal car at Rome, he caused him to be privately put to death.

Revolt of Vercingetorix. B. C. 52.

Gaul. From A. M. 3404. — A. C. 600. to U. C. 704. — A. C. 50.

Cæsar remained during the ensuing winter in Gaul, and, in a short time, completed the reduction of the remaining tribes who continued in arms after the surrender of Alisia; the dominion of Rome became permanently and peaceably established; and the wealth of Gaul, plundered without remorse, and appropriated without scruple, enabled the conqueror to overturn the Constitution of his own country.‡

End of the revolt. B. C. 50.

* Plutarch, *in Vitâ Cæsaris.*

† Burgundy.

‡ It is worthy of notice, that the barbarous hordes of the Celtic race, who inhabited the fastnesses of the Alps, were not subdued by Cæsar. Most of them, however, submitted to Augustus; but a few retained their independence in the time of Nero. *Hist. des Gaules*, tom. i. c. 10.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXIII.

OF PARTHIA.

FROM U. C. 509. B. C. 245. TO U. C. 701. B. C. 53.

History. From U. C. 509. — B. C. 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

Of this country scarcely any thing authentic is to be found in the page of History, till after the conquests of Alexander the Great. Before that time, the Parthians appear to have been in subjection, first to the Medes, and afterwards to the Persians; and when the latter people were subdued by the arms of Macedon, their tributaries in the north likewise found themselves compelled to acknowledge the same masters, and to share in the same government.

In the division of the Macedonian Empire, Parthia was included in that portion of the Asiatic territory which fell to Seleucus Nicator; and it seems to have continued, without any interruption, under the authority of Syrian Kings, till about two hundred and fifty years before the Christian æra; when the natives, enraged at the tyrannical conduct of a local commander, displayed the standard of revolt, and asserted their independence. Arsaces, to whom the Parthians committed the direction of the war, proved himself worthy of the confidence which his countrymen had reposed in him: for he not only defeated Seleucus Callinicus and drove him out of the Province, but also, when the Syrian monarch afterwards renewed his invasion, he overthrew his army in a great battle, took the King himself prisoner, and detained him in captivity till the day of his death.*

Rise of the Parthians. A. M. 3759. Arsaces I. B. C. 245.

The Parthians after this, having placed their successful General on the throne, reduced Hyrcania and some other contiguous Provinces; and thereby, at once, added materially to their own power, and weakened that of their former rulers: but an unfortunate battle with Ariarathes, the King of Cappadocia, shook the foundations of their new State, deprived them of their brave Prince, who fell in the action, and exposed them to the renewed hostility of Alexander's successors, who continued to resent the loss of so much territory and of so many warlike subjects.

Arsaces II.

But the attention of Antiochus the Great, who had now assumed the reins of the Syrian Government, was soon diverted from the affairs of Parthia. A war with Ptolemy Evergetes employed so entirely his arms and his councils, that Arsaces the Second found himself at liberty to invade Media, and to reduce a considerable portion of that valuable country. The Parthians, however, were not allowed to retain either a long or a tranquil possession of their conquest. Arsaces was compelled to retrace his steps in the presence of an overwhelming host of Syrians; and although he immediately thereafter brought into the field 100,000 foot and 20,000 horse, he was glad to terminate the war with a treaty, which allowed him, on certain conditions, to remain master of his paternal dominions.

Parthia. From U. C. 509. — B. C. 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

Priapatius was the third King of Parthia; but he has left no memorial of success or misfortune to occupy the pen of History, or to call forth the praise or reproof of the annalist. He had three sons, Phraates, Mithridates, and Artabanus; the first of whom succeeded him on the throne, and signalized his arms by a splendid victory over the Mardians, who had never yielded to any other invader but Alexander the Great. Mithridates, in like manner, added to the reputation of his Kingdom by subduing the Bactrians, Elymæans, and certain other barbarous tribes which were said to inhabit the banks of the Indus, and to have witnessed the most eastern triumph of the Macedonian conqueror. The rapid progress of the Parthian Chief could not fail to awaken the fears of Syria. Demetrius Nicator, accordingly, who then governed the remaining Provinces of Seleucus, made an attempt to recover the ground which he had lost; but he was entirely defeated at the head of a large army, taken prisoner on the field, and thrown into a miserable captivity, from which he was only released by death. Upon this, Mithridates made himself master of Babylonia and Mesopotamia, as well as of the greater part of those more eastern Provinces which border on the Indian rivers.*

Priapatius. Phraates. Mithridates.

Phraates I.

Phraates, the son of Mithridates, had to encounter a more unequal fortune than that which had crowned the efforts of his more active predecessors. The King of Syria, Antiochus Sidetes, raised a large army and marched against him, with the view of obtaining the liberation of his brother Demetrius, who still groaned under Parthian chains. The first efforts of the invader were accompanied with singular success. He defeated Phraates in three pitched battles, stripped him of

* Justin, lib. xli. c. 4. Appian, *Syriac.* c. 65.

* Justin, *ut supra.* Appian, *Syriac.* Strabo, lib. xi. and xii. Justin, lib. xl. c. 6.

History. From U. C. 509. — B. C. 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

all the conquests achieved by his father, and confined him within the narrow limits of his hereditary dominions. But afterwards, either from an undue use of his victories, or from the difficulty of retaining military occupation of so extensive an Empire, the Syrian fell a victim to the treachery or to the courage of the vanquished, was cut off with his numerous army, and deprived at once of his crown and his life.*

Artabanus.

At this period the Scythians began to manifest no small degree of jealousy at the aggrandizement of the Parthian power; and taking the field against Phraates, they fully avenged the quarrel of Antiochus Sidetes, by inflicting on the former a most signal defeat. Phraates fell with nearly the whole of his troops, and was immediately succeeded in the government by Artabanus, his father's brother. Nor was the success of the new King against his Scythian enemies more flattering than that of his nephew; for he, in like manner, soon after his accession, was routed in the field of battle, and put to death with the greater number of his followers. The sceptre forthwith passed into the hands of Pacorus the First, whose reign

Pacorus I.

is chiefly distinguished by the alliance which he contracted with the Romans. His successor Phraates the

Phraates III.

Third, alarmed by the ambitious views of these western republicans, ventured to set their enmity at defiance, and to grant protection to the young King of Armenia, the son of Tigranes the Great. He gave him his daughter in marriage; and, advancing with a powerful armament, was determined to expel the Romans from their conquest, and reinstate the lawful heir, when the approach of Pompey effected an alteration in his measures, and induced him to renew the treaty with the Romans.†

Orodes. Expedition of Crassus.

Orodes, the second son of Phraates the Third, was on the throne when Crassus formed the resolution of invading Parthia. The motive to this memorable and unfortunate undertaking was not the desire of military reputation, nor even of political ascendency, on the part of this Triumvir, but the mere rapacious love of wealth, which formed the leading principle of his character, and which overshadowed or perverted his brilliant talents and singular strength of mind. Unequal to Cæsar and Pompey in the art or fame of a General, he sought to obtain a balance to their power in the possession of riches; which, in the luxurious and mercenary habit of mind which then began to prevail at Rome, he regarded as a full equivalent for the glory of victories and the brilliancy of a Triumph. Crassus, at the same time, was no mean soldier. On the contrary, his services under Sylla, and the success which crowned his arms in the arduous war with Spartacus, the accomplished leader of the revolted gladiators, had raised his name to an enviable place among the commanders of his day; and it was only when he fixed his eyes on the lofty station which was occupied by his two colleagues in the Triumvirate, that he yielded to the impression which the current of events had already formed in his mind, that he would most effectually maintain his influence at Rome by a judicious display of wealth, and by a seasonable exercise of political skill. The invasion of Parthia, therefore, was contemplated by him with unbounded delight, rather because he hoped to fill his coffers with the treasures of the east, than that he coveted the fame of returning to the city at the head of victorious legions.*

Parthia. From U. C. 509. — B. C. 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

It was not without considerable opposition from the people and the Tribunes that Crassus was allowed to proceed on this expedition. All the influence of Pompey was necessary to prevent an expression of popular wrath. When the Consul had reached the gate of the city, the Tribune Ateius attempted to stop him by force; but failing in this, he immediately proceeded to perform a religious ceremony of the most appalling nature, by which he devoted the General himself, and all who should follow him on that service, to the wrath of the infernal gods and a speedy destruction. The Romans, according to Plutarch, were wont to maintain that these mysterious and ancient imprecations have such power, that the object of them never escapes their effect; nay, they insist, the person who utters them is sure to be unhappy, so that they are seldom used, and never but upon some great occasion. Ateius, says he, was much blamed for his rash zeal. It was for his country's sake that he was an adversary to Crassus, and yet, he adds, it was his country that he laid under that terrible curse.†

Evil omens at its commencement U. C. 699. — B. C. 55.

Embarking at Brundusium, Crassus proceeded by Macedonia and the Hellespont into Asia. In passing through Galatia, he found Deiotarus, the sovereign of that principality, now advanced in age, devising the plan of a new city, and providing the means for an increased population; upon which he is said to have observed to the veteran Chief, that "he was beginning a great work at a late hour."—"Nor do you," replied Deiotarus, "commence at a very early period the conquest of Parthia." The youngest of these interlocutors was upwards of sixty.

His first successes.

As the enemy was not prepared for this unprovoked invasion, the Romans met with no resistance. At first Crassus overran the greater part of Mesopotamia, and received the subjection of all the towns, of which only one ventured to make the smallest opposition; and, had he taken advantage of the consternation into which his sudden appearance had thrown the Parthians, he might, with the greatest ease, have extended his conquest to Babylonia itself. But the season being far advanced, he did not think it expedient to proceed. On the contrary, having left in the different towns and strongholds a detachment of seven thousand foot and a thousand horse, he returned into Syria and took up his winter quarters. This retrograde movement has been greatly condemned; and, says Plutarch, among the many errors which Crassus committed in this war, the first and one of the greatest was his returning so soon into Syria. His occupations, too, during the winter, have been heavily censured, as having more of the trader in them than of the General. Instead of improving the discipline of the soldiers and keeping them in proper exercise, he spent his time in making inquiry relative to the revenues of the cities, and in weighing the treasures which he found in the temple of Hierapolis.

Treachery of Ariamnes

In the spring the Roman commander took the field on the frontier of Syria, with seven legions, four

* Josephus, lib. xiii. c. 8. Diod. *Excerp.* p. 603. Appian, *Syriac.* c. 68. Ælian, lib. x. c. 34.
† Justin, lib. xlii. c. 1. Strabo, lib. xi.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xl.
† Plutarch, *in Vitâ Crassi.* Appian, *de Bello Parthicō*

History. From U. C. 509. — B. C. 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

thousand horse, and an equal number of light or irregular troops. With this force he again passed the Euphrates, when he was joined by an Arabian Chief, whom Plutarch calls Ariamnes, but who is elsewhere named Acbarus or Abgarus; and in this barbarian, owing to his knowledge of the country and his warm and reiterated expressions of attachment to the Romans, Crassus unfortunately placed the most entire confidence. Here he had likewise expected to meet Artabazus, or Artavasdes, King of Armenia, who had promised a reinforcement of troops and a supply of provisions; but the vigilant Orodes had prevented the junction, by invading the Kingdom of Armenia in person, while he left Surena, a young officer of great reputation, in Mesopotamia to oppose the Romans.

Crassus, we are told, intended to have followed the course of the Euphrates, till he should reach the point where it approaches nearest to Seleucia and Ctesiphon, the capital of the Parthian Kingdom; but was dissuaded by his guide, the crafty Ariamnes, who prevailed on him to direct his march eastward on the plains, where he might easily carry the position occupied by Surena, and at once effect his entrance into the enemy's country. Some parties, too, that had been sent in advance to examine the route which the army was to take in that direction, returned with a report that they had not actually seen any enemy, but that they had observed the tracks of a large body of cavalry which appeared to be retreating. In this way was Crassus induced to quit the Euphrates, and to march through the desert towards the town of Carrhæ. Having garrisoned this inconsiderable place, he proceeded still in an easterly direction; till, at length, he arrived in the heart of a country, covered with barren sand, and without the slightest appearance of trees, herbage, or water. At this stage of their progress, when the Romans were already much discouraged and fatigued, a few horsemen, belonging to the advanced guard, fell back upon the main body in the greatest alarm; conveying the unwelcome intelligence that their party had been suddenly surrounded by numerous bodies of cavalry, and almost entirely cut in pieces, and, moreover, that the enemy were hastening to the attack, and must soon be in sight.*

We are informed by Plutarch, who, in his life of Crassus, copies very closely both Appian and Dion Cassius, that, before the Romans had left Syria in the spring, a deputation from the Parthian monarch appeared in their camp to remonstrate with their Consul on the injustice and impolicy of his invasion. To the proposals made by this barbarian embassy, Crassus replied, that "he would give them his answer at Seleucia." Upon which Vasiges, the oldest of the envoys, laughed and said, "Here," shewing him the palm of his hand, "hair will grow before thou shalt see Seleucia."†

Despair of the Roman army.

This threat or prediction was not forgotten when the Romans found themselves in the midst of a pathless desert, exhausted by the heat of the sun as well as by the burning sand, parched with thirst, ignorant of the dangers which they knew were thickening around them, and without confidence in their leader, who, it was now obvious, had listened to the voice of a traitor. Besides, their apprehensions were not a little excited by the report of those who had seen the Parthian horsemen, and who described them as a people whom it was impossible to escape when they pursued, or to overtake when they fled. They have, said these eyewitnesses, a new and strange sort of arrows, which are swifter than lightning, and strike their mark before you can see that they are discharged. The offensive arms of their cavalry pierce through every thing, and their defensive arms are so well tempered, that no weapon can penetrate them. They fight equally well when they retreat and when they advance, and are not less formidable when they turn their backs than when they face their antagonists. It is victory to them if a counterfeited flight throws their pursuers into disorder; and they never cease to inflict the most painful and deadly wounds but when they are entirely out of sight.

Parthia. From U. C. 509. — B. C. 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

When it was no longer doubtful that the enemy was approaching, and that the Roman Consul had been deceived by the false Arabian, a deep dismay took possession of the troops, and Crassus was the most terrified of all. In his confusion, he had scarcely understanding enough left to draw up his army in battle array. At first, in conformity with the opinion of his Quæstor Cassius, he extended the front of his infantry so as to occupy a wide space of ground, in order to prevent their being surrounded; whilst, for the same purpose, he distributed the cavalry in the wings. But changing his mind immediately after, he drew up his troops in a close square, which faced every way, and had on each side twelve cohorts in front. To support the foot, and to give them at once boldness and security in making their charges, he placed by each a troop of horse; and in this way the whole army bore a greater resemblance to the compact order and phalanx of the Macedonians than to the usual legionary tactics of the Roman army. One of the wings was given to Cassius, the other to young Crassus, and the General himself took the command of the centre.*

Roman order of battle.

In this order they marched forward till they came to a small stream called Bulissus, the sight of which gave great pleasure to the soldiers, as well on account of their heat and thirst, as of the fatigue of marching through a sandy desert. Most of the officers were of opinion that they ought to pass the night there, and, after having procured the best possible intelligence as to the number and position of the enemy, to advance against them at break of day. But Crassus, yielding to the impetuosity of his son, and to the eagerness of the cavalry, who demanded to be led out to meet the Parthians, would not consent to halt; giving orders to those who required refreshment to take it as they stood in their ranks. Before the soldiers had finished their hasty meal, he set them once more in motion, and advanced, not in the regular and firm pace to which the legions were accustomed, but rapidly and unsteadily until they came within sight of the enemy. The troops of Surena appeared neither so numerous nor so formidable as was expected; for that commander had concealed his main body behind his advanced guard, instructing

Stratagem of the Parthians.

* Dion Cassius, lib. x. Appian, *ut supra*. Plutarch, *in Vitâ Crassi*.

† Orosius, Florus, Dion, and Plutarch.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xl. Appian, *de Bello Parthico*.

his men, at the same time, to prevent the glittering of their armour, by covering it with a piece of cloth or skin; by which means, their weapons as well as persons were hid from the eyes of the Romans.*

This stratagem produced the effect which was contemplated: for the Parthians no sooner received a signal from their commander, than starting up, as it were out of the earth, they advanced against the Romans with hideous shouts and the noise of barbarous instruments; and immediately throwing off the covering of their arms, they appeared in shining cuirasses and helmets of polished steel, so that, in the eyes of their intimidated foe, they looked, says Plutarch, like battalions of fire. The miserable tactics of Crassus seconded this device of Surena. The compacted mass of the Romans presented to the Parthian archers an object on which they could not fail to accomplish the most mortal execution: whilst the weapons opposed to them were, in this situation, of no avail; the shield itself afforded no protection from the arrows that showered from every quarter and in every direction. They stood, however, in their place with some degree of courage, in the hope that the quivers of the Parthians would soon be exhausted, and that the enemy would then be obliged either to engage with them in close conflict, or to have recourse to a speedy flight. But they found themselves deceived in this expectation, upon observing that the enemy had in their rear a herd of camels loaded with arrows, whence the first ranks, as soon as they had emptied their quivers, were supplied afresh, and immediately returned to the work of death.†

Crassus, seeing no end to this frightful attack, sent directions to his son to charge the Parthian horsemen, and prevent them, if possible, from surrounding the legions under his immediate command. The young man made haste to obey this order; and taking thirteen hundred horse, including a thousand mounted Gauls whom he had received from Cæsar, five hundred bowmen, and eight cohorts of infantry, he instantly faced about in order to come to the charge. The Parthians, according to custom, turned their backs and fled: upon which the son of the Consul encouraged his men to pursue; and, setting the example, pressed with horse and foot upon the heels of the enemy. But they had not advanced far till they found that they were once more the victims of barbarian cunning. The pretended fugitives, having drawn their pursuers to a sufficient distance from the main body, wheeled about under cover of the cloud of dust which they had raised on the plain, and renewed the attack with increased numbers and redoubled fury. The Romans suffered dreadfully from the storm of arrows with which they were assailed; many dying in the most frightful tortures, and most of those who survived being quite unfit for action. Thus, when young Crassus directed them to renew the attack, they shewed him their hands nailed to their shields, and their feet pierced through and fastened to the ground; so that, observes the historian, they could neither fight nor fly.

The gallant Roman was, however, determined to dislodge the heavy horse of the Parthians; and, for this purpose, advanced at the head of his intrepid Gauls, and began again the unequal conflict. His troops, indeed, fought with incredible spirit and perseverance; for, finding that their short javelins made little impression on men covered with steel cuirasses, they rushed forward, laid hold of the pikes of the barbarians, and, closing with them, pulled them off their horses and dashed them to the ground; where they lay totally unfit either for exertion or defence, owing to the load of armour with which their persons were weighed down. The brave Gauls even dismounted from their horses, and getting under those of the Parthians, wounded them with their swords, and in this way made them throw their riders, who could never again recover their seats, or use their weapons. But all their efforts to repel this formidable enemy were at length found unavailing; and, accordingly, upon discovering that their gallant leader was severely wounded, and the greater part of their horses destroyed, they deemed it expedient to fall back upon the infantry, and to rejoin, if possible, the main body of the legions.

Being hard pressed by the Parthian light troops, young Crassus was glad to conduct the remains of his detachment to a rising ground which he perceived at some distance; hoping that he would be able to defend himself in that position until a reinforcement should be sent from his father. But in this expectation he was completely deceived. The Parthians continued the pursuit; and surrounding the little eminence, on which the Romans were only so much the more exposed to the destructive effect of their missiles, they poured upon them such a cloud of pikes and arrows that there was hardly any possibility of escape. In this miserable predicament, the son of the Consul was addressed by two Greeks, who happened to be with him, and who, having settled in the town of Carrhæ, were well acquainted with the neighbouring country. They urged him to retire with them to the city of Ischnæ, which, they assured him, was at no great distance, and which, moreover, had declared for the Romans. But the young warrior rejected the proposal with warmth; telling them, that there was no death, however dreadful, the fear of which should ever make him abandon so many brave men who were content to die for his sake. Having returned this answer, he entreated them to save their own lives by an immediate departure; whilst, as to himself, having no longer any hope of receiving succour, and seeing his friends and soldiers falling thick around him, he formed the resolution of protecting his feelings from barbarian insult, by dying the death of a Roman. But his right arm being disabled by a severe wound, he was obliged to demand the assistance of an attendant, whom he ordered to strike the last blow; and in this act of questionable heroism, his example was followed by Censorinus a Senator, by Megabacchus an old and valued commander, and by most of the principal officers who served under him.*

Suicide of the younger Crassus and his officers.

The detachment which had gone forth under the younger Crassus being thus entirely destroyed, the Parthians made preparations for renewing their attack on the army at large. The Consul having enjoyed a short respite owing to the engagement with his son, had, in the mean while, withdrawn his troops to a position somewhat more advantageous than that in which he was first assailed by the enemy; and was now waiting with anxiety the result of the second conflict. The young Crassus had sent several messengers to inform

The attack renewed on the side of Crassus.

* Plutarch, *in Vitâ Crassi.*
† Dion, Appian, and Plutarch, *ut supra.*

* Appian, *de Bello Parthico.* Plutarch, *in Vitâ Crassi.*

History. From U. C. 509. — B. C 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

his father of the danger into which he had fallen: but these were all taken by the Parthians and put to death; and it was only the last, who had escaped with difficulty, who arrived with the intelligence that his son would be irrecoverably lost if he did not send an immediate and powerful reinforcement. Crassus was thrown into the greatest consternation and perplexity. Anxious to save the youth, he resolved to advance to his assistance; but unwilling to sacrifice the whole army, he delayed to give some necessary orders. In the mean time, the enemy approached with loud shouts and songs of victory; affording a painful confirmation of the worst fears which had seized the breasts of the Romans, and striking a deeper dread into the heart of the Consul. At length the head of his son, which the barbarians carried on a spear, revealed to him the full amount of his misfortune; and the acuteness of his sufferings was not a little increased by the taunting language in which the enemy thought proper to address his desponding ranks. They asked for information regarding the family and parents of the young man whom they had slain; for it is not possible, said they, that so brave and gallant a youth can be the son of Crassus, the greatest dastard and the meanest wretch in the world.*

But the Roman commander sank not under this complicated distress. On the contrary, perceiving the effect which the dismal sight had produced on the people around him, he revived for a moment the natural strength of his character; and, marching from rank to rank, endeavoured by his looks and eloquence to inspire in them a degree of confidence which he himself did not feel. "Romans," said he, "this loss is entirely mine. In you, the fortunes and glory of Rome stand safe and undiminished. If you have any compassion for me, bereaved as I have just been of the bravest and best of sons, shew it by your resentment against the enemy, and by the signal revenge which you will inflict on the authors of his death."

This attempt of the Consul to animate his troops was not attended with much success. Their courage was damped, and their confidence in his talents or wisdom was entirely gone. When he ordered them to shout for the battle, they scarcely lifted up their voices; whilst the Parthians, on the other hand, rent the air with clamorous defiance and triumphant exultation. The combat was thus renewed under the most unfavourable impressions on the part of the Romans. The light troops of the enemy immediately repeated their galling attack, pouring in showers of barbed arrows from either flank; whilst the heavy-armed cavalry in front charged with their pikes, compelling the legionaries to close their files, and thereby to become the object of a surer aim to the indefatigable archers, by whom they were nearly surrounded. Many of the Romans, animated by an impulse of despair, rushed upon the spears of the horsemen who approached their column; preferring death inflicted with such a weapon to the lingering pain and hopeless agony which those endured who were wounded with arrows. In this manner the fight was continued during the greater part of the day; and when, at the close of it, the Parthians were about to retire, they exclaimed that they would grant to Crassus one night to lament the loss of his son; but added, that it should be his last, if he did not, in the mean time, adopt better counsels, and consent to surrender himself to Orodes, rather than be carried by force into his presence.

Parthia. From U. C. 509. — B. C. 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

The night which ensued was a dismal one to the Romans. So deeply smitten was every man with the sense of his misery and approaching fate, that the burial of the dead and the care of the wounded were equally neglected. Crassus himself, wrapped up in a military cloak, lay stretched on the ground; a sad example, says his biographer, to ordinary men, of the instability of fortune, and to men of deeper thought, of the miserable effects of rashness and of ill-placed ambition. Octavius, one of his lieutenants, and Cassius, his Quæstor, endeavoured to raise him from the earth; but finding that he had entirely abandoned himself to despair, they summoned, on their own authority, a council of war, in which it was determined that they should instantly commence their retreat, and retire in silence to the town of Carrhæ, which was still occupied by a Roman garrison. Encumbered with the sick and wounded, the march was very slow, insomuch, that Ignatius only, who commanded about three hundred horse, reached the walls of the place about midnight. In this emergency he addressed the sentinels in Latin, desiring them to inform Coponius the governor, that Crassus had fought a great battle with the Parthians; and, without explaining himself farther, or telling them who he was, he instantly proceeded on his way to Zeugma, on the banks of the Euphrates.

The Romans retire by night.

The hint thus given to Coponius was of much advantage to the Romans; for this governor rightly considering that the manner in which the intelligence of a battle had been conveyed to him betokened no good, instantly ordered his men to arms, and proceeded to meet Crassus, who was now approaching the town. The Parthians did not begin the pursuit till the break of day; but, as soon as it was light, they entered the Roman camp, and put all the wounded, amounting to four thousand, to the sword, and forthwith despatched their cavalry in search of fugitives. One of the Roman officers named Varguntеius, who had strayed in the night from the main body with four cohorts, was, in the morning, found by the enemy posted on a hill: upon which the little corps, availing themselves of the ground, maintained their defence till all were killed except twenty, who afterwards cut their way sword in hand through the ranks of the enemy, and arrived safe at Carrhæ.*

The Parthian General, having received information that it was only a small part of the Roman force which had shut themselves up in that town, and that the main body, with Crassus at their head, had retreated by a different route, resolved, before he proceeded farther in pursuit, to ascertain the truth of this rumour. For this purpose he sent a messenger to Carrhæ, who was instructed to give notice either to Crassus or Cassius, that Surena was desirous to enter into a treaty with them, and to demand a conference. But the Parthian had gained his whole object upon finding that the Romans were still within his grasp, and immediately ordered up his army to begin the siege; rejecting, with disdain, every proposal on the part of the vanquished, which did not imply the preliminary condition of surrendering both Cassius and the Consul himself in chains.

Finding themselves duped again by the wily bar-

* Plutarch, *in Vitâ Crassi*. Appian, *de Bello Parthico*.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xl. Plutarch.

From U. C. 509. — B. C. 245. to U. C. 701. — B. C. 53.

barians, the Romans came to the resolution of immediately resuming their retreat with the utmost secrecy. But Crassus, who throughout the whole campaign had allowed himself to be deceived by traitors, made known this resolution to Andromachus, a citizen of Carrhæ, whom he also chose for his guide. This unfortunate measure completed the destruction of his army: for Andromachus, who was in correspondence with the enemy, not only informed them of the intended retreat, but likewise undertook to detain the Romans in the neighbourhood of the town till Surena could bring up his troops to attack them. With this view he led them through the most intricate paths, till at length he brought them into deep marshy grounds, where the infantry could hardly stand; a circumstance which so strongly excited the suspicions of Cassius, that he refused to follow him any longer; and, returning back to Carrhæ, he chose a different route for Syria, which he ultimately reached with five hundred horse. The lieutenant Octavius, too, with five thousand men under his command, followed the direction of a more faithful guide than Andromachus, and was, accordingly, fortunate enough to find himself, at break of day, in the vicinity of a range of mountains, where he was perfectly secure from the arrows of the nimble Parthians.

Meantime, day dawned upon Crassus, who, with only four cohorts of infantry and a small number of horse, was still struggling with the difficulties of the ground into which he had been seduced. Having at length regained the road, he proceeded towards the mountains where Octavius had intrenched himself; but, as the enemy were already urging their pursuit and pressing on his rear, he found it necessary to post his troops on a hill, at the distance of about twelve furlongs from his lieutenant, and to act on the defensive. The soldiers under Octavius, perceiving the hazard to which their General was exposed, hastened from their position to afford him succour; and driving the Parthians from the heights which they had begun to ascend, they threw themselves around the person of Crassus, boldly declaring that no arrow should touch him so long as one of them was left alive.*

Treachery of Surena.

Surena now perceiving that his light troops had lost the advantages which they derived from the flat surface of the sandy plain, and afraid that the Romans, by retreating through the mountains, would, in the course of another night, be entirely out of his reach, thought it necessary to recur once more to the pretence of a treaty. He took care to pave his way for this treacherous manœuvre, by dismissing a few prisoners, in whose hearing he had repeatedly declared that the object of his sovereign was to cultivate peace with the Romans, and that he was desirous to engage the friendship of that people by his generous treatment of Crassus. Taking with him a few of his principal officers, he advanced gently to the hill on which the Roman General stood; where, unstringing his bow, he courteously presented his hand to him, and invited him to a conference. The troops witnessed this conduct with delight, and urged their General to listen to the proposal of Surena; but Crassus, whose misfortunes had, at length, taught him caution, and who had no longer any confidence in Parthian faith, shewed some reluctance to accept the invitation. He represented to his men that if they would but hold out for the remainder of the day, they might, in the course of the ensuing night, gain the strongest part of the mountain range, and set all the archers and horsemen of Parthia at defiance. But long suffering had rendered them impatient; they would not listen to the reasonable considerations which he suggested in support of his views; they insisted that he should receive the proposals of Surena, and put an end to the dreadful privations and the painful uncertainty which they had so long endured.*

It was in vain to oppose the united wish of a whole army. Crassus, with fearful anticipation, began to descend; remarking, as he passed, to Octavius and Petronius, that they were witnesses of the violence by which he was constrained to adopt so questionable a step. These officers, however, insisted upon attending him at the conference: and when they met the Parthian Chiefs, Surena exclaimed, "From this moment there shall be peace and an alliance between Orodes and the Romans. But the treaty," he added, "must be signed on the banks of the Euphrates, for you Romans remember your agreements very ill." This arrangement appears to have been acceded to by Crassus; but when he proposed to send for a horse to use on the march, the Parthian prevented him, and immediately ordered one to be brought. When the animal appeared, richly caparisoned and decked with gold, the equerries assisted the Roman General to mount; upon which they began to employ the most indecorous violence, as if they had wished to remove Crassus out of the reach of his friends, or even to displace him from his seat, and thereby expose him to the ridicule of the barbarian commanders. Octavius laid hold of the bridle; in which step he was instantly followed by Petronius, one of the legionary Tribunes. A scuffle immediately ensued, and recourse was had to weapons on both sides. Octavius drew his sword and killed one of the Parthian grooms; but was himself instantly slain by another who attacked him from behind. Petronius appears to have escaped, but Crassus fell by a blow from a Parthian named Axæthres, who forthwith proceeded to cut off his head and his right hand, which were afterwards sent to Orodes.†

Assassination of Crassus.

This miserable tragedy being completed, the Parthians addressed the Roman troops, who continued to retain their station on the hill; telling them that Crassus had indeed met with the recompense which his unjust invasion of the Parthian territory deserved; but that, in regard to themselves, the mere instruments of his ambition, they had nothing to fear. They were, accordingly, invited by Surena to descend boldly and place themselves under his protection. Upon this invitation some went and surrendered themselves; others attempted to escape in the night, most of whom were overtaken and put to death by the cavalry; and, on the whole, it is said that twenty thousand Romans were killed in this campaign, and ten thousand made prisoners.

In this unfortunate manner, and with effects so disastrous to the arms of Rome, terminated the expedition of Crassus; and at this epoch we conclude the History of Parthia for the present; reserving an account of the subsequent fortunes of that country for a separate article in a future part of our work.

* Dion. lib. xl.

* Appian, *de Bello Parthico.*

† Plutarch, *in Vitâ Crassi.* Dion Cassius and Appian, *ut supra.*

CAIUS JULIUS CÆSAR.

PART II.

CONTAINING A SKETCH OF THE ROMAN HISTORY FROM THE APPOINTMENT OF CÆSAR TO THE COMMAND IN GAUL TO HIS DEATH.

FROM U. C. 695. TO 710. A. C. 59. TO 44.

Coalition between the Triumvirate and the popular party.

THE proceedings of the Triumvirate, and the supreme influence which its members had exercised during the Consulship of Cæsar, were a sufficient proof that the effects of Sylla's victory were already lost, and that the Aristocracy was unable to resist the enemies by whom it was again assailed. That coalition between the popular party and individuals of great personal distinction, which had before taken place when Marius united himself with Sulpicius, had now been repeated; and as there was now no Sylla to assert by arms the authority of the Senate, it had been repeated with more entire success. The part of Sulpicius had been hitherto performed by Vatinius; it was now to devolve on P. Clodius; who, having entered on his Tribuneship in the month of December 694, and being supported not only by the influence of the Triumvirs, but by the Consuls elect, Piso and Gabinius, who would use all the authority of their office in his favour, and by the terror of Cæsar's military force, was likely to pursue his career with little impediment.* His chief object was to effect the ruin of Cicero; as by so doing he would at once gratify a personal enmity of his own, and would deprive the Senate of the most eloquent and, with all his faults, the most popular, and one of the most upright of their defenders.

Tribuneship of P. Clodius, and his designs against Cicero.

During the earlier months of Cæsar's Consulship, Cicero had absented himself from Rome;† but he had returned thither in June, soon after the passing of the law of Vatinius, which conferred on Cæsar the command in Gaul, and the unusual power of nominating his own lieutenants. He already apprehended the effects of the enmity of Clodius, and was at first inclined to accept the offer made him by Cæsar, that he would accompany him, as his lieutenant, into Gaul.‡ But encouraged by the apparent popularity which he enjoyed, and receiving from Pompey the strongest assurances that Clodius would not think of attacking him, and that if he should do so, he would sacrifice his own life rather than that Cicero should be injured, he was persuaded to remain in Rome and abide the issue.§ Accordingly Clodius, as we have already mentioned, entered on his Tribuneship in December, and immediately professed his intention of visiting upon Cicero's head the execution of Lentulus, Cethegus, and the other accomplices of Catiline. He was sure of the support of the Consuls Piso and Gabinius; and he boasted also, that he was acting with the entire concurrence of the Triumvirate. Mobs, consisting of slaves and the lowest of the people,* were openly armed and organized to overawe every attempt of Cicero's friends to defend him by legal means; and when the Senate and the Equestrian order, and, as Cicero asserts,† the great majority of respectable citizens, put on mourning, and assumed the dress of suppliants, to testify their grief and the deep interest which they felt in his cause, the Consuls ordered the Senate to resume their usual habit; and Gabinius in particular, in a speech addressed to the multitude, told them that the Senate was nothing in the Commonwealth, and that the Equestrian order should soon be made to suffer for the part they had taken in abetting Cicero's proceedings during the late conspiracy. It is added that, by his own sole authority, Gabinius commanded L. Lamia, a citizen who had been zealous in Cicero's defence, to leave Rome, and not to come within two hundred Roman miles of the city;‡ an exercise of power which is mentioned, indeed, as illegal and tyrannical, but which still shews to what an extent the Consuls could carry their orders, and enforce obedience.

The professed measure on the part of Clodius, which filled Cicero with such lively alarm, was a law proposed by him for the punishment of all persons guilty of putting a Roman citizen to death without trial.§ It is said that when this law was brought before the assembly of the people, (who were summoned by Clodius to meet without the city, because Cæsar could not otherwise, as commander of an army, be present at the discussion,) Cæsar spoke in favour of its principle, but wished that it should not affect any past transactions. This exception, however, would have so defeated Clodius's main object, that it was not admitted, and the law passed in its original form; which denounced punishment against any past, as well as against any future violation of its provisions. But still although Cicero might have been brought to trial under this act, yet the natural prejudice against *ex post facto* laws, together with the strong considerations that might have been urged in his defence, and the popularity and interest which he possessed, might have rendered his condemnation a matter of great uncertainty. His own conduct, therefore, as he himself afterwards confessed, was the main occasion of his ruin;‖ for, by soliciting protection, by assuming the dress of a suppliant and appealing to the compassion of the people, he, in a manner, anticipated his own

* Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 17.
† *Epist. ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. iv.—xvii.
‡ Ibid. lib. ii. epist. xviii. § Ibid. epist. xx.

* Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 15. *in Pisonem*, c. 5.
† *Pro Sextio*, c. 12.
‡ Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 12, 13.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxviii. p. 67. edit. Leunclav.
‖ *Epist. ad Atticum*, lib. iii. epist. xv.

accusation, and rendered the motion of bringing him to trial for the measures adopted in his Consulship, less startling and extravagant to others, by seeming himself fully to expect it. While he was going round the city with his friends, all wearing the same air of dejection and entreaty, he was frequently met and insulted by parties of the armed rabble which acted under Clodius's orders;* and he thus compromised his own dignity without any advantage to his interests. He particularly laboured to obtain the support of Pompey; from whom indeed, both on public and private grounds, he had a right to look for it. But Pompey had entangled himself so deeply in the plans of the enemies of the Aristocracy, that he could not act freely on either side. With the usual fate of those men whose principles are not firm enough to keep them steadily in the path of duty, but are yet sufficiently powerful to check them in their deviations from it, and to hinder them from ever attaining the rewards of wickedness, Pompey already, it is probable, repented of his share in the proceedings of the Triumvirate, and found that the confirmation of his acts in Asia had been too dearly purchased by the loss of the good opinion of the better part of his countrymen, and the degradation to which he was reduced of being a tame spectator of the ruin of his friend, and of the outrages of a man like Clodius. Thus beset with shame and difficulties, he avoided a personal interview with Cicero, who came himself to his Alban villa to solicit his assistance; and when L. Lentulus, L. Torquatus, M. Lucullus, Q. Fabius Sanga,† and many other persons, applied to him to the same effect, he referred them to the Consuls, saying, that he, as a private individual, did not like to enter into a contest with a Tribune who had an armed force at his disposal; but if the Consuls should act in defence of the Commonwealth, with the authority of the Senate, he would take up arms to join them. We have seen Marius, in his sixth Consulship, obliged by the Senate to act against his own associate Saturninus; and Pompey, it is probable, would gladly have obeyed a similar call to return to his own natural situation as defender of the Commonwealth. But the call was not given; the Consuls, it is said, had bound themselves, for their own private interests, to abet all the proceedings of Clodius;‡ and thus Pompey remained inactive in his villa, and Cicero, despairing of any effectual support, and unwilling, as he tells us,§ to be the occasion of bloodshed, withdrew by night from Rome, and went into voluntary exile. His departure relieved his enemies from every difficulty; and the punishment, which a judicial sentence would hardly have pronounced, was easily inflicted by a legislative attainder. Clodius proposed a law forbidding him, in the usual language, the use of fire and water within four hundred miles of Italy;|| denouncing penalties against any person who should harbour him within those limits; and forbidding any one to move for his recall, either in the Senate or before the people. This was carried immediately, and not, if we may believe Cicero,¶ by the votes of the Roman people, but in an almost empty Forum, by the voices of that rabble which was the mere instrument of Clodius's violence. In addition to this, the property of Cicero was ordered to be confiscated; his house on the Palatine hill was burnt to the ground, its site was consecrated to religious purposes, and a statue of Liberty was erected on the place whereon it had stood.*

Behaviour of Pompey towards Cicero.

Cicero withdraws from Rome, and a decree of banishment passes against him.

It has been often remarked, that it is the natural tendency of violent measures to produce a reaction; and this effect seems to have followed from the banishment of Cicero. Scarcely had he left Italy, before the Senate began to exert itself to procure his recall. Pompey also was at last roused by an affront offered to him by Clodius, of a nature peculiarly irritating. Tigranes, the son of the King of Armenia, was amongst the prisoners brought to Rome by Pompey on his return from Asia, and, having remained ever since in captivity, was at this time under the custody of L. Flavius, one of Pompey's old adherents, and now one of the Prætors. Clodius was bribed, as it is said, to take Tigranes out of the hands of Flavius, and to cause him to be set at liberty.† This happened in May, little more than a month after Cicero's retreat from Rome; and Pompey from this time began to appear in the Senate, and to complain of the late proceedings of Clodius. On the first of June the Senate passed a resolution in favour of Cicero's recall, without a single dissentient voice;‡ but Sextus Ælius, one of the Tribunes, interposed his negative, and, for the present, prevented it from being attended with any effect. Clodius, meanwhile, was not wanting, either in art or audacity, in his endeavours to rid himself of those persons whose opposition he most dreaded. About the beginning of August, one of his slaves dropt a dagger near the Senate-house;§ and on being seized, and examined before the Consul Gabinius, it was said that he had received orders from his master to assassinate Pompey, who was at that time in the Senate. Whether this plot was real or fictitious, Pompey took alarm at it, and during the remainder of Clodius's Tribuneship, he confined himself to his house,|| the armed rabble which acted under Clodius rendering it unsafe for him, it is said, to appear in public. The other individual, whom Clodius most feared, was M. Cato; and him he contrived to remove from Rome, by forcing him to accept a public commission which would employ him abroad for a considerable time.¶ Its nature will deserve our notice, as exemplifying the wide extent of the evils which the power of Rome at this period enabled a profligate demagogue to inflict.

A change of circumstances begins to take place in his favour,

But is checked for a time by the violence of Clodius.

M. Cato is sent to Cyprus.

The island of Cyprus was early filled with Greek colonies, and was first conquered by Amasis King of Egypt, about five hundred and forty or fifty years before the Christian æra.** When Egypt was overrun by Cambyses, the Cyprians submitted to the Persian dominion; and remained attached to that Empire, although sometimes enjoying a practical independence, till its final overthrow by the arms of Alexander. In the division of his conquests which followed upon his untimely death, Cyprus was

Sketch of the revolutions of that island.

* Plutarch, *in Ciceronc*, c. 30.
† Cicero, *in Pisonem*, c. 31. ‡ Ibid. *pro Sextio*, c. 10.
§ *Pro Sextio*, c. 20, *et seq.*
|| Cicero, *pro Domo*, c. 19. *ad Atticum*, lib. iii. epist. iv. xii. xv.
¶ *Pro Sextio*, c. 24

* Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 24. Dion Cassius, lib. xxxviii. p. 70.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xxxviii. p. 78. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. iii. epist. viii.
‡ Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 31.
§ Asconius, *in Oration. pro Milone.*
|| Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 32. ¶ Ibid. c. 22
** Herodotus, *Euterpe. cap. ultim.*

again united to the new Egyptian monarchy established by Ptolemy the son of Lagus;* and although its possession was often disputed by the Kings of Syria, yet it still continued among the dependencies of the crown of Egypt; and appears to have formed what would in modern language be called an appanage, being bestowed as a separate principality on some member of the royal family. At the time of which we are now speaking, it was ruled in this manner by a brother of the reigning King of Egypt, who himself also bore the name of Ptolemy. It is said that Clodius, when a young man, having fallen into the power of the Cilician Pirates, during the period of their greatness, applied to the King of Cyprus for money to pay his ransom,† and that Ptolemy sent so small a sum, that the Pirates refused to accept it; and afterwards, from what motives we know not, released their prisoner gratuitously. Clodius, it is added, had long resented the behaviour of Ptolemy on this occasion; and now gladly availed himself of his present power to propose a law, declaring the island of Cyprus forfeited to the Roman Republic. The only possible colour for such an act was a pretended will of the late King of Egypt, by which he was said to have assigned his dominions to the Roman people. But the reality of this instrument was so questionable, that the Senate had never chosen to act upon it; and the present King of Egypt had lately been acknowledged as a lawful Sovereign; so that his brother, the ruler of Cyprus, holding his crown by the same title, was, in equity, equally included in this acknowledgment. It was sufficient, however, that the island was a tempting prize, and that the power of the Romans enabled them to seize it with impunity. Its fertility, indeed, and abundant resources of every kind, were highly celebrated; and it was the boast of the inhabitants that they could build and send to sea a ship of the largest size, without applying to foreign countries for the supply of a single article required in her construction and equipment.‡ The law for the forfeiture being passed, Clodius proposed, by a separate law, to intrust M. Cato with the execution of it; and he was accordingly despatched with Prætorian authority to carry into effect a measure which he is said to have abhorred for its injustice. He was, besides, ordered to procure the restoration of certain individuals who had been exiled by the Government of Byzantium;§ and these two employments were expected to detain him for a considerable time at a distance from Rome.

Proceedings and behaviour of Cato in Cyprus.

They were however both executed without any difficulty. Ptolemy, hearing of the sentence of deposition issued against him, swallowed poison in despair;‖ and Cato, being informed of his death, sent the famous M. Brutus, his nephew, immediately to Cyprus, to secure the King's property, while he himself first went to Byzantium, to discharge his commission there. As soon as this was effected, he rejoined his nephew in Cyprus, and superintended the sale of the confiscated treasures with an excessive and almost ridiculous minuteness;* allowing nothing to be sold except in his own presence, and doing his utmost to procure a good price for every article. Whilst he was thus engaged, Munatius Plancus, one of his most devoted friends, arrived in Cyprus to join him; but happening to call on Cato when he was transacting business with his principal officer, he was refused admittance. He complained of this afterwards to Cato, and received from him a very rough answer, being told that Canidius, the officer with whom Cato had been engaged, was the person most deserving of confidence from his experience and integrity, and that Cato therefore preferred his company. Not content with having said this to Munatius himself, Cato, with characteristic indelicacy, repeated it afterwards to Canidius; and Munatius then, feeling himself offended, absented himself from Cato's table, and did not go to him when sent for to assist him in the despatch of business. This behaviour shocked Cato's notions of discipline, and he threatened to fine him for his disobedience; but Munatius immediately quitted the island, and remained for some time in a state of alienation from his former friend. Afterwards, however, they both were invited to an entertainment at the same house, and Cato arriving after the guests had taken their places at the table, asked his host to which couch he ought to go; when, being told to choose any place that he liked, he said that he would then fix himself near Munatius; and, accordingly, he lay on the sofa next to him for the whole evening, but made no further advances towards a reconciliation. But, at the request of his wife Marcia, he afterwards wrote to Munatius, requesting him to call at his house as on business; and Munatius coming, and being detained by Marcia till all other visitors were gone, Cato then went in to him, threw his arms around him, and embraced him with great cordiality. This story exhibits very fairly Cato's characteristic good and bad qualities;† and as Plutarch professes to copy it from the account of Munatius himself, it rests on sufficient authority to deserve our belief, and may therefore be readily admitted; for the well attested personal anecdotes of eminent individuals are so rare in Roman History, that we may well be pardoned for noticing those which do present themselves to our curiosity.

Meanwhile the Consular elections at Rome came on, and P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, and Q. Cæcilius Metellus Nepos, were elected to succeed Piso and Gabinius. Lentulus had been Ædile during Cicero's Consulship, and his dispositions were known to be such, that Cicero conceived his appointment to be a favourable omen for himself. Metellus, during his Tribuneship, had affronted Cicero personally, and had acted uniformly against the Aristocracy; but he was so much under the influence of Pompey, that

* Strabo, lib. xiv. p. 782. edit. Xyland.
† Ibid. *ubi supra.*
‡ Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xiv. p 21. edit. Vales.
§ Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 26. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 34.
‖ Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 36. Ammianus Marcellinus, *ubi supra.*

* Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 37.
† Some points in this story must remind the reader of Dr. Johnson, who is said by Boswell to have often made indirect advances towards a reconciliation, when he had offended his friends by some rudeness; expecting that they would accept such tokens of his good-will towards them, in the place of any more open apology. In fact, the natural dispositions of Cato and Johnson appear to have borne a considerable resemblance to one another; and, had Cato been a Christian, the likeness would have been more perfect. His character would have been far better than it was, had he been taught to struggle against his pride and courseness of mind, instead of thinking it to his credit to indulge them.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

nothing was to be feared from him under the present circumstances. Accordingly, on the very day on which the new Consuls came into office, P. Lentulus brought the case of Cicero before the Senate, and found that body almost unanimously disposed in his favour.* It was proposed that a law should be submitted to the people repealing his sentence of banishment; but the assembly held for this purpose was interrupted by the armed partisans of Clodius;† Q. Cicero was assaulted and obliged to fly for his life, the Tribunes friendly to Cicero's cause were driven from the Forum, and great numbers of citizens were murdered in the riot. On a subsequent occasion, P. Sextius, another Tribune, zealously devoted to Cicero, was wounded and left for dead in the temple of Castor;‡ and these atrocious acts were perpetrated without receiving any check from the authority of the Government. But T. Annius Milo, who was also among the Tribunes of this year, and who was of a temper well fitted to render him a proper antagonist to Clodius in such times of disorder, seeing the laws utterly powerless to preserve the peace of the city, resolved to meet the rioters on their own ground; and while on the one hand he threatened Clodius with a legal prosecution for his acts of violence,§ he prepared, in the mean time, to restrain his outrages by force; and, having procured a body of gladiators and armed retainers, he enabled the Aristocratical party to speak and act with more freedom. Then it was that the Senate and people, with wonderful unanimity, passed the law for Cicero's recall; and on the fifth of August he returned once more to Italy,‖ and was received at Brundusium with a kindness which was a foretaste of the universal feeling soon after manifested towards him in every quarter. After a short stay at Brundusium, he set out on his way to the Capital. Deputies from the several towns met him on the road with their congratulations; and when he approached Rome, there was not a single individual of any note, except his avowed enemies, who did not come forth to welcome him. As he entered by the Capene gate, the steps of the temples were thronged with multitudes of the poorest of the people, who expressed their joy by the loudest cheers; and as he passed through the streets to the Capitol, he was every where greeted with the same acclamations, and surrounded by a similar concourse. This was, indeed, a triumphal procession far more honourable than those of victorious Generals; and on this occasion it was proved, that Cicero was not only regarded by a party, but possessed, in an unusual degree, the respect and affection of the people at large. He reaped on this day the just reward of that upright and impartial course which he had pursued since the commencement of his political life; supporting the moderate ascendency of the Aristocratical party, yet not ashamed to advocate the rights and promote the benefit of the lower classes; the queller of a profligate insurrection, but unseduced to abuse his victory, or to gratify a spirit of animosity or ambition by shedding any blood that was not demanded by justice and the safety of the Commonwealth.

New proceedings at Rome in behalf of Cicero. U. C. 601.

He is recalled from exile, and returns in a triumphant manner to Rome.

* Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 34. † Ibid. c. 35.
‡ Ibid. c. 37. § Ibid. c. 40, *et seq.*
‖ Ibid. *Epist. ad Atticum*, lib. iv. epist. i.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

One of the first things which he did after his return, was to propose a law for investing Pompey with another extraordinary commission. There had been for some time a scarcity of corn at Rome,* which, as was natural, disposed the multitude to tumult; and at the time of Cicero's return, a mob assembled round the Senate-house, and calling aloud that Pompey should be intrusted with the control of the markets, they required Cicero by name to propose a vote to that effect. Accordingly the Senate, on his suggestion, resolved that Pompey should be appointed with full powers to manage every thing relating to the supply of the corn markets in every part of the Empire for five years; and a law to the same purpose was submitted to the assembly of the people. C. Messius, however, one of the Tribunes, proposed another law, in which Pompey's authority was extended still more; inasmuch as it conferred on him the control of the entire revenue of the Commonwealth, gave him the command of a fleet and army, and bestowed on him a power in all the Provinces paramount to that of the officers by whom they were immediately governed. It does not appear whether these additions to the original proposition were approved by the people or not; but it seems most probable that they were rejected. Still the power actually committed to Pompey was exceedingly great; and the readiness with which the people conferred such great charges on individual citizens, was a sure symptom of that helplessness in themselves, and that habit of dependence for every thing upon their Government, which shew that a nation is fit only for despotism.

Pompey is appointed Controller of the markets throughout the Empire.

The remainder of the year 696 was marked by nothing that deserves particular notice. The Senate, on the report of the Pontifices,† before whom the question had been previously argued, resolved that the consecration of the site of Cicero's house was not valid; and that the ground should be given back to him, and a sum presented to him out of the treasury to enable him to restore the building. Smaller sums were also voted to him to repair the damage which his country houses had sustained. But the workmen who were employed in rebuilding his house in Rome, were dispersed on the third of November by the armed rabble under the command of Clodius; the house of his brother Quintus was deliberately set on fire by the same assailants; and a few days afterwards a house belonging to Milo was attacked in the same manner. On this last occasion, however, Q. Flaccus sallied out from another of Milo's houses at the head of an armed party, and, attacking Clodius, killed a number of his most notorious followers, and obliged him to save his own life by flight. At the same time, also, Clodius, as we have before mentioned, was threatened with a prosecution by Milo; but, by the assistance of his brother-in-law, Q. Metellus the Consul, and of his brother Appius Claudius, one of the Prætors, he succeeded in postponing his trial till after the Comitia had been held for the election of Ædiles.‡ He was a candidate for that office; calculating that, if he should gain it, he should be able to shelter himself under its protection from the impeachment of his adversaries for another year; and being

Riots in the streets of Rome. T. Milo supports the cause of the Aristocracy

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. iv. epist. i.
† Ibid. lib. iv. epist. ii. and iii.
‡ *Epist. ad Atticum*, lib. iv. epist. iii.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

in fact elected, he immediately commenced in his turn a prosecution against Milo, whom he charged with disturbing the public peace.* P. Sextius, who, when Tribune, had been nearly murdered by the followers of Clodius, was now also himself brought to trial for the same offence; but he was defended by Cicero in one of his most eloquent orations, and was acquitted. The trial of Milo was adjourned from time to time, till it was either abandoned altogether, or may be supposed to have ended in the acquittal of the accused.

U. C. 697.

The Consuls for the year 697 were Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus and L. Marcius Philippus; the former warmly disposed in favour of the Aristocratical party; the latter a respectable and moderate man, who is known as the father-in-law of Augustus Cæsar, having married Atia his mother after the death of her first husband C. Octavius. About this time the partisans of Pompey endeavoured to procure for him another extraordinary command. Ptolemy King of Egypt,† having been expelled from his throne by his subjects, had come to Rome during the preceding year in the hope of recovering his kingdom through the assistance of the Roman Government. It is said that he gained many partisans by bribery; and be this as it may, the Senate passed a vote that he should be restored, and the Consul P. Lentulus Spinther, to whose lot Cilicia had fallen in the distribution of Provinces, was appointed to carry the vote into execution. But in the mean time a deputation of a hundred citizens of Alexandria had been despatched from Egypt to counteract, if possible, the effect of Ptolemy's bribes and intrigues; and the King, imitating the conduct of Jugurtha on a like occasion, had caused the greater part of them to be assassinated, some on their way to Rome, and others in the city itself. Still it appears that the influence which he had gained by his money, or by the hope that his restoration would afford to many an opportunity of obtaining military commands and emoluments, was likely not only to save him from punishment, but even to secure his return to his kingdom; when it began to be whispered that a prophecy had been found in the Sibylline books, warning the Romans "not to restore a King of Egypt to his throne with the aid of numbers, but that in any other way they might effect it." On the first rumour of this injunction of the Sibyl, C. Cato, one of the Tribunes, summoned the keepers of the mystic books before the assembly of the people, and obliged them to repeat the oracle exactly. It may be hoped that he availed himself of this expedient to baffle the intrigues of Ptolemy and his supporters from an honest indignation at their crimes, and that it was taken up by a large party in the Senate with the same feelings. But, however this may be, the subject was debated with considerable warmth.‡ Pompey's friends proposed that he should be commissioned to restore the King; since his name and authority, now that the support of an army was forbidden, were more likely to succeed than those of any other person. Cicero and Hortensius insisted that P. Lentulus should not be deprived of an office which the Senate had already committed to him; but C. Cato finding that Pompey's claims were regarded with peculiar jealousy, and that the appointment would probably remain with Lentulus, brought in a law to take away that officer's command.* In this he does not appear to have succeeded; but his determined opposition, and the mutual jealousies of the partisans of Pompey and Lentulus, disappointed, for the present, the hopes of Ptolemy; who, despairing of his return, retired to Ephesus, and there, to avoid the vengeance to which he might be exposed from the relations of those whom he had murdered, he lived in a sort of sanctuary under the protection of the sacred precincts of the temple of Diana.†

Affair of Ptolemy Auletes King of Egypt.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

While these transactions were occurring, Cæsar, as usual, was passing the winter at Lucca, on the very southern extremity of his Province, and regarding, with no indifferent eye, the state of affairs at Rome. He had just concluded his second campaign, which he had signalized by his famous victory over the Nervii; and for this, together with his other successes, he soon after received from the Senate an unprecedented honour, in the appointment of a solemnity of thanksgiving, which was to continue for fifteen days.‡ But the Aristocratical party, retaining a lively resentment against him for the seditious tenour of his Consulship, and viewing his present extensive military command with a very reasonable jealousy, were resolved to avail themselves of the known sentiments of one of the Consuls, and of the moderation of the other, to commence an attack upon him and his measures. Scarcely had the present Consuls been elected, when P. Rutilius Lupus,§ one of the Tribunes, brought forward in the Senate the question of Cæsar's Agrarian law, by which the lands of Campania were assigned for division among the poorer citizens. This had been always an obnoxious measure to a large portion of the people, as it cut off one of the most valuable sources of the public revenue; for the whole of Campania having been forfeited to the Roman people after the revolt of Capua in the second Punic war, had been since let out to individuals, and the rent arising from these estates afforded a considerable and constant income to the treasury. Thus when P. Rullus, in the Agrarian law which he brought forward during Cicero's Consulship, had proposed to include Campania among the districts that were to be divided, Cicero attacked this as one of the most pernicious parts of the whole scheme. No wonder, therefore, that Cæsar's law was regarded by many as a measure which ought to be rescinded as soon as possible; but as Pompey was not present when P. Lupus first laid the subject before the Senate, it was judged right to postpone the discussion of a question, in which the Triumvirate was so nearly concerned, till he could attend to take a part in it. On the fifth of April,‖ however, after a vote had passed to grant Pompey the sum of forty millions of Roman money, (322,916*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*) for the discharge of his duties as Controller of the markets, the Agrarian

Cæsar at Lucca.

The Aristocratical party threaten to attack the laws passed in his Consulship.

* Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 44. 69.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 97.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. i. epist. i. *et seq.*

* Cicero, *ad Q. Fratrem*, lib. ii. epist. iii.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix p. 99.
‡ Cæsar, *de Bello Gallico*, lib. ii. c. 36. Cicero, *de Provinciis Consularibus*, c. 10, 11.
§ Cicero, *ad Quintum Fratrem*, lib. ii. epist. i.
‖ Ibid. lib. ii. epist. v. *Ad Familiar.* lib. i. epist. ix.

law was again mentioned; the large grant which had just been made out of the treasury, made its poverty more deeply felt, and rendered the recovery of the Campanian rents more desirable; and, accordingly, after a stormy debate, it was voted, on the motion of Cicero, that the question of the lands of Campania should be formally discussed in a full Senate, on the fifteenth of May. But the fifteenth of May arrived, and the lands of Campania were suffered, without dispute, to remain subject to the provisions of Cæsar's law; while, instead of commencing any attack on Cæsar's measures, Cicero about this time delivered a speech in the Senate full of the highest praises on his conduct in Gaul,* and recommending that his Province should still be continued to him, when some members had proposed that a new officer should be sent out to succeed him, according to the usual practice and law of the Commonwealth. It appears that Cicero, ever since his return from exile, had been disgusted with the high Aristocratical party; and finding that they regarded him with jealousy, according to his own account,† he was naturally disposed to seek the friendship, or at least to deprecate the enmity, of their opponents. Accordingly, on the trial of P. Sextius, when he attacked P. Vatinius, one of Cæsar's instruments during his Consulship, with the utmost vehemence, he was careful to speak of Cæsar himself in terms of respect.‡ Still he seemed disposed to adhere to the cause which he had formerly upheld: he openly extolled the conduct of M. Bibulus,§ Cæsar's late colleague; he supported the interests of P. Lentulus in opposition to the friends of Pompey, in the question of the King of Egypt's restoration; and above all, his motion on the fifth of April seemed to be the pledge of his determined enmity to the party of the Triumvirate. It was received as such by the high Aristocratical party, who displayed an evident joy at the prospect of an irreconcilable quarrel between him, and Pompey, and Cæsar. Cicero took alarm at this, and having probably received some personal grounds of offence from the Aristocratical leaders, he despatched, within five days,‖ a small work of his own composition to Cæsar, couched in language designedly complimentary, on purpose, as he himself confesses, to bind him to his reconciliation with Cæsar, and to cut off the possibility of his reuniting himself with the Aristocracy. Still his conduct in the Senate, on the fifth of April, had so offended and alarmed Pompey, that leaving Rome immediately, as if to superintend the business of his office as Controller of the markets, he paid a visit to Cæsar at Lucca,¶ and there consulted with him upon the steps to be taken with regard to Cicero's opposition to their measures. From Lucca Pompey crossed over to Sardinia, and had an interview with Q. Cicero, who held a public situation in that island.** He dwelt much on the services which he had rendered to Marcus Cicero, and reminded Quintus that he had answered to him for his brother's attachment to the interests of the Triumvirate, when soliciting their concurrence in his proposed recall from banishment. Quintus, it is probable, lost no time in reporting this conversation to his brother; and it seems to have produced on him the desired effect; for he dropped, as we have seen, the prosecution of the Campanian question, and, during the greater part of the remainder of the year, he absented himself from political business altogether.

Cicero is persuaded to desert the Aristocratical party.

It was in the early part of this year that M. Cato returned to Rome from Cyprus, bringing with him a considerable treasure which had belonged to the late sovereign of the island. As his vessel advanced up the Tiber,* the Senate, headed by the two Consuls, and followed by an immense crowd of private citizens, came out of the city, and descended along the banks of the river to welcome him; but he proceeded without noticing this compliment, till he reached the spot where the treasure was to be landed. Still further to testify their regard for him, the Senate proposed to confer on him the office of Prætor for the following year;† by voting that he should be appointed Prætor at the next Comitia, "*extra ordinem*," that is, by virtue of the Senate's resolution, independently of the votes of the Centuries. But Cato disapproving of such an unusual measure, and conscious also that, if it were contested by the popular party, it would greatly prejudice his prospects of success when he became a candidate in the ordinary manner, declined the compliment thus offered him. It is said also, that he complained of the conduct of Cicero‡ in wishing to declare the Tribuneship of Clodius illegal, and all the acts passed in it to be consequently invalid, and that he openly espoused the cause of Clodius on this question. In doing this, he was defending, in fact, the validity of his own proceedings in Cyprus; which, as his commission was bestowed on him by a law of Clodius, would themselves have lost their authority, if that commission were not legally conferred. But the Aristocratical party in general were disposed to coalesce with Clodius at the present moment, because he was now at enmity with Pompey; and this was one of the reasons which alienated Cicero from them, and inclined him, as we have seen, to relinquish his opposition to the Triumvirate.

Return of M. Cato to Rome.

L. Domitius Ænobarbus, by birth and by preference alike attached to the Aristocracy, was preparing to offer himself as a candidate for the Consulship, with the avowed intention of procuring the recall of Cæsar from his Province.§ It was not to be doubted that he would receive the zealous support of the Senate; and if the Comitia were held by the present Consul Marcellinus, his election was most likely to follow. To prevent it, Pompey and Crassus resolved to come forward themselves as his opponents; and that the Comitia might not be held by an unfriendly person, C. Cato,‖ one of the Tribunes, was prevailed on to stop the elections by his negative, till the year expired and the present Consuls went out of office. Whether he had been gained over by Pompey since his opposition to the restoration of King Ptolemy, or

Pompey and Crassus candidates for the Consulship.

* *De Provinciis Consularibus.*
† *Ad Familiares*, lib. i. epist. ix. *Ad Atticum*, lib. iv. epist. v.
‡ Cicero, *in Vatinium*, c. 6, 7.
§ *Ad Familiares*, lib. i. epist. ix.
‖ *Ad Atticum*, lib. iv. epist. v.
¶ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. i. epist. ix.
** He was one of Pompey's lieutenants, in the service of superintending the markets throughout the Empire. Cicero, *pro Scauro. Fragm. Orat. ab Angelo Maio editarum.*

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 71. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 39.
† Valerius Maximus, lib. iv. c. 1.
‡ Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 40. Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 100. edit. Leunclav.
§ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 24.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 103. Cicero, *ad Q. Fratrem*, lib. ii. epist. vi.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

whether he only served the Triumvirate from his aversion to the Aristocratical party, we cannot clearly decide; but it seems that, in forbidding the Comitia, he professed only to retaliate upon the Consul Marcellinus, who, by appointing frequent holydays, had obstructed the assembling of the people on public business, and had deprived him of all opportunities of carrying some laws, of which he was the proposer. After all, the Consular elections were disgraced by scenes of open violence: Domitius,* who persisted in trying the event, was prevented by force from reaching the Forum; M. Cato, who attended him with his usual courage, was wounded, and one of his servants killed; and in this manner Pompey and Crassus obtained their second Consulship, fifteen years after they had been for the first time elected together to the same office.

They procure their success by violence.

U. C. 698.

But although Domitius was thus excluded from the Consulship, M. Cato still hoped that he should himself obtain a place among the Prætors, even though he had declined the irregular interference of the Senate in his behalf. His character was so respected, that, if no unfair arts were practised by his opponents, he was likely to be successful; but the elections were deferred, it appears, till the month of May;† and then the Consuls rejected a proposal made by some of the Senators, that sixty days should elapse between the nomination of the Prætors and their entering upon their office, in order to allow time for inquiry into any corrupt practices to which they might have been indebted for their success. Bribery, indeed, is said to have been used most unscrupulously by the Triumvirate;‡ yet still, on the day of the Comitia, Cato obtained the votes of the first tribe; a circumstance which so alarmed his opponents, that Pompey himself came forward and declared that he had heard thunder; thus procuring the adjournment of the assembly, at the expense, it is said, of an open falsehood. In the interval thus gained, the party of the Consuls renewed their efforts to procure votes, and, when the election again came on, Cato was rejected. The other elections were equally unfavourable to the Aristocracy; and only two of their partisans, C. Ateius Capito, and P. Aquillius Gallus,§ could find a place on the list of Tribunes.

M. Cato sues for the Prætorship and is rejected.

The Trebonian law.

The most memorable event of this year was the law proposed by C. Trebonius, now Tribune of the people, and a partisan of the Triumvirate, and afterwards more notorious as one of the assassins of Cæsar. Its object was to confer a military command for a term of years on each of the Consuls: thus, the Province of Spain was assigned to Pompey,‖ and that of Syria to Crassus, to be held for five years, with a discretionary power of raising troops, and of making peace and war. After a most resolute opposition on the part of the two Aristocratical Tribunes, and of M. Cato, the law was carried by absolute violence; and immediately afterwards Pompey himself proposed and carried another,¶ prolonging Cæsar's command in Gaul for five, or, according to Dion Cassius, for three years beyond the term originally assigned to it, and adding Germany also, as it is said, to his Province. Crassus, who was eager to grasp the glory which he anticipated from an attack on the Parthians, left Rome in the month of November,* on his way to Syria; but his departure was attended with circumstances which were regarded at the time as ominous of evil, and which were remembered more carefully after the disastrous issue of his expedition. The Tribunes, Ateius and Aquillius,† at first attempted to prevent him from going, and Ateius threatened him with imprisonment, but was restrained by the negative of his colleagues: however, when Crassus was leaving the city, as we have before related, he denounced the wrath of the gods against his enterprise, and lighting a fire at the gate through which Crassus was to pass, he went through certain ceremonies of imprecation, devoting, with the most fearful curses, both the General and his army to destruction. It is said, too, that the projected war with the Parthians was so unpopular, especially when combined with the manner in which Crassus had gained his Province, that he was attended by nothing of that train of citizens who were used to crowd round an officer when departing from Rome to undertake an arduous contest against a foreign enemy; but that he besought Pompey to accompany him out of the city, in the hope that his presence might save him at least from any open expressions of ill-will on the part of the multitude. Meanwhile Pompey himself intrusted the command of his Province to his lieutenants, and continued to reside in Rome, pretending that his post of Controller of the markets did not allow him to be absent from the Capital;‡ but enjoying probably the thought, that whilst he, like Cæsar and Crassus, had a Province and an army at his disposal, he was living at the same time at the seat of Government, and exercising an influence there which was little short of sovereignty.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

Crassus sets out from Rome on his way to Syria.

In this situation Pompey was at the utmost height of his ambition; and accordingly from this time forwards he abetted no acts of violence, and encouraged no parties against the Aristocracy, but seemed inclined to regard the Senate, as a Prince would view the nobility of his kingdom, that is, as the most natural supports and ornaments of his own greatness. Thus the elections for the ensuing year appear to have passed without disturbance; and L. Domitius, who had been the unsuccessful opponent of Pompey and Crassus, was now able to gain his object, and was chosen Consul, together with Appius Claudius Pulcher, the brother of P. Clodius, and a partisan of Cæsar. M. Cato also was allowed to avail himself of the esteem which the people entertained for him, and was elected Prætor without difficulty. Cicero's reconciliation with Cæsar was about this time confirmed, by the appointment of his brother Quintus to be one of Cæsar's lieutenants in Gaul; and P. Clodius had now somewhat declined in notoriety, and had lost much of his power and perhaps of his inclination to excite disturbances. The Commonwealth seemed, in short, destined to enjoy a breathing time from the perpetual tumults by which it had been assailed; but its peace rested on such slender foundations, that no intelligent

Consulship of L. Domitius and Appius Claudius. M. Cato Prætor. U. C. 699.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 105. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 41.
† Cicero, *ad Q. Fratrem*, lib. ii. epist. ix.
‡ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 52. *In Catone*, c. 42.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 105.
‖ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cv.
¶ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 106, 107. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 43.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. iv. epist. xiii.
† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 72. Plutarch, *in Crasso*, c. 16.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 109.

observer could venture to calculate on its permanency.

We have already seen that Ptolemy King of Egypt had left Rome in the year 697, and had retired to Ephesus, hopeless of effecting his restoration to his throne by the assistance of the Romans, although he had committed so many crimes to purchase it. But in the beginning of the year following he found an unexpected friend in A. Gabinius, who still held the Province of Syria, to which he had succeeded on the expiration of his Consulship. Gabinius instigated, as some say, by private letters from Pompey,* and at any rate trusting to his protection to save him from punishment, if he were afterwards questioned for his conduct, did not hesitate to espouse the King's cause; and, in defiance of the provisions of two recent laws of Sylla and Cæsar, marched with his army out of his Province,† invaded Egypt, and, having defeated the Egyptians and taken Alexandria, reinstated Ptolemy in his former power. Meantime the Syrians, during the absence of his army,‡ suffered severely from the incursions of some hordes of plunderers, by whom, as by the common scourge of that part of Asia, the wilder parts of their country were occupied. They carried their complaints to Rome, and they met with the more favourable reception, because, from the distressed state of the Province, which had been ill protected even when Gabinius was present, the taxes could not be collected, and the farmers of the revenue were unable to discharge their debt to the Government. But the interest of Pompey and Crassus sufficiently defended Gabinius during their Consulship; and Crassus, who was going to supersede him in his Province, felt himself possibly the more bound to secure him from molestation on his return to Rome. Now, however, the interest of the Triumvirate was less predominant; and Gabinius, when he at last arrived in Italy, and entered the Capital by night, on the twenty-eighth of September,§ found himself at once beset with prosecutions. On his first trial, for a violation of the Cornelian law in leading an army out of his Province, he was acquitted;‖ partly, according to Cicero, from the want of talent in his accuser, and partly from the corruption of his Judges. He was tried a second time, however, on a charge of receiving bribes from King Ptolemy; and to the surprise of every one, Cicero, who had ever been his most vehement enemy, now appeared as his advocate.¶ This change had been brought about by the earnest solicitations of Pompey,** to whom Cicero was unwilling to refuse any thing; but the real placability of Cicero's disposition disposed him to lay aside his animosities; and the consciousness of this feeling would make him less suspect the purity of his own motives, when he suffered himself to be won over by Cæsar to forget his enmity to Vatinius, and when he now was persuaded by Pompey to defend Gabinius. His reconciliation, however, was of no benefit to the accused, who was condemned, and went into exile.

Ptolemy King of Egypt is restored to his throne by A. Gabinius.

Trials of A. Gabinius, on several charges.

He is defended by Cicero; but condemned and goes into exile.

The competition for the Consulship began as usual about midsummer, and was carried on with great vehemence. There were four candidates,* Cn. Domitius Calvinus, who had been Tribune in the Consulship of Cæsar and Bibulus, and had distinguished himself by his steady support of the Aristocracy; M. Valerius Messala, who was also attached to the same interest; C. Memmius, who had been formerly Pompey's Quæstor in Spain, and who now rested his hopes, in a great measure, on the influence of Cæsar's friends in his behalf; and M. Æmilius Scaurus, the son of that Scaurus who was, during so many years, first on the rolls of the Senate, and the son-in-law of L. Sylla, who had married his mother Metella. He was at this very time brought to trial before M. Cato as Prætor,† on a charge of corruption in the administration of his late Province of Sardinia; but was defended by Cicero and Hortensius, and acquitted. All these candidates were guilty of bribery to such an amount as to produce a great effect on the money market; for they borrowed such large sums to carry on their canvass,‡ that the rate of interest rose in one day from four to eight per cent. The Senate, to repress these proceedings,§ wished to institute an inquiry into the conduct of the candidates previously to the election; and this being prevented by one of the Tribunes, Q. Scævola, another Tribune in the interest of the Senate, forbade the Comitia to be held until this obstruction should be removed. In the mean time C. Memmius, by the advice of Pompey,‖ disclosed a singular scene of infamy in which he himself was a principal actor. He produced and read in the Senate an agreement which had been entered into by himself and Cn. Domitius Calvinus with the present Consuls; in which it was stipulated, that, if they were elected Consuls, they would produce three Augurs and two Senators of Consular dignity, who should depose to the validity of a forged act of the Comitia Curiata, and a forged decree of the Senate; that these false instruments were to confer the command of certain Provinces on the Consuls of the present year, in return for the support which they were to give to Memmius and Domitius in their present contest; and if the proper witnesses could not be procured to prove what was required, the two candidates agreed to forfeit to the Consuls a certain sum of money. We may suppose that Memmius was prevailed upon by the party of the Triumvirate to make this disclosure, in order to ruin the character of L. Domitius, one of the present Consuls, who, as the friend of Cato, and as the opponent of Pompey and Crassus in the preceding year, was peculiarly obnoxious to them. He trusted besides, that, in consequence of this transaction, the elections would be postponed till after the expiration of the present year; and Pompey's friends then thought it probable that he might be named Dictator; in which case Memmius, as a partisan of the Triumvirate, had every prospect of succeeding to the Consulship. In fact, the year was suffered to pass away without any election taking place; L. Domitius and Appius Claudius went out of office; and the beginning of the seven hundredth year of Rome found the Commonwealth

Violent competition for the Consulship.

Infamous agreement between the Consuls and two of the candidates.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 115.
† Cicero, *in Pisonem*, c. 21.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. p. 118.
§ Cicero, *ad Q. Fratrem*, lib. iii. epist. i.
‖ Ibid. lib. iii. epist. iv.
¶ Valerius Maximus, lib. iv. c. 2.
** Cicero, *pro Rabirio Postumo*, c. 8. 12.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. iv. epist. xv. *ad Q. Fratrem*, lib. ii. epist. xv.
† Asconius, *Argumentum in Ciceron. Orat. pro Scauro.*
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. iv. epist. xv.
§ Ibid. lib. iv. epist. xvi.
‖ Ibid. lib. iv. epist. xviii.

in a state of anarchy, without any promise of a speedy return to any thing more regular.

Amongst the events of the year 699 should be mentioned, however, the death of Julia, the daughter of Cæsar, and wife of Pompey. She died immediately after having given birth to a daughter,* and the child survived her only a few days. Her amiable character and constant affection to her husband had gained her the general regard of the people; and this they testified by insisting on celebrating her funeral in the Campus Martius, a compliment scarcely ever paid to any woman before. It is said that Pompey had always loved her tenderly, and the purity and happiness of his domestic life is one of the most delightful points in his character. Now the tie that had bound him so closely to Cæsar was broken, and no private considerations any longer existed to allay the jealousies and animosities which political disputes might enkindle between them.

Death of Julia, the wife of Pompey, and daughter of Cæsar.

The Commonwealth remained without Consuls for some months,† the elections being continually obstructed, as it appears, by some of the Tribunes who were in the interest of Pompey, and who wished to drive the Aristocracy into the necessity of appointing him Dictator. Pompey, however, always professed his unwillingness to accept such a trust; and whether he was sincere or not, he was obliged, at last, to act agreeably to his professions; and, uniting his influence to that of the Senate, the Comitia were at last suffered to be held, and Cn. Domitius Calvinus and M. Valerius Messala were elected Consuls. But the same difficulties threatened to arise, with regard to the appointment of their successors. T. Annius Milo,‡ who had borne so great a part in effecting Cicero's recall from banishment, P. Plautius Hypsæus, a partisan of Pompey, and who had served as his Quæstor in the war with Mithridates, and Q. Metellus Scipio, who, being by birth a member of the family of the Scipios, had been adopted into that of the Metelli by Q. Metellus Pius, and who had been accused of bribery seven years before,§ were now candidates for the Consulship; and at the same time P. Clodius was aiming at being elected Prætor. The old enmity that had subsisted between Clodius and Milo now broke out afresh with increased violence; and they opposed one another, as before, with parties of armed men, who frequently met and fought in the streets, while all the candidates were equally guilty of the most scandalous corruption. Milo had the support of the Aristocratical party, and had won, moreover, a large share of popular favour, by the extreme magnificence of the games which he had lately exhibited for the entertainment of the multitude. He was thus not unlikely to gain his election, if the Comitia were peaceably held; and Clodius, to prevent this, occasionally interrupted the assemblies of the people by acts of violence; on one of which occasions the two Consuls were assailed with stones and wounded.‖ Three of the Tribunes also, Q. Pompeius Rufus, T. Munatius Plancus Bursa, and C. Sallustius Crispus the historian, were determined enemies of Milo; and their negatives were probably used, as had been done in the preceding year, to stop the election in a manner more agreeable to law. Cn. Domitius and M. Messala thus resigned the Consulship at the end of the year, before any persons were named to succeed them; and a period of anarchy was likely again to continue for some months, till one party or the other could gain a more decided ascendency.

Interregnum for several months.

Consulship of Cn. Domitius and M. Messala. U. C. 700.

Milo, Scipio, and Hypsæus candidates for the Consulship.

Clodius a candidate for the Prætorship.

But an event soon occurred which totally changed the face of affairs. On the twentieth of January Milo set out from Rome to go to Lanuvium; a town of which he was the chief Magistrate, or Dictator, and where, by virtue of his office, he was on the following day to appoint a Flamen for the performance of some of the religious ceremonies of the Municipality. He travelled in a carriage, accompanied by his wife Fausta, and by one of his friends, and attended by a strong body of his slaves, and also by some of those gladiators whose services he had occasionally employed in his contests with Clodius. It was late in the afternoon, and he had just passed the little town of Bovillæ, ascending the Alban hills, when he fell in with Clodius, who was on his way to Rome, mounted on horseback, and followed by about thirty of his slaves. Clodius, it appears, had been to Aricia on business, and thence had returned to a villa of his own on the Alban hills, where he intended to pass the night; but receiving intelligence of the death of one Cyrus, an architect at Rome, whose property he expected to inherit, he left his villa at a late hour, purposing to travel on with all speed to the Capital. He and Milo passed one another without disturbance; but the gladiators, who were among the last of Milo's party, provoked a quarrel with the slaves of Clodius; and Clodius turning back, and interposing in an authoritative manner, Birria, one of the gladiators, ran him through the shoulder with his sword. Upon this the fray became more general. Milo's slaves hastened back in greater numbers to take part in it, while Clodius was carried into an inn at Bovillæ. Meanwhile, Milo himself was informed of what had passed, and, resolving to avail himself of the opportunity which was before him, he ordered his slaves to attack the inn and destroy his enemy. Clodius was dragged out into the road, and there murdered; his slaves shared his fate, or saved their lives by flying to places of concealment; and his body, covered with wounds, was left on the ground in the middle of the highway.*

Interregnum.

Clodius is murdered by Milo at Bovillæ. U. C. 701.

After the perpetration of this act, Milo continued his journey towards Lanuvium. The body of Clodius was taken up soon after by a Senator who happened to be returning to Rome from the country, and was sent on by him to the Capital in his own litter; he himself (suspecting, probably, what was likely to follow), going back to the place which he had just left, in order to be out of the way of all disturbance. It was about an hour after nightfall, that the body was brought to the house of Clodius in Rome, and there deposited in the court of the building. A crowd, consisting of the lowest class of the populace and of

The body of Clodius is carried to Rome.

* Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 53.

† Cicero, *ad Famil.* lib. vii. epist. xi. *ad Q. Fratrem*, lib. iii. epist. viii.

‡ Asconius, *in Ciceron. Orat. pro Milone.*

§ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. i.

‖ Cicero, *Fragm. de Ære alieno Milonis, ab* Angel. Maio *edit.*

* Asconius, *in Ciceron. Orat. pro Milone.* This account of the death of Clodius is taken from the argument prefixed by Asconius to Cicero's speech in defence of Milo. In the whole of the detail, Asconius has shewn great diligence, clearness, and impartiality; and his authority, on this occasion, may be followed with entire reliance on its excellence.

slaves, presently gathered round it; and Fulvia, the widow of the deceased, inflamed their passions by a display of the wildest sorrow, as she pointed out the wounds with which her husband was covered. By daybreak on the following morning the crowd was greatly increased; and the Tribunes, T. Munatius and Q. Pompeius, who were attached to the popular party, hastening to the spot, recommended to the people to take up the body in its present state, to bear it into the Forum, and there exhibit it on the rostra. The multitude readily followed their directions; and the two Tribunes began to expatiate on the atrocity of the murder, and to inflame the public indignation against its author. As the passions of the populace were excited, they were more disposed to listen to the most violent suggestions; and presently they carried the body from the rostra into the Senate-house, and there set fire to it on a pile made at the moment out of the benches, tables, and other furniture which they found at hand. The consequence was, as might have been expected, that the Senate-house itself was involved in the conflagration, and burnt to the ground; many of the populace, no doubt, delighting in the accident, and pleased to see Clodius, even after his death, becoming the cause of mischief to that assembly, which, during his lifetime, he had regarded with such unceasing enmity.

And burnt by the populace in the Senate-house.

These and several other disorders committed by the multitude somewhat turned the tide of public opinion, which had at first run strongly against Milo. He now was encouraged to return to Rome, to renew his canvass for the Consulship, and to make a large distribution of money among the several Tribes. The other candidates continued their intrigues in the same manner,* and parties of armed men were employed successively on all sides to prevent the Comitia from being peaceably held; insomuch, that the Senate at last gave the usual solemn charge to the Interrex, the Tribunes of the people, and Pompey as a Proconsul holding a military command, "that they should provide for the safety of the Commonwealth;" and that Pompey should be commissioned to levy soldiers in every part of Italy to assist him in maintaining the public peace. But, as it seemed desirable at once to remove the want of a supreme magistrate, and as the appointment of a Dictator was a measure generally obnoxious, it was proposed in the Senate by M. Bibulus, with the concurrence of M. Cato, that Pompey should forthwith be declared Consul without any colleague. This seemed a complete overture on the part of the Aristocracy towards a reconciliation with Pompey, and he received it as such; and is said to have expressed, particularly to Cato, his thanks for the confidence which he had thus reposed in him.† He entered on his office immediately without opposition; whether it was admitted that the Senate might by its own authority create a Consul as well as a Dictator on extraordinary occasions, or whether the Interrex was enabled to hold the Comitia, and the resolution of the Senate was confirmed by the votes of the people. No sooner was he declared Consul than he brought forward two laws with the sanction of the Senate;‡ one enacting that an inquiry should be instituted into the late acts of violence, and specifying particularly the murder of Clodius, and the burning of the Senate-house; the other providing severer penalties for the crime of bribery. In both a material improvement was introduced in the regulation of trials: the witnesses on each side were to be previously examined during three days, and on the following day both the accuser and the accused were to finish their pleadings, two hours being allowed to the former, and three to the latter. It was further enacted, that a Judge should be chosen by the people from among the citizens of Consular rank, to preside in the proposed inquiry. When these laws were first brought forward, M. Cælius, one of the Tribunes, a man of doubtful character and closely connected with Milo, endeavoured to obstruct their progress; but was deterred by a threatening expression of Pompey, "that he would protect the Commonwealth, if necessary, by force of arms." Pompey, indeed, appeared personally to apprehend the violence of Milo. A man who had so long been accustomed to employ a band of gladiators in his political contests, and who had lately used their swords with so little scruple against his enemy, might well be suspected of venturing on some desperate measure to escape the judgment of the laws; and Pompey, therefore, surrounded his residence with a strong military guard, and on one occasion assembled the Senate in one of the galleries of his own house, that they might be under the safeguard of his soldiers.

Pompey appointed sole Consul.

Laws of Pompey.

Meantime L. Domitius Ænobarbus, who had been Consul two years before, was appointed chief Judge for the approaching trials; and the other members of the court were nominated by Pompey with such care, that Rome had never seen a tribunal composed of citizens more distinguished, or of greater integrity. M. Cato is mentioned as having been one of their number. Before these Judges Milo was accused by two of the nephews of Clodius; and the examination of witnesses, according to Pompey's new law, commenced on the fourth of April, and continued during that and the two following days. The proceedings were carried on in the Forum; and on the first day when M. Marcellus, one of Milo's advocates, was beginning to question one of the witnesses for the prosecution, the rabble, which filled the Forum, and which consisted of the partisans of Clodius, raised so alarming a clamour, that Marcellus, dreading some personal violence, was received within the place set apart for the Judges, and Pompey was applied to for a guard to enable the accused to conduct his defence with freedom. Accordingly, on the following days, the Court was protected by the presence of so strong a military force, that the examination of the witnesses was concluded without a second interruption. On the afternoon of the third day, after the Court had adjourned till its final sitting, T. Munatius Plancus addressed the multitude, and advised them to attend on the last day of the trial with a full display of their strength, to testify to the Judges their own opinion of Milo's guilt, and not to suffer him to escape the punishment which he deserved. At length, on the morning of the eighth of April, the Court again assembled; the shops were shut throughout the city; the Forum was crowded by multitudes of the populace, and surrounded by Pompey's soldiers; Pompey himself was present, attended by a select guard; the

Trial of Milo.

* Asconius, *in Ciceron. Orat. pro Milone.*
† Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 47, 48.
‡ Asconius, *ubi supra.*

Judges, eighty-one in number, were taken by lot out of the larger list of persons nominated by Pompey, and the commencement of the pleadings was awaited in a silence of the deepest interest by the immense concourse of people that thronged the Forum. The accusers were three in number, Appius Claudius, one of Clodius's nephews, M. Antonius, who was afterwards so distinguished, and P. Valerius Nepos; and their speeches, according to Pompey's law, were limited to two hours altogether. Cicero arose to reply in defence of Milo; but it is said that he was so confused by the clamours and outcries of the populace devoted to the party of Clodius, that he did not speak with his usual force and eloquence. Before the sentence of the court was to be pronounced, fifteen Judges were challenged by the accusers, and as many by Milo, so that there were left only fifty-one persons who actually decided the cause; and out of these there were found thirteen who voted in favour of the accused, and thirty-eight who condemned him. When the event of the trial was known he went into exile, and fixed his abode at Massilia, or Marseilles, in Gaul: he was also tried after his departure for three other distinct offences; for bribery, for illegal caballing and combinations, and for acts of violence; and was successively found guilty on all. But the triumph of his enemies was limited to the ruin of Milo alone; for when, shortly afterwards, M. Saufeius was accused for having headed the assault on the inn at Bovillæ, he was acquitted, although the charge was notoriously true; and this decision was owing to the universal abhorrence in which the memory of Clodius was held. On the other hand, Sex. Clodius and T. Munatius Plancus* were brought to trial as the instigators of that riot in which the Senate-house had been burnt; and they, together with several others of the same party, were found guilty. Thus justice seemed to be administered with unusual impartiality; and Pompey's behaviour fully justified the confidence which his countrymen had shewn in conferring on him an authority so extensive and so unprecedented.

He is condemned, and goes into exile.

After he had held the Consulship alone for some months, he chose for his colleague L. Scipio. The new Consul had been one of the candidates for that office at the beginning of the year, and his daughter Cornelia had lately become the wife of Pompey. Several prosecutions for bribery were going on at this time, under the new law of Pompey; and another measure was either proposed by him, or was now for the first time carried into effect, in order still further to check that immoderate competition for public offices which had of late been so injurious to the Commonwealth. It was enacted,† that no magistrate should be appointed to the government of a Province, till five years had elapsed from the expiration of his magistracy; but at the same time we are told, that Pompey did not hesitate to procure for himself a continuation of his command in Spain for five additional years. This act of most ill-judged ambition was attended with consequences more disastrous to his country, than Pompey could be expected to foresee. His conduct since the beginning of his Consulship had greatly reconciled him to the Aristocratical party; and the severe laws which he had brought forward to correct the public disorders, combined with the desire which he still manifested to maintain his own supremacy in reputation and dignity, gave no small alarm to all those who hoped to rise in the Commonwealth by corruption or tumults; as if Pompey, having himself gained the height which he coveted, was resolved to employ his power in barring up the path against all others. Above all, Cæsar and his immediate partisans regarded the present course of Pompey's administration with the utmost jealousy. Cæsar's own command in Gaul had now lasted for more than six years, and in less than four years more it would naturally expire; he had then the prospect of returning to Rome as a private citizen, while Pompey would still retain the command of an army, and, from his late conduct, was likely to enjoy, at least in a far greater degree than himself, the confidence and support of the Aristocracy. Before his connection, then, with Pompey was disturbed by a more decided separation of their interests, and while the remembrance of his daughter Julia was still alive in the heart of her husband, notwithstanding his recent marriage with another, he resolved to avail himself of Pompey's influence to secure a point most essential to his future designs. He might represent with some plausibility, that while Pompey was combining the possession of civil and military authority in his own person, he ought not himself to be debarred from pursuing his career of honours at home, because the service of the State was still detaining him in Gaul; and he proposed, accordingly, that he might be allowed to become a candidate for the Consulship in his absence, without resigning the command of his army, or leaving the important duties of his Province. To this Pompey not only assented, but even himself* applied to Cicero to obtain his concurrence in the measure; and accordingly a law, such as Cæsar desired, was brought forward by some of the Tribunes, and was passed in spite of the most vehement opposition on the part of Cato.† But when Cæsar's friends expressed a desire to obtain a still further extension of the term of his command in Gaul, Pompey was unwilling to support them; and, according to Plutarch,‡ he asserted that he had letters from Cæsar in his possession, in which Cæsar himself professed that he was tired of the labours of a military life, and that he would gladly be relieved by the appointment of a successor.

Law allowing Cæsar to become a candidate for the Consulship in his absence.

While, however, Cæsar was thus affecting to be disgusted with his actual situation, he was, in reality, making it subservient in many ways to the designs which he entertained against the liberties of his country. During the present summer he had, in fact, completed the conquest of Gaul by the defeat of the formidable confederacy organized by Vercingetorix, and by the capture of Alesia. By his successive victories he had amassed a treasure, which, if we judge by the effects ascribed to it, must have been enormous. He is said to have spared no expense in gaining over every person whose support at Rome

Proceedings of Cæsar in order to gain popularity.

* Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. vii. epist. ii.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xl. p. 147.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. i.
† Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cvii.
‡ *In Pompeio*, c. 56.

might be valuable. He lent Cicero* a large sum of money to enable him to rebuild his houses after his return from banishment; he won the favour of the populace by commencing several public works in the city,† by giving splendid exhibitions of gladiators, and by offering entertainments to the multitude in honour of his daughter Julia's memory. To his own army his liberalities were almost unbounded; while his camp presented a place of refuge to the needy, the profligate, the debtors, and even the criminals,‡ who found it convenient to retreat from the Capital. When it is remembered that the object of all this profusion was the enslaving of his country, and that the means which enabled him to practise it, were derived from the unprovoked pillage of the towns and temples of Gaul, and the sale of those unfortunate barbarians, who, in the course of his unjust wars, became his prisoners, it may be justly doubted whether the life of any individual recorded in history was ever productive of a greater amount of human misery, or has been marked with a deeper stain of wickedness.

Consulship of Ser. Sulpicius and M. Marcellus.

Meantime the year drew near its close, and the Consular elections were again approaching. The candidates were Servius Sulpicius, a man eminent for his great knowledge as a lawyer, M. Claudius Marcellus, and M. Cato; and as Cato was generally unpopular with the multitude, from his exertions to stop that traffic in votes by which they were benefited, Sulpicius and Marcellus were elected. Marcellus was a partisan of Pompey, and as such was disposed to act against Cæsar; for although the two leaders still professed a friendship for each other, yet their respective adherents already conducted themselves as if an open quarrel had taken place between them. From this point it becomes necessary to trace minutely the progress of those disputes which so soon terminated in the civil war; and to these, indeed, our attention for the present will be chiefly confined.

Cæsar supports the claims of the people north of the Po to the rights of Roman citizenship. U. C. 702.

It may be remembered that the party of Marius and Cinna, during the former civil dissensions, derived its main strength from the support of the Italian allies; whose claim to the rights of Roman citizenship had been always opposed by the Aristocracy, and favoured by the popular leaders. The event of what is called the Italian war, had procured for the Italians all that they desired; and the victory of Sylla had, as we have seen, deprived them only, in a few instances, of the advantages which they had gained. But the inhabitants of the country between the Po and the Alps had not yet been raised to an equality with the other people of the peninsula; and their cause accordingly was espoused by those who wished to gain popularity in the same manner as the privileges of the other Italians had been contended for on former occasions. We have already seen that when M. Crassus was Censor, in the year 688, he had wished to extend the rights of citizenship to the people beyond the Po, but was prevented by the opposition of his colleague Q. Catulus; and it is said that Cæsar§ had even then exerted himself on the popular side of the question, and had secretly instigated the Transpadani to assert their claims by an open insurrection. The command which he had since enjoyed in the north of Italy, was likely to make him more desirous of ingratiating himself with its inhabitants; and whilst he was disposed on the first favourable opportunity to procure for them in general the freedom of Rome, he had, in the mean time, availed himself of a power conferred on him by the Vatinian law,* under which he held his command, and had bestowed on some of the towns north of the Po, the rank and title of Roman colonies; so that any of their inhabitants, who had held any public office in their own city, became, in consequence, *ipso facto* citizens of Rome. Among the towns thus favoured, was Comum, situated at the foot of the Lake Larius, or, as it is now called, the Lake of Como; a place which had first received an accession of inhabitants from Cn. Pompeius, the father of Pompey,† and secondly from C. Scipio, who appears to have been exiled under the Dictatorship of Sylla,‡ and whose misfortune may possibly have communicated itself in part to the town which he had patronised. Cæsar had added five thousand names to the list of its citizens, amongst whom were five hundred Greeks of distinction, who did not reside at Comum, but enjoyed the privileges of the new establishment, and reflected some honour on its name. One of the citizens of Comum,§ who had held a magistracy there, happened to go to Rome in the present year, and claimed the rights of a Roman citizen, on the ground of having filled a public office in a Roman colony. The Consul M. Marcellus, one of whose ancestors, by a curious coincidence, had first recovered Comum‖ to the Roman dominion after the second Punic war, desirous to express his animosity against Cæsar, insisted that the man's claim was ill-grounded, and, in mockery of his pretensions, ordered him to be publicly scourged, desiring him, it is said, to go and shew his stripes to Cæsar. This act of unmanly cruelty was probably of considerable service to the cause of him whom it was meant to insult; and Cicero, in a letter to Atticus,¶ expressed his opinion, that it would give as great offence to Pompey as to Cæsar; for Pompey, it seems, with his usual true liberality,** had taken the case of the people beyond the Po into his consideration, and was disposed to grant them the rights of citizenship as an act of justice, and as one of those honourable means by which a Government may most wisely and most effectually defeat the designs of the disaffected.

The conduct of the Consul Marcellus in this affair was a bad omen of his temper and judgment in the management of the main dispute between the Government and Cæsar. As the war in Gaul drew more evidently towards its close, men seemed on a sudden to be awakened to a sense of their error in having allowed an officer of Cæsar's character to form and discipline a formidable army in the very position that

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. v. epist. v. vi. lib. vii. epist. iii. viii. *Ad Familiar.* lib. i. epist. ix.
† Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 26.
‡ Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 20. Suetonius, c. 27.
§ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 8.

* Suetonius, c. 28. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 26.
† Strabo, lib. v. p. 236. edit. Xyland.
‡ Cicero, *pro Sextio*, c. 3.
§ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 26. Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 29.
‖ Livy, lib. xxxiii. c. 36.
¶ *Ad Atticum*, lib. v. epist. xi.
** Ibid. lib. v. epist. ii

was most dangerous to the safety of the Commonwealth; and the wish was generally entertained of removing him by any means whatever from a station so threatening. But while Marcellus was anxious to effect this object at any risk, his colleague, Ser. Sulpicius,* endeavoured to moderate the vehemence of the Senate by representing the inevitable evils of all civil wars, and by bidding them remember the natural tendency of such contests to increase in havoc and atrocity, each improving on the precedent of that which had gone before it. His moderation, and the unwillingness of Pompey to give Cæsar any just cause of offence, prevented all violent proceedings for the present. It was only resolved by the Senate,† that the disposal of Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul, and of the other Provinces, should be discussed early in the following year; that if any person should endeavour to stop the jurisdiction of the Senate in this affair, he should be considered as acting against the good of the Commonwealth; and that further, the cases of all soldiers in Cæsar's army claiming their discharge, should then be considered and determined by the Senate. Several of the Tribunes, who had been gained by Cæsar, interposed their negatives upon this resolution; so that it could not have the force of a decree, but was registered in the journals, under the title of the "Authority" of the Senate.

Consulship of C. Marcellus and L. Paullus. U. C. 703.

Meantime C. Claudius Marcellus, a cousin of the present Consul, and L. Æmilius Paullus, were elected Consuls for the following year; and C. Scribonius Curio was at the same time elected one of the Tribunes.‡ Curio was a man of talents, of eloquence, of a restless thirst for distinction, and impatient of slight or neglect. In the year of Cæsar's Consulship, when the power of the Triumvirate was at its height, he had courted and obtained popular applause by the boldness with which he had on some occasions attacked their conduct.§ When candidate for the Tribuneship, he professed himself warmly devoted to the party of the Senate; being irritated, as it is said,‖ by some appearances of indifference or contempt which were manifested towards him by Cæsar. But, in the very first month of his Tribuneship, he was again disgusted with the Aristocracy,¶ because he could not obtain the insertion of several additional days in the Calendar to lengthen the term of his office; the intercalary month, which was inserted every year to make up the deficiency in the ordinary computation, being made longer or shorter at the discretion of the Pontifices, according as the interests or wishes of their friends or their party might require. On this ground Curio began to espouse the cause of Cæsar; and a man so jealous of affront, so ambitious, and with so little steadiness of character, may be as naturally supposed to have acted from this motive, as from that still baser one which rumour imputed to him,** namely, that he was bribed, by Cæsar, with a sum amounting to about 80,000*l.* of our money.

Tribuneship of C. Curio.

Yet the year 703 passed on to its close without witnessing any thing more decisive than the year which had preceded it. We are told that Curio professed to follow a course of perfect impartiality,* and proposed that both Cæsar and Pompey should alike resign their military commands, that so the Republic might have nothing to fear from the ambition of either. When he found that the Senate was disinclined to this measure, he began to attack Pompey with great freedom,† and to charge him with aspiring to the exercise of an absolute power over his country. Pompey's influence in Rome had long been so predominant, that language of this sort was considered a proof of extraordinary boldness; and the multitude, who always delight to hear invectives against the powerful, testified their admiration of Curio by the liveliest acclamations. He threatened, it seems,‡ to negative any decision to which the Senate might come respecting Cæsar's recall; and thus the question concerning the Provinces was not brought forward on the first of March, as the Senate had before resolved, but was suffered to remain undetermined. It was understood to be Pompey's wish that Cæsar should now be recalled on the thirteenth of November, and that he should on no account be permitted to enjoy the Consulship till he had resigned the command of his army. Two years before, it will be remembered, Pompey had interested himself in obtaining for Cæsar the very privilege which he now wished to take away; but in that interval Cæsar had shewn a disposition to resist the Senate's authority, which might give just suspicion of his real designs. Pompey justly considered the successive interference of the Tribunes to deprive the Senate of their lawful control over the Provinces, as equivalent to an actual disobedience on the part of Cæsar,§ in whose behalf and at whose instigation this interference was exerted; and the general attachment of all profligate and desperate citizens to the cause of Cæsar, and the resort of many persons of that description to his camp, where they were received with the utmost cordiality, seemed to warn the Commonwealth of the danger of allowing the head of such a party to unite the command of an army with the highest post in the civil Government. It is the opinion of Cicero,‖ that if the Senate had consented, according to many former precedents, to apply officially to Curio, and request that he would not interpose his negative on their decrees, he would have yielded to their wishes. But this, though proposed by M. Marcellus,¶ was not adopted; and Curio, still further incensed at this apparent contempt of his power, persisted in his threats of preventing the execution of every thing which the Senate might resolve. In this manner nothing was determined; and the final decision of the question, with its important results, a civil war on the one hand, or on the other the removal of all apprehensions of violence from Cæsar, was to be reserved for the following year, when C. Claudius Marcellus and L. Cornelius Lentulus were appointed Consuls; the last individuals who ever held that office by the unforced votes of the Roman people.

* Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. iv. epist. iii.
† Ibid. lib. viii. epist. viii.
‡ Ibid. lib. ii. epist. vii.
§ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. xviii.
‖ Ibid. *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. iv.
¶ Ibid. lib. viii. epist. vi.
** Velleius Patercul. lib. ii. c. 75.

* Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 58. Dion Cassius, lib. xl. p. 150.
† Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. xi. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 28.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. xi.
§ Ibid. lib. viii. epist. viii.
‖ *Ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. vii.
¶ Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. xiii.

Illness of Pompey.

It was about the autumn of the year 702 that Pompey was seized with a dangerous fever,* while at his villa in the neighbourhood of Naples. No sooner was his illness known, than public prayers for his safety were offered up throughout Italy; and when he recovered, sacrifices of thanksgiving were equally general: every town celebrated the event by a spontaneous festival; and when he was able to travel to Rome, multitudes of people thronged the road, with garlands on their heads and torches in their hands, scattering flowers around him as he passed. These signs of the attachment of his countrymen were received by Pompey with peculiar pleasure, for he had ever been more ambitious of popularity than of power; but it is said that they misled him fatally on the present occasion, by inducing him to estimate from them the real strength of his cause. So confident, indeed, did he feel in the support of the Italians, that he is said to have declared that he could raise armies in Italy by the stamp of his foot.† But he was for a long time also lulled into security from a belief that Cæsar would not dare to make war upon his country for his own private quarrel; perhaps, also, from a persuasion that he would be restrained by his personal friendship to himself. This last hope, however, vanished towards the close of the year 703; when Hirtius,‡ one of Cæsar's most confidential officers, arrived at Rome from the army, and departed again without visiting Pompey, or holding any communication with him; and still more, when M. Antonius, who had been Cæsar's Quæstor in Gaul, and who had been just elected Tribune to support his interests, delivered a speech full of violent invectives against Pompey,§ and attacking the whole of his public life from its first commencement. From that time he looked forward to a war as inevitable; and professed that he dreaded such an issue less than the prospect of allowing Cæsar to enjoy any political power at Rome. His own great name, the large army held by his lieutenants in Spain, the attachment of the Italians, and the authority of the Senate, seemed to ensure him an easy victory over a single rebel General and his army, however great might be the talents of the one, and the discipline of the other.

Of the supporters and resources of Pompey.

But, in fact, the mass of the people of Italy were not disposed to risk their lives and properties in the maintenance of a contest which seemed little to affect their individual interests. The landed proprietors and the monied men were anxious for peace,‖ and indifferent whether Pompey or Cæsar administered the affairs of the Commonwealth; the citizens of the different towns, who had been so earnest in their prayers for Pompey's safety, were not equally ready to endure for his sake the evils of a civil war, and the devastation of their homes and families; while the men of desperate fortunes, the debtor, the profligate, and the robber, were eager in every part of Italy to embrace the cause of Cæsar, as that of revolution, and impunity, and plunder. If from Italy we extend our view to the Provinces, we shall find them influenced by particular causes to favour one leader or the other, according as their principal inhabitants had received favours from either, or as either happened to be better known amongst them, or to possess the strongest military force in their immediate neighbourhood. But degraded and oppressed as they had been under the Roman Government, it mattered little to them by what party the system under which they suffered was administered; unless there were some among them, who, looking upon Cæsar as the advocate of popular and liberal principles, indulged the hope that he would extend more generally that envied privilege of Roman citizenship, which he had already wished to impart far wider than his Aristocratical opponents were willing to allow.

The authority of the Senate, and the reputation of upholding the cause of law and good principles, might have conferred a greater strength on Pompey, had it not been for the selfish and narrow, and profligate views and characters which marked so many of his adherents. His own private morals were remarkably pure and amiable; but his father-in-law Metellus Scipio had, even when Consul,* been present at an entertainment where such a scene of debauchery was exhibited, as no honest man, and far less a magistrate, should have sanctioned by his presence; and Appius Claudius, with whom he was also become connected by the marriage of his son Cnæus with Appius's daughter, after having committed many acts of oppression and extortion in his Province of Cilicia, after having been detected during his Consulship in the grossest corruption, and having obtained a general character of prodigality and voluptuousness, was now invested with the office of Censor,† and was exerting his power with the utmost severity. He expelled a number of persons from the Senate, and amongst the rest C. Sallustius Crispus the historian; he also degraded many individuals of the Equestrian order; and although we are not told that any of his censures were undeserved, yet they seemed inconsistent with the character of the Censor himself, and served to alienate from the cause of the Aristocracy those who had become obnoxious to them. L. Lentulus, one of the Consuls for the present year, was overwhelmed with debts,‡ and is said to have eagerly anticipated a civil war, as the means of restoring his broken fortunes. To these might be added that large proportion of selfish and narrowminded individuals who are the incumbrance and disgrace of every Aristocracy; men who abhor all reform, because they think it may interfere with their comforts and privileges, and who consider their own ascendency rather as the ultimate object of Government, than as one of the means by which the general welfare of the State is promoted; men, in short, who burden a noble cause with all the weight of their pride and ignorance, who render its success a doubtful blessing, and lessen the regret with which the good regard its overthrow. This was the party which had persecuted the patriotic Tribune C. Cornelius,

* Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 57. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 74.
† Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 57.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. iv.
§ Ibid. lib. vii. epist. viii.
‖ Ibid. lib. viii. epist. xiii.

* Valerius Maximus, lib. iv. c. 1.
† Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. xiv. Dion Cassius, lib. xl. p. 150.
‡ Velleius Paterculus. lib. ii. c. 76. Cæsar, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. i. c. 3.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

which had largely shared in the oppression and plunder of the Provinces, and which had constantly opposed the extension of the right of Roman citizenship to the allied or subject States of Italy.

On the other hand the strength of Cæsar's cause was of a nature most likely to ensure victory in such a state of society as the Roman Empire exhibited. He was at the head of an army of nine legions,* consisting of such veteran soldiers, that one of the legions was considered inferior to the rest in tried courage and experience, because it had not served more than eight campaigns. The people of the north of Italy were attached to him, as the supporter of their claims for a participation in the freedom of Rome; and Gaul, however ill-affected towards the man who had been at once her spoiler and enslaver, was yet forced to assist his views by the wealth which her plunder put at his disposal, and which enabled him to purchase partisans at Rome, and to bind his soldiers to his interests by the liberality of his donations. Thus amply provided with means to strike the first blow with effect, he trusted on his approach to Rome to find a numerous party ready to cooperate with him. The profligate young Nobility,† who had conspired with Catiline in his plans of rapine and murder, and who had since abetted the vices and the riots of P. Clodius, were eager to support this new leader, who would accomplish, as they trusted, what their former chiefs had attempted in vain; and the rabble of the Capital, constantly at enmity with the existing Government, was a certain ally to any one who should head a rebellion. All these were likely to be active assistants in promoting the cause which they espoused; while a large proportion of those who wished well to the Constitution, would confine their zeal to words or feelings, and would make no practical exertions in its behalf.

Of the supporters and resources of Cæsar.

Of the situation of several eminent individuals at the beginning of the civil war.

It may not be uninteresting to the reader here to mention the dispositions and the situation of some of the most eminent citizens of the Commonwealth, when the civil war was now on the very eve of its commencement. We have spoken of the departure of M. Crassus from Rome in the year 698, to take possession of his Province of Syria, and to attempt the conquest of Parthia; and we have shewn how, in the year 700, his ambition, unaccompanied by corresponding ability, had been finally checked by his defeat and death in Mesopotamia. The wreck of his army had been led back into Syria with considerable difficulty by C. Cassius,‡ afterwards one of the assassins of Cæsar, and at this time acting as Quæstor under Crassus. Cassius covered the Province of Syria against the attacks of the Parthians, and maintained his ground, till in the year 702 M. Cicero was appointed to succeed Appius Claudius in the government of Cilicia, and M. Bibulus arrived in Syria to take the command in the room of Cassius. Neither of these officers, however, had much to do in their military capacity, for the Parthians were unequal to make any serious impression on the Roman Empire: but Cicero§ carried with him into his Province the virtues of his private life, and preserved both himself and all his subordinate officers pure from every act of oppression or extortion; nor would he even accept from the provincials those sums for the maintenance of his personal establishment, which, as the Governors received no salary from the treasury at home, were considered as the ordinary allowances of their office. He resigned his command and returned to Italy about the close of the year 703, but remained at his different villas for some time; and when he moved towards Rome early in January,* he did not enter the city, or take any part in the debates of the Senate, as he intended to prefer his claim to a Triumph, on account of some successes which he had gained over the plundering tribes of the mountain districts of Cilicia; and under these circumstances he was obliged by law to remain without the walls of Rome. M. Cato was constantly attending the Senate, and, as might be supposed, gave his warm support to every resolution hostile to Cæsar. L. Lucullus and his brother Marcus had been some time dead; and Q. Hortensius, another of the oldest and most eloquent members of the Aristocratical party, had died more recently, in the summer of the year 703.† P. Lentulus Spinther, to whose exertions, when Consul, Cicero professed himself greatly indebted for his restoration from exile, and L. Domitius, the colleague of Appius Claudius in the Consulship, and implicated together with him in the corrupt agreement which they entered into with two of the candidates for the succession to their office, were both in Rome, and disposed to cooperate zealously with Pompey. L. Piso, the father-in-law of Cæsar, who had been Consul with A. Gabinius in the year of Cicero's banishment, was now Censor, and although wishing to restrain the vehement proceedings of his colleague Appius Claudius,‡ was yet by no means inclined to go all lengths with Cæsar. Of the persons who afterwards acted a principal part in the civil wars, M. Antonius was now just elected one of the Tribunes, in order to further Cæsar's designs; M. Brutus was in Rome; but although known as the nephew of Cato, and as the son-in-law of Appius Claudius, and considered as a young man of promising talents,§ he had as yet taken no conspicuous share in public affairs. C. Cassius was one of the Tribunes for this year;‖ and C. Octavius, now a boy of about thirteen years of age, was living at Rome under the care of his mother Atia, and of his father-in-law L. Philippus.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

Cæsar dictates terms to the Senate.

On the first of January, 704,¶ when the new Consuls, L. Lentulus and C. Marcellus, entered on their office, C. Curio the late Tribune arrived in Rome from Cæsar's quarters, whither he had lately betaken himself, and presented a letter from Cæsar, addressed to the Senate. It was read at the earnest desire of the Tribunes Q. Cassius and M. Antonius; and contained a statement of Cæsar's services to the Commonwealth, and professions of his willingness to resign his Province and the command of his army, if Pompey would do the same; but otherwise, he said, it was

* Cæsar, *de Bell. Gallico*, lib. viii. c. 7. 45.
† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. v. vii.
‡ Velleius Patercul. lib. ii. c. 72.
§ *Ad Atticum*, lib. v. and vi. *passim*. *Ad Familiar.* lib. xv. epist. v.

* Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. xvi. epist. xi.
† Ibid. lib. viii. epist. xiii.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xl. p. 150.
§ Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. iii. epist. x.
‖ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xxi.
¶ Appian, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. ii. c. 32. Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 152.

unjust to desire him to expose himself without defence to the attempts of his enemies. This language was in itself rebellious, inasmuch as it dictated the terms on which alone he would obey the Senate's orders; the Consuls therefore refused to take the sense of the Senate on the contents of the letter, but called upon the assembly to consider generally the state of the Republic. A vehement debate ensued,* and one or two members urged that Cæsar's proposals should be accepted; but a great majority resolved, on the motion of Scipio, Pompey's father-in-law, that Cæsar should resign the command of his army by a certain day, and that if he refused to comply with this order, his conduct should be regarded as treasonable. The account of these transactions, which goes under Cæsar's name, whether it be really the work of himself or of one of his partisans, naturally represents this decision as being almost extorted from the fears of the Senate by the violence of Pompey's friends, and the apprehension of the military force which he commanded in the neighbourhood of the Capital; but it appears from Cicero's more impartial testimony, that although many of the more moderate Senators† were probably hurried into resolutions more violent than they thought expedient, yet that Cæsar's pretensions were generally regarded with abhorrence; and that they doubted not of the justice, but of the policy of requiring him to give up his army. However, the decree of the Senate was negatived by the Tribunes Antonius and Cassius;‡ upon which the Consuls submitted to the assembly the consideration of this negative; and it was debated in what manner they should counteract it. Nothing was determined on that day; but for some days afterwards the more violent party amongst the Aristocracy exerted their utmost endeavours to bring the question of Cæsar's obedience at once to an issue. The Senators, as had often been practised on similar occasions, put on mourning,§ to express their feeling that the interests of the Commonwealth were obstructed by the behaviour of the Tribunes; and when this step failed to produce any effect, they had recourse to their highest prerogative, and gave their charge to the Consuls, Prætors, Tribunes, and Proconsuls, "to provide for the safety of the Republic." This resolution was entered on the journals of the Senate on the seventh of January; and no sooner was it passed, than Antonius and Cassius, together with Curio,‖ professing to believe their lives in danger, fled in disguise from Rome, and hastened to escape to Cæsar, who was at that time at Ravenna, waiting for the result of his application to the Senate.

He is ordered by the Senate to give up his army.

U. C. 704. Oct. 29.

The Senate's decree is negatived by two of the Tribunes.

Charge given to the Consuls to provide for the safety of the Commonwealth.

The Tribunes fly to Cæsar.

U. C. 705.

It appears from one of Cicero's letters,¶ written a few days before the first of January, that he had calculated on such an event as the flight of the Tribunes, and on its affording Cæsar a pretext for commencing his rebellion. When it had actually taken place, the Senate were well aware of the consequences to which it would lead, and began to make preparations for their defence. Italy was divided into several districts,* each of which was to be placed under the command of a separate officer; soldiers were ordered to be every where levied; money was voted from the treasury to be placed at Pompey's disposal; and the Provinces were assigned to their respective Governors, as Proconsuls or Prætors. Among these appointments, Syria was given to P. Scipio, and the two Gauls, which Cæsar had been just summoned to resign, were bestowed on L. Domitius and M. Considius Nonianus. The whole direction of the forces of the Commonwealth was conferred on Pompey; whose reputation as a General was still so high, that none contemplated the probability of his meeting with an equal antagonist.

The Senate prepares for war.

We have said that, when Curio, Antonius and Cassius fled from Rome, Cæsar was at Ravenna. He had with him at this time no other troops than the thirteenth legion, which had been ordered to winter in Cisalpine Gaul;† the remainder of his army, amounting to eight legions, was avowedly quartered beyond the Alps; but, by the celerity with which one of these legions afterwards joined him, it may be conjectured that it had already received orders to march into Italy, and was on the Italian side of the Alps at the moment when Cæsar commenced hostilities. No sooner was he informed of the flight of the Tribunes, and of the subsequent resolutions of the Senate, than he assembled his soldiers, and expatiated on the violence offered to the Tribunitian character, and on the attempts of his enemies to despoil him of his dignity, by forcing him to resign his Province before the term of his command was expired. Thus much of his speech is avowed by his own party historian: the promises which he made to his followers, and the prospect of spoil and settlements of lands which he held out as the price of their rebellion, it was not equally to his purpose to record, although such temptations were not likely to be omitted. He found his troops perfectly disposed to follow him; and, accordingly, having sent out some men in small parties, with orders to enter unobserved into Ariminum‡ and secure the town, he himself left his quarters at Ravenna late in the evening, and, on the following morning, on his arrival at Ariminum, found that his enterprise had succeeded, and that the place was already in his power. This was the first town of importance without the limits of his Province on the road to Rome; and by thus seizing it he declared himself in open rebellion, and that from this time forward he was to follow, without reserve, that path of lawless usurpation on which he had for so many years been preparing himself to enter.

Cæsar commences his rebellion.

He seizes Ariminum.

At Ariminum he met the fugitive Tribunes,§ whom he introduced, without delay, to his army, in the disguise in which they had fled from Rome, desiring them, at the same time, to relate the violence which they had suffered. Cæsar himself then began to speak, imploring the troops, with the most passionate expressions of grief and

* Cæsar, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. i. c. 2.

† Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xvi. epist. xi. xii. *Ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. vii. ix.

‡ Cæsar, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 2, 3.

§ Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 153.

‖ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xvi. epist. xi. Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 31.

¶ *Ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. ix.

* Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. xvi. epist. xi. xii. Cæsar, *de Bello Civili*, lib. i. c. 6.

† Cæsar, lib. i. c. 7.

‡ Appian, *de Bello Civili*, lib. ii. c. 35.

§ Cæsar, lib. i. c. 8. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 33. Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 154.

indignation, to revenge at once the injuries of their General, and the outrage offered to the Tribunes of the People. In the vehemence of his words and gestures he frequently held up his left hand, and, pointing to the ring which he wore as the well-known badge of Patrician or Equestrian rank, he declared, that he would sooner part with that ring, than fail to satisfy the amplest wishes of those who were now offering their aid to maintain his dignity. The action being seen at a greater distance than the words could be heard, many of the solders imagined that he was promising to advance all his followers to the rank and fortune of the Equestrian order; and this impression tended not a little to inflame their zeal in his behalf. At Ariminum,* also, Cæsar found L. Roscius, one of the Prætors, and L. Cæsar, a distant relation of his own, who had both left Rome in the hopes of preventing an open rupture, and had both consented to be the bearers of a private communication from Pompey to Cæsar. Its substance was an exculpation of his own conduct in the part he had lately taken; in which, he said, he had been actuated by no unkindly feelings towards Cæsar, but from a sense of his paramount duty to the Commonwealth; and he urged Cæsar, in like manner, to wave his personal animosities in consideration of his country, and not to seek to punish his enemies at the price of involving the Republic in a civil war. Cæsar professed to be equally desirous of avoiding bloodshed; and requested L. Cæsar and Roscius to carry back his answer to Pompey: in which, after studiously dwelling on his supposed injuries, he proposed that both Pompey and himself should give up their armies; that Pompey should go into Spain; and that all the forces in Italy should be disbanded on both sides, that the Senate and People of Rome might deliberate and decide on all public questions with perfect freedom; that he himself should resign his Provinces of Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul to the officers appointed by the Senate to succeed him; and that he should go to Rome to offer himself as a candidate for the Consulship. Finally, he requested a personal conference with Pompey, that all things might be fully adjusted, and that both parties might pledge themselves by oath to fulfil the conditions of the treaty.

Fruitless negotiation for peace.

With these terms L. Cæsar and L. Roscius set out on their return to Pompey. But Cæsar,† not waiting to see the result of the negotiation, despatched M. Antonius, who already had taken a command under him, with five cohorts, to occupy Arretium, and, at the same time, he secured, with other detachments, the towns of Ancona, Fanum, and Pisaurum. These movements excited a general consternation;‡ many of the inhabitants fled from their homes at the approach of Cæsar's troops; while men of broken fortunes, and those who had been obliged to go into exile for their crimes, welcomed his arrival as the sure forerunner of a total revolution. The alarm reached Rome, and produced there such an effect, that Pompey judged it expedient to abandon the Capital, as he had not yet organized a force sufficient to withstand the sudden advance of the rebel army. Accordingly, before the nineteenth of January,* he withdrew from Rome towards Capua, accompanied by both the Consuls, the great majority of the inferior Magistrates, and most of the members of the Senate. The treasury was left closely locked; from the precipitation with which the Capital was abandoned, or from a reluctance to carry off treasures, some of which were looked upon as almost too sacred to be invaded, and from the hope that Cæsar would in this point imitate the forbearance of his adversaries. It is said that the sight of every thing most noble in the Commonwealth being now obliged to fly from their country, produced a strong effect on the public mind;† and that compassion for Pompey, and indignation against Cæsar, were for a time the prevailing feelings of the inhabitants of the country towns of Italy. So general was the abhorrence of Cæsar's rebellion, that his own father-in-law, L. Piso,‡ did not hesitate to accompany the Senate in their retreat from Rome; and T. Labienus,§ who had been one of his most favoured lieutenants in Gaul, left him immediately on the open disclosure of his designs against his country, and joined Pompey and the Consuls at Theanum in Campania, on the twenty-fourth of January.

The Senate and Consul withdraw from Rome

It appears certain that Pompey was taken by surprise through the suddenness with which Cæsar commenced hostilities. Trusting probably to the season of the year, he had imagined that he should have two or three months before him; in the course of which he might organize a sufficient force in Italy to prevent Cæsar from advancing, and might thus detain him in Cisalpine Gaul, till the Spanish army, under Afranius and Petreius, could cross the Pyrenees and the Alps to complete his destruction by assailing him in the rear. But when Cæsar opened the campaign, just as the winter was setting in, (for, owing to the defective state of the Roman Calendar, the nominal time was nearly two months in advance of the real season of the year,) Pompey's preparations for defence were paralysed. His actual force consisted chiefly of two legions,|| which had been withdrawn from Cæsar's army by a decree of the Senate in the preceding year, as a reinforcement for the troops of the Republic in Syria; but which had been detained in Italy, when it became apparent that the Commonwealth had more to fear on the side of Gaul than of Parthia. These legions had shared in Cæsar's victories for several years, and when he at last parted from them, one, or both of them, had received from him a liberal donation in money;¶ so that Pompey dared not risk a battle while these troops composed the whole or the greater part of his army.** His officers, it is true, were busy in levying soldiers in different parts of Italy, and particularly in Picenum; that district in which his father

Pompey is unable to meet the enemy.

* Cæsar, lib. i. c. 8, 9. Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xvi. epist. xii.

† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xi. *Ad Familiar.* lib. xvi. epist. xii. Cæsar, lib. i. c. 11.

‡ Appian, lib. ii. c. 35. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xi.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. x. xi. xii. Appian, c. 37.

† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vi. epist. xi.

‡ Ibid. lib. vii. epist. xiii.

§ *Ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xii. xiii.

|| Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xiii. Cæsar, *de Bell. Gallico*, lib. viii. c. 54.

¶ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 29. Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 29.

** *Epist. Pompeii ad Domitium, apud Ciceron. ad Atticum*, lib. viii. epist. xii.

had acquired such great influence, and from which he had himself raised an army of three legions by his personal exertions, when he first took part in public affairs, and though then a youth, without rank or public authority, marched at the head of fifteen thousand men to support the cause of L. Sylla. But these levies were carried on to great disadvantage under the constant alarm of the approach of the enemy.* Under such circumstances, men are unwilling to come forward; and those who might have rallied round any regular force which was already organized, had no inclination to take upon themselves all the dangers of an unequal resistance. Moreover, Pompey might have remembered, from the experience of the last civil war, that soldiers were easily induced to desert officers with whom they were little acquainted, and whose names bore no commanding authority; and that it was therefore most unsafe to trust Generals of no reputation with untried soldiers in the presence of such an enemy as Cæsar, whose liberality was hardly less notorious than his victories. His fixed determination, accordingly, was, to avoid all engagements with the rebels, and to concentrate all the troops that his lieutenants could collect in the south of Italy; after which he would be guided by circumstances, whether still to make a stand in Italy, or to cross over into Greece, and there organize the resources of that part of the Empire in which his past exploits had gained for him so many connections, and such an universal popularity.

His plan of operations.

Pompey was still with the Consuls at Theanum,† when L. Cæsar arrived there on the twenty-fifth of January, with Cæsar's proposed conditions of peace. They were immediately discussed in a Council composed of the principal Senators; and it was agreed to accept them, provided that Cæsar would withdraw his troops from all the towns which he had occupied beyond the limits of his Province. L. Cæsar was sent back with this answer; and Cicero seems for a time to have flattered himself that the war would thus be brought to a conclusion. But Cæsar had no intention of resting contented with the permission of standing for the Consulship, when the sovereignty of Rome seemed within his grasp. He complained that Pompey still continued his levies of soldiers;‡ that his making no mention of a personal conference, betrayed an unwillingness to terminate the quarrel; and that he had fixed no particular day for his departure into Spain. He, meantime,§ on his own part, was raising troops, and awaiting the arrival of the other legions of his own army; he had occupied the towns of Iguvium and Auximum,‖ which Pompey's officers had in vain attempted to defend; and Curio,¶ in his private correspondence, ridiculed the mission of L. Cæsar, as a measure from which the invader had never really anticipated any result. Pompey, still pursuing his plan of retreating, was at Luceria in Apulia, in the beginning of February; and on the seventh of that month,** encouraged by Cæsar's protracted absence, he sent orders to the Consuls at Capua, that they should return with all haste to Rome and carry off the sacred treasures from the treasury, which he now regretted that he had left behind. But the Consuls, judging the attempt too hazardous, declined to put it in execution. The disobedience of one of his officers soon afterwards brought upon Pompey a far severer loss. P. Lentulus Spinther and L. Vibullius Rufus* had been employed in levying soldiers in Picenum, and although, as Cæsar advanced, many of their men deserted, and went over to him, yet Vibullius was able to reach Corfinium with fourteen cohorts, amounting to about eight thousand four hundred men. At Corfinium he found L. Domitius Ænobarbus, with a force of twelve cohorts, and C. Hirrus with five more, which he had collected from the neighbourhood of Camerinum. In this manner an army was assembled of nearly nineteen thousand men; and Vibullius† wrote to Pompey to tell him that Domitius would put the whole in motion to join him on the ninth of February. But, instead of executing this plan, Domitius began to flatter himself that he was strong enough to arrest Cæsar's progress, or, at any rate, to threaten his rear with serious annoyance, if he should venture to pass beyond him, and advance in pursuit of Pompey. It appears, too, that private interests were allowed to influence his decision;‡ and that some individuals, who possessed property in the neighbourhood, induced him to remain, that he might protect their villas, or enable them to remove their effects with greater security. He even divided his forces, and attempted to hold the towns of Sulmo and Alba; and, instead of setting out to join Pompey on the ninth of February, he remained at Corfinium in spite of repeated orders to the contrary, till Cæsar arrived before the town, about the fifteenth or sixteenth,§ with a force which cannot be exactly computed, as he was every day receiving reinforcements either by desertion from the enemy, or by the success of his levies, or by the arrival of detachments from the legions of his own army which he had left in Gaul. Sulmo was soon surrendered to his lieutenant M. Antonius;‖ and the event of the siege of Corfinium was awaited with the most lively interest in every quarter. There were many persons, and Cicero himself was among the number, who expected that Pompey would march to the relief of Domitius, and considered that it would be most disgraceful if he tamely abandoned him. But Domitius had exposed himself to danger in defiance of the express orders of the commander of the armies of the Commonwealth; and he had detained with him the levies from Picenum, on whose fidelity to his person Pompey relied with particular confidence, and whose presence he anxiously looked for to overawe the wavering inclinations of the two legions which he had received from Cæsar. It is possible, indeed, that a more enterprising General might have

L. Domitius attempts to defend Corfinium.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xiii.
† Ibid. lib. vii. epist. xiv. xv.
‡ Cæsar, *de Bello Civili*, lib. i. c. 11.
§ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xviii.
‖ Cæsar, lib. i. c. 12, 13.
¶ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xix.
** *Ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xxi.

* Cæsar, *Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 15. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xxiii. lib. viii. epist. ii. xi.
† *Epist. Pompeii ad L. Domitium*, *apud Ciceron. ad Atticum*, lib. viii. epist. xii.
‡ Ibid. *antea citata.*
§ Ibid. *apud Ciceron. ad Atticum*, lib. viii. c. 12.
‖ Cæsar, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 18. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. viii. epist. iv.

risked the attempt, and might have thought it wise to run all hazards in the hope of putting himself at the head of the soldiers of Picenum; but Pompey, misled perhaps by the example of Sylla, seems to have attached too little value to the possession of Italy, and to have contemplated without regret the prospect of abandoning it for the present, while he was preparing in Greece sufficient resources to enable him, as he trusted, speedily to recover it. Accordingly, having written to Domitius to warn him that he must look for no relief, he continued his retreat towards Brundisium, and reached that place about the twenty-fifth of February.* Domitius, thus left to his own resources, soon found how unequal he was to the task of opposing Cæsar; his soldiers began to perceive his distrust of his own situation, and thought that they were now authorized to consult their own safety.† They immediately mutinied against their Generals, secured the persons of Domitius and the principal officers who were with him, and sent to inform Cæsar that they were ready to open the gates to him, and to put his chief enemies into his power. Upon this offer he took possession of the town, and ordered Domitius, with the other leaders, to be brought before him; when, having reproached some of the number with personal ingratitude to himself from whom they had received many favours, he dismissed them all unhurt, and even allowed Domitius to carry off with him a considerable treasure which he had brought to Corfinium for the payment of his troops. The soldiers he enlisted in his own army; and immediately set out from Corfinium, about the twenty-second of February, to prosecute his march to Brundisium. In this manner Cæsar, like Sylla, owed his first great success to the faithlessness or weakness of his enemy's adherents; and the betrayal of Scipio by his own soldiers in Campania, was now imitated by the troops at Corfinium, who surrendered their post and their General, and themselves joined the standard of the conqueror.

His troops mutiny, and surrender the town to Cæsar.

It now appeared certain that Pompey intended to abandon Italy; and when this determination became known, it necessarily drove the Italians to throw themselves into the arms of Cæsar, since they were left wholly at his mercy. His moderation at Corfinium was every where eagerly reported; and those who had at first dreaded the worst evils from the approach of his army,‡ were now grateful to him in proportion to their former fears, when they saw that he abstained, as yet, from confiscations and proscriptions. There were many Senators also, and men of rank and fortune,§ who, considering the Roman Government inseparable from the possession of Rome, did not think themselves bound to follow Pompey into a foreign country, and looked upon his resignation of the seat of Government as a virtual acknowledgment that Cæsar might now dispose of the Commonwealth with some shadow of lawful authority. P. Lentulus, having been freely spared by Cæsar at Corfinium, was unwilling to take any further part in the quarrel; and even Cicero hesitated whether he should follow Pompey into Greece or not; he having been left at Capua with the care of that part of Italy, and having afterwards been prevented from reaching Brundisium by the rapid advance of Cæsar's army into Apulia. Meanwhile the Consuls, with all the troops which they had been able to raise, had effected their junction with Pompey; but some of his officers, endeavouring to join him from more distant parts of the country, found that Cæsar had intercepted them. Among these P. Rutilius Lupus, one of the Prætors, whilst trying to retreat from Taracina with about eighteen hundred men, fell in with Cæsar's cavalry; upon which his soldiers immediately deserted to the enemy, and he himself, relinquishing the cause of Pompey as desperate, returned to Rome, and there began to perform the ordinary duties of his office in administering justice. Cæsar arrived before Brundisium on the ninth of March, with a force amounting now to six legions; four of which belonged to his own veteran army, and the other two consisted of the troops which he had levied since he entered Italy. He found that the Consuls, with the greater part of the army,* and with a large number of Senators, accompanied by their wives and children, had embarked for the opposite coast of Greece on the fourth of March; and that Pompey, with about twenty cohorts, or twelve thousand men, was apparently resolved to maintain Brundisium against him. He had, a short time before, taken prisoner one of Pompey's officers,† whom he had sent back to Pompey, hoping, according to his own professions, that he would use his influence with his General to agree to a reconciliation, But when Pompey sent this officer to Cæsar‡ with proposals of peace, Cæsar, pretending to consider the terms unsatisfactory, prosecuted the siege of Brundisium with the utmost vigour; and, on the other hand, Pompey is said to have declined another offer on the part of Cæsar to negotiate,§ alleging that he could enter into no treaty in the absence of the Consuls. At the same time, however, that Cæsar was expressing his wish for peace, his followers, in their private reports,‖ gave a very different representation of his intentions; and declared, that he talked of revenging the fates of Carbo and Brutus, and those other members of the party of Marius, whom Pompey had formerly put to death; nay, so eager was he to find grounds of complaint against his antagonist, that he pretended to consider T. Milo as the victim of Pompey's unjust persecution, and thus to espouse the cause of a man, whose only claim on his support was a turbulence and factiousness of spirit resembling his own. Meanwhile the siege of Brundisium was pressed with vigour; and Cæsar attempted to carry out two moles from the opposite sides of the harbour's mouth, with the view of blocking up the passage, and thus depriving the enemy of his means of retreat by sea. But before this work was completed, the ships, which had transported the Consuls¶ and the first division of the army into Greece, returned to Brundisium; and Pompey was finally enabled to embark the remainder of his troops, and to put to sea,

Cæsar besieges Pompey in Brundisium.

Pompey crosses the sea to Greece with his army.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. viii. epist. ix. xi.
† Cæsar, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 19. 23.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. viii. epist. xiii.
§ Ibid. lib. viii. epist. xvi. lib ix. epist. i.

* Cæsar, lib. i. c. 25. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. vi.
† *Epist. Cæsaris ad Oppium et Balbum, apud Ciceron. ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. vii.
‡ Ibid. lib. ix. epist. xiii.
§ Cæsar, lib. i. c. 26.
‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. xiv.
¶ Cæsar, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 27. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. xv.

on the seventeenth of March, with the loss of only two transports, which ran aground at the contracted entrance of the harbour, and were in this manner taken. The citizens of Brundisium immediately opened their gates to Cæsar; and on the eighteenth he entered the town and made a public address to the inhabitants. Thence he resolved at once to move towards Rome, for he was unable to follow Pompey from the want of shipping; and he was anxious to take possession of the seat of Government, and then to carry his army into Spain, and destroy, if possible, the formidable force which was under the command of Pompey in that Province.

It appears that Pompey,* justly regarding Cæsar and his partisans as rebels, had in all his proclamations denounced severe punishments against every one who should abet or countenance them; and by this language he had alarmed and alienated the minds of that large portion of the Italian people, who were disposed, above all things, to consult their own private ease and safety. This feeling towards the opposite party, combined with the fame of his antagonist's moderation, had disposed the inhabitants of the different towns to favour Cæsar's interests, and, on some occasions, to afford him active assistance; but now that Pompey was retired from Italy, the evils occasioned by his rival were more keenly felt, and rendered men in turn dissatisfied with him. Cæsar, although the mere leader of a rebellious army, began to act as if he were the lawful Sovereign of Italy. He sent orders to the chief Magistrates of all the corporate towns to provide a certain number of ships,† and cause them to be sent to Brundisium, there to be in readiness to transport his army into Greece; he quartered his legions in different places, to the great vexation of the inhabitants, who were unused to such a burden in Italy; and he continued to levy soldiers, as he had done from the beginning of his rebellion, while his officers conducted themselves in the execution of a task odious in itself, with much superfluous insolence and offensiveness. The character of his partisans was, indeed, such as would have disgraced the most honourable cause. His own personal profligacy was faithfully imitated by his lieutenants Antonius and Curio; and the reputation of the leaders, together with the revolutionary views which they were supposed to entertain, had attracted to their standard a crowd of desperate and atrocious men,‡ whose appearance filled all respectable citizens with terror.

Cæsar moves towards Rome.

Thus attended, Cæsar moved from Brundisium towards Rome, wishing to assemble and address the Senate, or rather the small minority of Senators who had not left the Capital on the first of April.§ As he was anxious to gain the sanction of every person of credit whom he could at all hope to influence, he wrote to Cicero, earnestly requesting him to meet him at Rome: Cicero, however, having no intention of complying with his wishes, had a personal interview with him on his road, about the twenty-eighth of March, at Formiæ; hoping to persuade him not to press his request any further. But Cæsar told him,* that his absence from the Senate would naturally influence others, and would be looked upon as a condemnation of his conduct. He then urged him to appear in the Senate, and endeavour to bring about a negotiation; but when Cicero replied, that if he did so, he should recommend the Senate to forbid the march of troops into Spain, or their transport into Greece, and should lament the condition to which Pompey had been reduced, Cæsar told him, "that he would have nothing of that sort said;" and in conclusion, finding Cicero resolute in his refusal, he observed, "that if he were denied the benefit of Cicero's advice, he must follow such as he could procure, and should have recourse to extreme measures." On these terms they parted, and Cæsar proceeded on his way to Rome.

His interview with Cicero.

We have already stated that there were many Senators who, after Pompey's departure from Italy, resolved to take no further share in the civil war. Amongst these were L. Volcatius Tullus and Manius Æmilius Lepidus, who had been Consuls in the year 687;† Ser. Sulpicius, who had been Consul in the year 702; and C. Sosius and P. Rutilius Lupus, who were two of the Prætors for the present year. But of this number all were by no means agreed as to the propriety of countenancing Cæsar's usurpation. The two Prætors, by continuing to act in their judicial character at Rome, seemed to acknowledge that the Capital was still the seat of a lawful Government; but L. Tullus and Ser. Sulpicius wished to remain in perfect retirement,‡ and declined to attend the meeting of Senators which Cæsar called together on his arrival. Another Prætor, M. Æmilius Lepidus, afterwards the associate of Octavius and Antonius in the second Triumvirate, had remained at Rome when the Consuls and the majority of the Senate had left it, and was considered to be a decided partisan of Cæsar. M. Cælius Rufus, at this time Curule Ædile, who had been Tribune in the year 701, and had then taken an active part in behalf of Milo, was now also engaged on the side of Cæsar, and appears to have been at this period in Rome.§ L. Cæcilius Metellus, one of the Tribunes, was in Rome also,‖ but with very different intentions; it being his purpose to force Cæsar to display his real contempt for the laws of his country, and to prove how little he himself respected the sacredness of the Tribunitian character, when it was in the way of his own ambition.

Description of the persons who remained in Rome to receive Cæsar.

Cæsar appears to have reached the Capital about the time that he proposed to arrive there, that is, on the first of April; and having assembled as many of the Senators as could be prevailed on to obey his summons, he held to them a language, in which he scarcely attempted to disguise the lawlessness of his usurpation.¶ He again repeated the story of his pretended injuries in not having been allowed to dictate to the Government the terms on which he would obey their orders; and

Cæsar addresses the Senate.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. x. xiii. lib. viii. epist. xi. xvi.

† Cæsar, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 30. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. xix.

‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. xviii. xix.

§ *Ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. xvii.

* *Ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. xviii.

† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xii. lib. viii. epist. i. ix. xv. lib. ix. epist. i.

‡ *Ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. iii.

§ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. viii. epist. xvi.

‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. iv. Cæsar, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. i. c. 33.

¶ Cæsar, lib. i. c. 32.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

he inveighed against the cruelty shewn to the Tribunes Antonius and Q. Cassius, a cruelty which had existed at most only in intention, and, probably, only in the counterfeited fears of those who were its imaginary objects. On such provocations he thought himself entitled to be guilty of rebellion and usurpation; and he entreated the Senate to assist him in the administration of the Republic, telling them plainly, at the same time, that if they were averse to the task, he would not burden them with it, but would govern the Commonwealth by himself. Meanwhile, he recommended that deputies should be sent to Pompey, to endeavour to effect a peace.

This last proposal the Senate, according to Cæsar's own account,* was not unwilling to embrace; but no one could be found to accept the office of ambassador, because they were all afraid to put themselves in Pompey's power after the threats which he had denounced against those who did not follow him out of Italy. This is probably a mere calumny of Cæsar's; and a more natural cause of the general reluctance is assigned by Plutarch,† and implied by Cicero,‡ that no one thought Cæsar sincere in his offer to negotiate. He attempted to carry several other measures through the concurrence of the Senate; but he found even the shadow of that body, which now alone remained, decidedly averse to his interests; and L. Metellus the Tribune interposed his negative on several occasions to defeat Cæsar's objects. All the opposition was nearly indifferent to him, for he was little anxious to have his power supported by law; and, as if he were already the despot of his country, he refused to let his lieutenant C. Curio derive his title to his command in Sicily from a decree of the Senate, but told him that all commissions should proceed from himself. But when L. Metellus endeavoured, by his negative, to prevent him from breaking open the treasury, and from converting the public money to his own use, he was highly irritated, insomuch that, when Metellus,§ as a last resource, placed himself before the door of the treasury, Cæsar threatened him with immediate death, and was disposed to have made this murder, had Metellus persisted in his resistance, the prelude to a general massacre. Thus, within the space of three months, the man, who had attacked his country under pretence of revenging the insults offered to the Tribunitian power, was himself guilty of a most violent outrage upon that power, when exercised in as just a cause as could, on any occasion, have required its protection. But by this act of violence Cæsar lost much of his popularity, even with the lowest of the people;|| and, finding that he was doing himself nothing but mischief by his stay in Rome, he set out before the middle of April on his way to Spain, without venturing to deliver a speech to the people as he had before designed. He intrusted the command of the Capital itself to M. Lepidus;¶ that of the rest of Italy to M. Antonius; C. Curio, as has been before mentioned, was to occupy Sicily; Q. Valerius Orca, Sardinia; and C. Antonius, Illyricum.

Cæsar robs the treasury, and violates the sacredness of the Tribunitian office.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710 — A. C. 59. to 44.

Sicily and Sardinia were won with little difficulty. The first of these Provinces had been assigned by the Senate to M. Cato on the first commencement of the rebellion; but he, judging himself more fitted for civil than for military employments, had declined to accept the command,* so long as there was any prospect of the speedy reestablishment of the Government at Rome. When this became desperate, he went over to Sicily, and exerted himself with great vigour in building ships, in refitting such as he found in the island, and in levying soldiers, not only from among the Sicilians, but from the inhabitants of the opposite coast of Italy. These preparations, however, were in a very imperfect state, when he received the tidings of Curio's approach with an army of three legions; the troops being, indeed, actually carried over into Sicily by C. Asinius Pollio before Curio had joined them to assume the command.† Cato appears to have entered into the war with the same feelings that are ascribed to our own Lord Falkland, under circumstances partly similar: he deeply regretted the bloodshed which must attend the victory of either party, and he justly estimated the wickedness of bringing the miseries of war on the peaceable inhabitants of a country, without any reasonable prospect of success. Accordingly, finding himself unable to maintain possession of the island,‡ he quitted Syracuse on the twenty-fourth of April, and went to join Pompey and the army of the Commonwealth in Greece. Curio thus became master of Sicily without opposition, and Q. Valerius Orca was equally fortunate in Sardinia; for M. Cotta,§ to whom the Senate had intrusted the care of that Province, finding the inhabitants strongly disposed to submit to Cæsar, and being driven out of Caralis, one of the chief towns in the island, by the unassisted efforts of the citizens themselves, despaired of resisting Cæsar's officer, and, abandoning Sardinia, withdrew into Africa, where the cause of the Commonwealth seemed to wear a more promising appearance.

He gains possession of Sicily and Sardinia.

We must now follow the steps of Cæsar towards Spain. On his arrival in Transalpine Gaul, he found that the citizens of Massilia refused to admit him within their walls,|| and were making preparations to stand a siege. Massilia, a Greek colony, founded by the Ionians of Phocæa, when Ionia was first conquered by the Persians in the reign of the elder Cyrus, had been for many years the ally of Rome, and had attained to a considerable height of power and prosperity. Its Government deemed it inconsistent with their relations with Rome to support a rebel General, whatever might have been the success of his rebellion; and L. Domitius, whom Cæsar had taken prisoner and dismissed at Corfinium, having been since busily employed in collecting a squadron of light vessels and manning them with his slaves and dependents from his estates near Cosa in Etruria, was expected soon in Transalpine Gaul, the command of which had

He marches into Spain. The city of Massilia refuses to acknowledge his authority.

* Lib. i. c. 33. † *In Cæsare*, c. 35.
‡ *Ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. i.
§ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. iv. Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 35.
|| Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. iv. *Ad Familiares*, lib. viii. epist. xvi.
¶ Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 6. Appian, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. ii. c. 41.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. xv. Cæsar, lib. i. c. 30.
† Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 53. Appian, lib. ii. c. 40.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. xvi. Cæsar, lib. i. c. 30. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 53.
§ Cæsar, lib. i. c. 30. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. xvi.
|| Cicero, lib. i. c. 34, *et seq.*

been conferred on him by the Senate, as we have before mentioned. According to Cæsar's account, the Massilians, after making professions of perfect neutrality, received Domitius into their city as soon as his squadron arrived, and placed all their resources at his disposal: but it seems more likely that Cæsar had insisted on their acknowledging his authority, and, from the moment they had refused to do so, had already regarded them as enemies; so that their reception of Domitius was rendered unavoidable. Be this as it may, their hostility to Cæsar soon assumed a decided shape, and he laid siege to their city with three legions. About a month was employed in the construction of a fleet of twelve ships of war by his orders in the neighbouring port of Arelate, and in preparing towers and other works for the attack of the walls; after which he gave the command of the army to C. Trebonius, and of the fleet to Decimus Brutus, (both of them afterwards in the number of his assassins,) and pursued his own course, according to his original intention, into Spain.

Siege of Massilia commenced

Spain was at this time held by three of Pompey's lieutenants: L. Afranius, who had been Consul with Q. Metellus Celer in the year 693; M. Petreius, a veteran officer, who, as lieutenant of the Consul C. Antonius, had commanded the forces of the Commonwealth in the battle in which L. Catiline was defeated and killed in the year 691; and M. Terentius Varro, a man more distinguished as a writer and philosopher than as a General. Their united force is stated by Cæsar to have amounted to seven legions;* two of which, under M. Varro, were occupying the southern part of Spain, while Afranius and Petreius, with the remaining five, and a numerous body of Spanish auxiliaries, had stationed themselves on the north of the Ebro, and had fixed their head-quarters at Ilerda on the Sicoris. Cæsar had already sent C. Fabius his lieutenant with four legions across the Pyrenees, and others were ordered to follow without delay. A considerable auxiliary force of Gauls also accompanied the army, and the Gaulish cavalry in particular is said to have been both numerous and excellent. Meantime a report was current that Pompey, with all his own army, was on his way to Spain to join his lieutenants; and the apprehension of so formidable an accession to the strength of the enemy, induced Cæsar to attempt to bind most closely the attachment of his own soldiers to himself. For this purpose he borrowed money of the military Tribunes and Centurions, and with this fund he was enabled to make a donation to the troops; a step by which he not only conciliated the soldiers, but secured the fidelity of the officers, whose only hope of being repaid rested in the victory of their General.

State of the army of the Commonwealth in Spain.

It is not easy to ascertain the precise amount of the numbers of Cæsar's army, when he himself arrived to take the command. They were at least equal to those of the enemy in regular infantry, and Cæsar was expecting additional reinforcements of Gauls, which might place his auxiliary force on a level with that of his opponents. However, Afranius and Petreius were unwilling to risk a general action with the veteran soldiers of Cæsar's legions; and they resolved rather to protract the contest, being

Cæsar arrives in Spain.

* Cæsar, lib. i. c. 38.

abundantly provided with resources, and being in a position which they had themselves chosen as the seat of war. The town of Ilerda was situated on the right bank of the Sicoris, and their army was encamped before it; so that Cæsar had pitched his camp on the same side of the river, preserving also his communications with the left bank by means of two bridges,* distant nearly four miles from each other, which had been constructed at points higher up the Sicoris. The country which he could command on the right bank was confined within narrow limits by the river Cinga, which flows into the Sicoris just above its confluence with the Ebro, and whose course was distant from Ilerda something less than thirty miles. This district was soon exhausted; as Afranius had already conveyed the greatest part of the corn which he could find in it into Ilerda, and Cæsar's troops had quickly consumed whatever had not been thus preoccupied. But, as large convoys of provisions were on their way from Gaul and Italy, as some of the more distant Spanish tribes had also engaged to send supplies, and as Cæsar's own plundering parties made frequent excursions on the left bank of the Sicoris, the support of the army seemed likely to be well secured.† It happened, however, that for some days there fell an unusual quantity of rain, which combined with the melting of the snow on the mountains to produce a great and sudden flood; insomuch, that both Cæsar's bridges were blown up in the course of the same day. Nor did the waters soon abate; but continued so high as to baffle all attempts at repairing the bridges, and effectually to cut off all intercourse with the opposite bank of the river. Under these circumstances Cæsar's foraging parties on the left bank were unable to rejoin the army, and several large convoys of provisions, which had reached the Sicoris, found themselves suddenly intercepted. The army of the Commonwealth, meantime, still preserved its communications uninterrupted, by means of the bridge at Ilerda; and in this manner Afranius, hearing of the detention of Cæsar's convoys, crossed the river with three legions and all his cavalry, and set out by night in the hope of surprising them. According to Cæsar's account,‡ the gallant resistance of some Gaulish horse enabled the greater part of the convoys to effect their escape to the higher grounds; some baggage, however, was taken, and the prospect of the safe arrival of the rest was rendered extremely doubtful. Great distress began to be felt in Cæsar's army; the price of corn rose to an extravagant height; the strength and spirits of the soldiers were affected by the necessary reduction in their allowance of food; whilst the legions of Afranius were abundantly supplied with every thing, and the Generals themselves, full of confidence in their final success, transmitted to Rome the most favourable reports of the state of their affairs, and represented, perhaps with some exaggeration, the distress of the enemy.

Campaign on the Sicoris.

Distress of Cæsar owing to the destruction of his bridges by a flood.

Under these circumstances Cæsar ordered his men to make a great number of boats, of a construction which, he tells us, he had learnt in Britain; and which may still be seen in the coracles used by the descendants of the Britons in the rivers and mountain

His army is carried over the river in light boats.

* Cæsar, lib. i. c. 40. † Ibid. c. 48.
‡ Ibid. c. 51.

akes of Wales. A light frame or skeleton of wood was filled up with wicker work, and then covered over on the outside with hides.* The boats thus formed were transported in waggons about twenty miles up the river by night, and, being then put into the water, carried over a detachment of troops immediately, who occupied a hill close to the bank. One entire legion was then ferried across in the same manner; and, the work being carried on at once from both banks, a new bridge was completed in two days. The dispersed convoys and the foraging parties, which had been detained on the left bank, now joined the army; and a large proportion of Cæsar's cavalry, crossing the river as soon as the bridge was finished, attacked some of the foragers of the enemy with great success, defeated their covering party of light troops, and returned to their camp on the right bank, bringing with them a very considerable booty. Indeed, Cæsar's cavalry was so decidedly superior to that of Afranius, that, as soon as he had reestablished his communication with the opposite bank of the Sicoris, he was enabled to retaliate on his antagonists the evils which had lately pressed upon himself. He commanded the country so as to prevent them from getting any provisions by foraging; and several of the Spanish tribes now thought it expedient to espouse his cause, and brought him abundant supplies of corn. The distance of his new bridge from his camp was still an inconvenience; to remedy which he proposed to render the Sicoris fordable at a point nearer to his present station, by drawing off a part of its waters into several small cuts, as the floods had, probably, by this time considerably abated. When he had made some progress in this work, the enemy's Generals thought it expedient to change entirely their plan of operations. They resolved to retire behind the Ebro;† and, relying on the affection of those Celtiberian tribes, which had received signal favours from Pompey in return for their assistance in his contest with Sertorius, they expected to draw from them such reinforcements of cavalry as might enable them to oppose Cæsar on equal terms, and to protract the war with advantage in a friendly country, till the return of winter. On the other hand, delay would be to Cæsar hardly less fatal than defeat. Neither the character nor the resources of his lieutenant M. Antonius were calculated to ensure his possession of Italy, if Cæsar should be long detained in Spain; and the Aristocracy might rally a sufficient force in Rome and in Italy to shake off the military usurpation by which it was enslaved, even without the aid of that formidable fleet and army which the Generals of the Commonwealth had already assembled in Epirus.

The army of the Commonwealth annoyed by Cæsar's superior cavalry.

The Generals of the Commonwealth's army propose to retire behind the Ebro.

We must suppose that Afranius and Petreius had not calculated on Cæsar's bringing with him into Spain a cavalry so decidedly superior to their own; as otherwise, their choice of Ilerda, as the base of their operations, seems to have been originally unwise. The country, for some miles on every side of that town, is a plain, on which cavalry can act with advantage; and accordingly we find that, as soon as Cæsar had remedied the accidental inconvenience produced by the loss of his bridges, the enemy were unable to cope with him, and were driven to abandon the ground on which they had at first proposed to carry on the campaign. Measures were taken by Afranius and Petreius to secure their retreat. A bridge of boats was begun to be thrown across the Ebro, near the point of its confluence with the Sicoris, and at the distance of something less than twenty miles from their present camp;* all the small craft on the river were secured and brought together on this spot; and two legions of their army crossed at once from Ilerda to the left bank of the Sicoris, and there formed a camp. At length, when they were informed that Cæsar's artificial cuts had nearly rendered the river fordable for infantry, they put their whole force in motion, and leaving only a small garrison in Ilerda, they transported all their troops to the opposite bank, and effected their junction with the two legions which, as we have mentioned, they had sent across before. From this point their course was through the plain of Ilerda, descending the left bank of the Sicoris for several miles; after which they would meet with a tract of wild and mountainous country extending as far as the Ebro. If then they could once reach the mountains, their retreat was accomplished, for the passes might be easily secured so as to check the pursuit of an enemy; and whilst they had only to march on in a straight line, Cæsar's infantry was still detained on the right bank of the river, and if he should attempt to go round by his own bridge, the circuit, which he would be thus obliged to perform, would render his chance of overtaking them before they had passed the plain utterly desperate. With these prospects Afranius and Petreius commenced their march a little before daybreak.

They retreat from Ilerda towards the Ebro.

It appears, however, that Cæsar had anticipated their purpose, and had already sent his whole cavalry across the river,† to be prepared to harass and impede their progress from the instant that they should quit their camp. This service was performed very effectually; the army of the Commonwealth having no horse or light troops of any description that could at all repel the annoyance. Meantime, as soon as it was day, Cæsar's infantry, seeing what was passing on the opposite side of the river, were impatient to join in the pursuit; and their General, availing himself of their ardour, ventured to ford the Sicoris with his whole army, leaving behind only one legion to guard his camp, together with those soldiers from the other legions whose bodily strength or courage seemed unequal to the enterprise. When he had gained the left bank, he pressed his march with such rapidity, that, although he had crossed the river some distance above Ilerda, and some delay had taken place in effecting the passage, he yet came up with the enemy three or four hours before sunset.‡ Afranius halted on a rising ground and offered battle; Cæsar halted too, not to fight, but to give his soldiers some refreshment; and when Afranius again attempted to continue his retreat, he experienced a renewal of the same annoyance as before from Cæsar's irresistible cavalry. Wearied with a long day of marching in retreat, and of fighting at continual disadvantage, the army of the Commonwealth halted, and formed their camp for the night, when they were now within five miles of those friendly mountains, to reach which was certain safety.

They are pursued by Cæsar.

* Cæsar, lib. i. c. 54. † Ibid. lib. i. c. 61.

* Cæsar, lib. i. c. 61. † Ibid. lib. i. c. 63. ‡ Ibid. lib. i. c. 64.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

About midnight Afranius and Petreius prepared, in silence, to recommence their march;* but some of their men having ventured too far to get water, were taken by Cæsar's cavalry, and their intention was thus discovered. Cæsar ordered the alarm to be instantly sounded, and the call to be given to his soldiers to commence the pursuit. The camps were so near to one another, that this note of preparation was clearly heard by the enemy's army; and the Generals, dreading the confusion of a night—engagement, while encumbered with their baggage on the march, changed their purpose, and kept their troops in their quarters. On the following day parties were sent out on both sides to reconnoitre the nature of the ground over which the retreat was to be continued; and when the report was received, Afranius and Petreius resolved to set out on the following morning, not doubting but that they should be able to gain the mountains, even if it were at the price of some partial losses. Cæsar also formed his plan; and, in pursuance of it, he put his army in motion at the very earliest dawn of the succeeding day, and, leaving his heavy baggage in his camp, set out apparently in the opposite direction from that which led to the mountains, following no road, but making the best of his way across the country. By a fatal and incomprehensible infatuation, Afranius and Petreius lost some irretrievable moments in congratulating themselves on the defeat of their enemy's plans, imagining that, having advanced beyond his resources, he was obliged to abandon the pursuit from want of provisions. They lingered in their camp,† till they saw the direction of this fancied retreat suddenly changed, and perceived Cæsar's army wheel round to the right, and push forward with the utmost speed to reach the mountains, and intercept their escape. Then perceiving their danger, every man at once ran to arms, and the army resumed its march with redoubled rapidity, striving to disappoint Cæsar's designs, and to gain their place of safety before they were for ever precluded from attaining it.

Their retreat cut off.

Their efforts, however, were fruitless.‡ They were harassed by Cæsar's cavalry; and this impediment more than counterbalanced the natural difficulties of ground with which Cæsar himself had to struggle. He reached the mountains first, and there drew out his army on a commanding ridge, in front of his baffled enemy. Afranius halted with his troops on a hill, which rose in the outskirts of the mountain region, and made one last effort to secure, with his light troops, the highest point in the chain before him; hoping, if the attempt succeeded, to carry his whole army thither, and still to retreat over the high grounds, though by a somewhat different course from that which he had originally designed. But he saw the whole detachment which he had sent on this service cut to pieces before his eyes by Cæsar's cavalry; and his troops, dispirited by repeated disappointments, seemed hardly able to resist an attack, if Cæsar should now try to finish the campaign by a single battle. Cæsar, however, preferred a surer and more bloodless victory; and purposely so altered the disposition of his troops, as to allow Afranius to fall back to his camp without fear of interruption. The hill on which the army of the Commonwealth was now posted, was untenable from its want of water; and no better prospect presented itself, than to return to the camp which they had left in the morning. Accordingly they did so; while Cæsar, having carefully occupied every pass in the mountains which led to the Ebro, again moved towards his enemy, and pitched his camp for the night as near to theirs as possible.

* Cæsar, lib. i. c. 66. † Ibid c. 69. ‡ Ibid. c. 70. 72.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

The issue of the campaign was now clearly decided, and the remaining faint struggles made by Afranius and Petreius to protract their fate do not require a very minute detail. They attempted to retreat to Ilerda, where they had left some supplies of corn;* but being harassed, as before, by Cæsar's cavalry, their progress was continually impeded, their parties sent out to get water were cut off, and at last, when they remained in their camp, as if wearied with the unceasing annoyance to which they were exposed on their march, Cæsar prepared to surround them with a line of circumvallation, and thus force them to surrender at discretion from mere famine. Before matters had come to this extremity, the soldiers on both sides had, on one occasion, begun to communicate with each other; and those of Afranius, availing themselves of the temporary absence of their Generals from the camp, proposed to submit to Cæsar, if he would engage to spare the lives of their commanders. So far had this unauthorized negotiation proceeded, that several officers and soldiers from either army passed without fear into the opposite camp; and the Spanish chiefs in particular, whom Afranius kept with him as hostages for the fidelity of their tribes, were eager to commend themselves to the protection of the conqueror. But Afranius and Petreius, being informed of the subject in agitation, hastened back to their camp; and Petreius, attended by some troops especially attached to his person, appeared suddenly on the rampart, broke off the conferences between the soldiers, drove away Cæsar's men, and seized and put to the sword all of them whom he could find within his own lines. No doubt every superior officer in Cæsar's army might justly have been executed as a traitor and rebel; but justice itself, when not supported by adequate power, becomes useless cruelty; and the conduct of Petreius on this occasion, besides the barbarity of such an indiscriminate slaughter of defenceless men, was merely likely to provoke a victorious enemy to a severe retaliation. When, therefore, the army of the Commonwealth was reduced to the last extremity, and the Generals, if we may believe Cæsar, threw themselves entirely on his mercy,† he reproached them bitterly for their cruelty to his soldiers, and represented this conduct as perfectly agreeable to the general treatment which he had received from the partisans of Pompey; but he was too politic to follow their example, and agreed to spare them and their troops, on condition of their quitting Spain and disbanding their army. This last stipulation was most welcome to the vanquished soldiers, who thus, unexpectedly, obtained their release from service at the hands of their enemy. The natives of Spain were dismissed immediately; the rest of the troops were marched through Gaul to the frontiers of Italy, receiving rations from Cæsar on their way, and when they arrived at the river Var, they also were all disbanded.

They endeavour to return to Ilerda.

But are obliged to surrender

and are disbanded.

* Cæsar, lib. i. c. 73—84. † Ibid. c. 84—87.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

Afranius and Petreius repaired to Greece, and joined the army of Pompey.

M. Varro still remained in arms in the south of Spain;* and, on receiving tidings of the issue of the campaign on the Sicoris, he intended to shut himself up with his army of two legions in the island of Gades, more familiar to our ears under its present appellation of the Isle of Leon. Here he had collected a fleet and considerable magazines of corn, and had also raised a large sum of money, partly by forced contributions from the Roman citizens resident in the Province, and partly by seizing the treasures and sacred ornaments from the famous temple of Hercules in the neighbourhood of the town. Cæsar, with his usual activity, hastened to extinguish these last remains of hostility in Spain;† and, having sent before him two legions, under the command of Q. Cassius, he followed himself with six hundred horse; issuing at the same time a proclamation, by which the Magistrates and chief men of all the towns of the Province were required to meet him on a certain day at Corduba. The fame of his victory over Afranius and Petreius had produced so general an impression in his favour, that his proclamation was every where obeyed, and every town took an active part in his cause. The people of Gades declared for Cæsar, and expelled from their city the officer to whom Varro had intrusted the command; and one of the two Roman legions that composed Varro's army deserted him openly, and marched away to Hispalis. Upon this, Varro offered to surrender his remaining legion, together with the fleet, corn, and money that he had collected for the war. Cæsar received his submission at Corduba, where he found the principal individuals of the Province, both Romans and Spaniards, assembled according to his orders. He thanked them for the zeal which they had shown in his cause, and remitted to the Roman citizens among them the contributions which Varro had demanded. He thence proceeded to Gades, where he ordered the treasures, taken from the temple of Hercules, to be restored; and having left Q. Cassius, with four legions, to command the Province, he embarked on board the fleet which Varro had just surrendered to him, and arrived, after a short passage, at Tarraco. Here he received a number of deputations from the different towns of the north of Spain, and having bestowed some honours on such States and individuals as had most assisted him in his late campaign, he set out from Tarraco by land, and returned to that part of his army which he had left under C. Trebonius employed in the siege of Massilia. It is said that the complete conquest of Spain was effected in forty days from the period of his first opening the campaign on the Sicoris.‡

Surrender of M. Varro, the last General of the Commonwealth in Spain.

All Spain submits to Cæsar.

He returns to Massilia.

Surrender of Massilia.

The citizens of Massilia were, by this time, reduced to the last extremity,§ their naval force having been totally defeated by Decimus Brutus, a considerable breach having been made in their walls, and they themselves suffering the combined evils of scanty sustenance and disease. Accordingly, on Cæsar's arrival before the town, they offered to surrender to him, L. Domitius having already effected his escape by sea; and their submission was so far accepted, that their city was preserved from plunder, and was even allowed to retain its liberty; but they were obliged to surrender all the arms and military engines in their arsenals, to give up all their ships, to pay to Cæsar all the money in their treasury, and at a subsequent period to forfeit most of the dominion which they possessed beyond their own walls. Before the end of the siege, Cæsar received intelligence from Rome, that he had been appointed Dictator by M. Lepidus the Prætor, in pursuance of a decree of the People. Nothing could be more illegal than such an appointment, made as it was without the authority of the Senate, or the nomination of either of the Consuls;* but it appears that the absence of the chief Magistrates of the Commonwealth had somewhat embarrassed Cæsar's party, and that they did not know how to procure his election as Consul for the year following, without this previous measure of conferring on him the Dictatorship, that he might be enabled to preside at the Comitia. This could not be done by Lepidus,† who was only Prætor, and far less by any inferior officer: there was no alternative, therefore, but to appoint Cæsar Dictator, or to allow the year to expire without proceeding to any election; and then, when the present Consuls should have resigned their power, to let the Comitia be held, as was usual in such cases, by an Interrex. But Cæsar now being invested with the title, at least, of a lawful Magistrate, set out for Rome, as soon as Massilia had surrendered, in order to exercise his power in the civil Government with more effect than during his late visit to the Capital on his way from Brundisium to Spain. He was unexpectedly detained, however, at Placentia by a mutiny which broke out in a part of his army,‡ owing, as it is said, to the disappointment of the soldiers in not being gratified, as they had hoped, with the plunder of Italy. Cæsar's ability displayed itself on this occasion to great advantage. He addressed the mutinous troops in the firmest tone; and, as they professed to wish to gain their discharge, he instantly dismissed from his service one entire legion, and punished with death the principal authors of the mutiny; after which, finding the legion most anxious to be again received into favour, he consented to revoke its punishment, and to continue it in his service. In this manner, like Cromwell on a similar occasion, he quelled the most formidable danger that could threaten him, by appearing unmoved by it; and whilst he was trampling on all laws himself, gave a lesson to his followers that they were not to be indulged with an equal license. From Placentia he then proceeded to Rome, and entered on the Dictatorship; but not choosing at present to hold this unpopular title longer than was necessary, he held the Comitia for the election of Consuls, and, having procured his own nomination, together with that of P. Servilius Isauricus, he laid down his office of Dictator in eleven days after he had begun to exercise it.§

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

Cæsar is appointed Dictator.

Mutiny of Cæsar's troops at Placentia.

But within this short space of time there were not a few important subjects which claimed his attention.

* Cæsar, lib. ii. c. 17. † Ibid. c. 19—21.
‡ Ibid. c. 32.
§ Ibid. c. 22. Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 165.

* Appian, *de Bello Civili*, lib. ii. c. 48.
† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. ix.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 165. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 69.
§ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 2.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

When he had set out for Spain some months before, he left the command of Italy, as has been already mentioned, to M. Antonius. A rebel General in this manner subjected the first country in the Empire to the absolute control of one of the vilest of his rebel officers. Antonius acted on no other authority than Cæsar's commission; but this empowered him to prevent any one from leaving Italy,* and to conduct himself as the master of a conquered Province. He travelled about, accompanied at once by his mistress, who was carried in an open litter, by his wife, and by his mother, and attended by a train of men and women of the most abandoned description. He obliged the several towns through which he passed to send out deputations to meet him, and to offer complimentary addresses, in which his mistress, who was by profession an inferior actress, was saluted with the name of Volumnia, a name consecrated in the traditions of Rome, as having been that of the wife or mother of Coriolanus. On other occasions, when the Magistrates of some of the most considerable cities were summoned to attend him,† he treated them with studied insult, because their towns had incurred Cæsar's displeasure from their disinclination to his cause. This behaviour tended greatly to alienate the affections of the people of Italy, and to make them anticipate the evils likely to follow from the final victory of a party, whose adherents already so boldly defied and insulted public opinion. Even the dispositions of the army began to waver; and, as far as we can learn from some hints in Cicero's letters to Atticus,‡ there were some of Cæsar's officers who were already disgusted with the party which they had chosen, and who secretly fomented the discontent of the soldiers. The Centurions of three cohorts, posted at Pompeii, came to Cicero,§ while he was residing at his villa in that neighbourhood, and offered to place themselves, their soldiers, and the town which they occupied, at his disposal. He was not disposed to commit himself by accepting their offer; but it shows how fair a prospect Pompey would have had of regaining Italy, if he had availed himself of Cæsar's absence to make a descent upon it. Meanwhile, the minds of men in general were kept in a continual ferment. We have seen, on former occasions, that the number of debtors at Rome, unable or unwilling to satisfy their creditors, was usually very considerable; and as the habits of the times became more expensive, it was likely to be perpetually increasing. The present distracted state of Italy contributed to aggravate the difficulties of persons of this description. Money, it appears, had risen greatly in value;‖ partly, perhaps, from the sums taken out of circulation by the many wealthy individuals who followed Pompey into Greece; partly from the great demand for it to maintain such large armies as were now on foot in different parts of the Empire; and partly, we may suppose, from the practice of hoarding, which is always common amongst a large proportion of the community, in times of apprehended distress and danger. On the other hand, landed property was as naturally depreciated; for no one liked to purchase that which might soon be wrested from him to furnish settlements for the veteran soldiers of the party which might finally prove victorious. In this manner, a debtor could neither readily raise money by the sale of his estates to discharge the principal of his debt, nor could he easily find means to pay the interest, which, in itself, was a great and now a permanent burden. Many, therefore, were looking forward with hope to a total revolution, by which all debts would at once be cancelled; many derived encouragement from the assurance of Antonius,* that all exiles would soon be allowed to return to their country; while others, again, were anticipating with horror a regular system of proscription and massacre whenever Cæsar should return from Spain. His arrival, invested as he was with the power of Dictator, was thus viewed on all sides with eagerness and anxiety; and men watched to see the first measures of his Government, by which they might judge whether he intended to imitate Sylla or Catiline; whether he felt himself strong enough to disclaim, as a tyrant, the principles which he had favoured as a demagogue; or whether he still proposed to tread consistently in the steps of his early life, and to uphold the needy, the extravagant, and the licentious, in their several courses of fraud, and dissipation, and profligacy.

State of Italy during the first year of the civil war.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

But Cæsar knew that no Government can sport with the rights of property without sinking into weakness and contempt. He was obliged, therefore, to uphold the cause of the creditor, and to give no countenance to those who called for an entire abolition of all debts; but yet, wishing to relieve the debtor, he ordered that certain Commissioners should be appointed to estimate the property of an insolvent,† and to oblige the creditor to receive it in payment at the price which it would have borne before the war. It is added, by Suetonius,‡ that he caused all sums, previously paid as interest, to be deducted from the principal of the debt; by which regulation, together with the preceding one, the creditor sustained, on the whole, a loss of twenty-five per cent. In his next measure, the Dictator was enabled to indulge his inclinations with less restraint. We have already mentioned the improvements introduced in the laws against bribery and other offences during Pompey's last Consulship; and that several individuals were tried and banished under the provisions of his acts. Cæsar now procured a decree of the people, reversing all the sentences passed at that time,§ and allowing all who had been sufferers from them to return to their country; alleging, that an undue influence had been exercised against them by the presence of Pompey's military force in the city during their trials. But to show the real motives by which he was actuated, he excepted Milo from the benefit of this decree,‖ because he was well known to be an enemy to the popular party; although no one had been condemned at the same period against whom Pompey had testified a stronger feeling of dislike. It should be observed, too, that the language of Cicero, on several occasions, implies a far

Cæsar's regulations in his Dictatorship.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. x. xvi. *Philippic.* ii. c. 23.
† Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. xiii.
‡ Ibid. lib. x. epist. xii. xiv. xv. xvi.
§ Ibid. lib. x. epist. xvi.
‖ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 1. Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 170, 171.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. xiii.
† Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 1. ‡ *In Cæsare*, c. 42.
§ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 1.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 170. Appian, lib. ii. c. 48.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

more general restoration of exiles on this occasion, than Cæsar or his partisans have thought proper to acknowledge;* that Dion Cassius, Appian, and Suetonius agree in asserting, distinctly, the same thing; and that Suetonius adds further,† that all those who had been degraded by the Censors, were in like manner restored to their former rank. The object of this last step was probably to gratify those individuals whom Appius Claudius had lately disgraced in his Censorship, and who at that very time threw themselves into the arms of Cæsar, in the hope of obtaining, through him, the recovery of their dignity. When he had thus rewarded his followers, and endeavoured to gratify that class of persons who were most disposed to support him, without greatly offending the possessors of property, he resigned the Dictatorship, as has been already mentioned, and set out for Brundisium. Here his army had been ordered to assemble; and the troops which had returned from Gaul and Spain, together with those which he had raised in Italy, formed, on the whole, a force of no fewer than twelve legions.‡ Some of these, however, were hardly more than skeletons, owing to their losses in former campaigns, which had not been yet made up, and to the effects of sickness, produced by the sudden change which many of the men had experienced from the climate of Spain and Gaul, to the influence of an autumn in Apulia; nor had he ships to enable him at once to transport into Greece so considerable an army. According to his own statement, the seven legions, which he at first proposed to embark, amounted to no more than twenty thousand infantry and six hundred cavalry, implying a diminution of their original numbers, for which his accounts of his former campaigns by no means would have prepared us; and with this force he put to sea on the fourth of January, and on the following day effected his landing in safety on the coast of Epirus.

He leaves Rome and proceeds to Brundisium

From which he crosses over to Greece. U. C. 705.

Campaign of Curio in Africa. U. C. 704.

The advantages which Cæsar had gained in Spain and Italy in the first year of the war, were somewhat checkered by the ill success of his officers in Africa and in Illyricum. We have already seen that C. Curio had occupied Sicily without opposition, M. Cato having thought his forces insufficient to defend the island, and having accordingly abandoned it before the arrival of the enemy. Curio's original instructions from Cæsar,§ directed him to cross over into Africa so soon as he should have secured Sicily; and this first object being already effected, he set sail with two legions, about the middle of the summer, and reached the African coast in safety after a passage of two days and three nights. The Roman Province of Africa was at this time held by P. Atius Varus, an officer attached to the cause of Pompey, but little scrupulous, as it appears, of disregarding the forms of the Commonwealth. He had been opposed to Cæsar in Italy, at the beginning of the rebellion; and being then deserted by his soldiers, he left Italy, and hastened to Africa,‖ a Province which had formerly fallen to his lot to govern in the year that followed his Prætorship.

State of that Province.

His old authority in that country was still favourably remembered; and the late Prætor, C. Considius, having returned to Rome,* and left the Province under the care of his lieutenant, Q. Ligarius, till the appointment and arrival of a successor, P. Varus thought proper to take the chief command upon himself, in order to secure so valuable a portion of the Empire from the usurpation of Cæsar. Ligarius was a quiet man, and was glad to be released from a situation of much difficulty and danger; so that he willingly allowed Varus to supersede him. But soon after L. Tubero† arrived off the coast, as the lawful successor of C. Considius, having received Africa as his Province, amongst the various appointments made by the authority of the Senate just before they were compelled by Cæsar to abandon the Capital. It seems, however, that Tubero had no inclination to accept the office, and had only been persuaded to do so by the strong remonstrances of some of his friends, who represented his compliance as a duty which he owed to his country in these times of peril. A man thus reluctantly engaged in the cause, appeared to Varus unfit to be trusted with a post of such importance as the command of Africa; and thus availing himself of the license of civil wars, Varus forcibly excluded the lawful officer of the Commonwealth from taking possession of his Province, and would not even suffer him to set his foot upon the shore. Tubero, thus repelled, showed the injustice of the suspicions entertained against him, by repairing immediately to the standard of the Commonwealth in Macedonia;‡ while the possession of Africa was to be disputed between two parties, both of whom were equally destitute of a legal title to it.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

Varus, however, professed to act as an officer of the Commonwealth, and a partisan of Pompey; and as such was strongly supported by Juba, King of Mauritania. That Prince was the son of Hiempsal,§ who, in the civil wars between Marius and Sylla, had supported the party of the Aristocracy, and had been rewarded for his services with the Kingdom of Mauritania, when Pompey overthrew the united forces of Domitius and Hiarbas, and established the authority of Sylla in Africa. Juba therefore was disposed, naturally, to assist Pompey as the benefactor of his family; and his assistance was given with double readiness when he found that the army against which it was required was commanded by Curio; for it seems that Curio,‖ during his Tribuneship, had proposed a law to declare the Kingdom of Mauritania forfeited to the Roman People. The succour which Juba afforded was prompt and decisive.¶ Curio obtained at first some advantages over the Roman forces under Varus; but being too much elated by his success, he neglected the necessary precautions; and attacking the army which Juba brought up to the relief of Varus, without duly acquainting himself with its strength, he and the entire force under his command were cut to pieces. By this victory the Province of Africa remained under the authority of the

Juba, King of Mauritania, assists the party of the Commonwealth in Africa.

Defeat and death of Curio.

* *Ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. i. xi. lib. x. epist. xiii. xiv.
† *In Cæsare*, c. 41.
‡ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 2. 6.
§ Cæsar, *de Bello Civili*, lib. i. c. 30. lib. ii. c. 23.
‖ Ibid. lib. i. c. 31. Cicero, *pro Ligario*, c. 2.

* Cicero, *pro Ligario*, c. 2.
† Ibid. c. 7. Cæsar, lib. i. c. 31.
‡ Cicero, *pro Ligario*, c. 8.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 172. edit. Leunclav. Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 12. *Auctor de Bello Africano*, c. 56.
‖ Cæsar, lib. ii. c. 25.
¶ Ibid. lib. ii. c. 36, *et seq.*

Commonwealth, and became afterwards the favourite refuge of the Constitutional party when the defeat of Pharsalia had ruined their cause in Greece and Asia.

Defeat of Cæsar's lieutenants in Illyricum.

With regard to the operations in Illyricum, our information is exceedingly defective. It appears that Cæsar, before his departure for Spain,* had left C. Antonius, the brother of Marcus, with a certain naval and military force in Illyricum, which country was comprised, together with the Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul, within the limits of his original Province. Its occupation at the present moment was of considerable importance to Cæsar's interests; because it might otherwise, during his absence in Spain, have afforded to Pompey a passage to the north of Italy, and thus have enabled him to cut off the resources which Cæsar drew in abundance from the attachment of the people of that country. Reports, indeed, were prevalent at Rome as early as the month of April, that Pompey was actually making this attempt;† but his plans were of another kind, and his armaments were not yet in such a state of forwardness as to encourage him to act on the offensive. To the southward of Illyricum, the mouth of the Adriatic‡ was guarded with a small squadron by P. Cornelius Dolabella, the son-in-law of Cicero; but, like most others of the young Nobility of bad character, engaged in the cause of Cæsar. Inferior as Cæsar was to his adversaries in naval means, he could only expect Dolabella to keep the sea for a time, till the fleets of the enemy should be brought together; after which it became his business to preserve his ships with the utmost care, as Cæsar was ill able to replace them, if they should be taken or destroyed. But whether from want of caution on the part of Dolabella, or from any other cause, he was attacked on the eastern shore of the Adriatic by the ships of the Commonwealth, under M. Octavius and L. Scribonius Libo,§ and was defeated with the loss of his entire fleet. His disaster was only the prelude to another of greater magnitude; for C. Antonius,‖ coming up in the hope of relieving him, was surrounded by the victorious forces of the enemy, who, putting on shore a portion of their seamen, blockaded him by land and sea, till he was obliged to surrender himself prisoner with all the troops under his command. The soldiers were incorporated with Pompey's army; and these successes tended, probably, to facilitate the levies which were now going on, in the name of the Commonwealth, in Greece, and in the eastern Provinces of the Empire.

It is now proper to notice more particularly the proceedings of Pompey, since his arrival in Greece in the early part of the year 704. He found himself attended by both the Consuls, and about two hundred Senators;* so that he might fairly consider himself as being supported by the authority of the Commonwealth. For the present, indeed, almost all the Magistrates of the Republic were at his quarters; but as their power would expire at the end of the year, and as it was impossible to observe the proper forms of election in any other place than at Rome, it was resolved that the present officers should be continued in their commands, with the titles of Proconsuls, Proprætors, &c. by a decree of the Senate. This appears to have been perfectly consistent with the Constitutional power of that order; and a place was accordingly marked out at Thessalonica, and duly consecrated by the Augurs, that the auspices might be taken with the usual solemnities, and that the Senate might not assemble on profane ground; a circumstance which would have violated all its acts. Meanwhile, Pompey was busily employed in collecting troops and ships, and supplies of provisions from all quarters. Many of the petty Princes and States of Asia Minor and the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, were indebted to him for their Crowns or their dominions during his long commands in that part of the Empire; so that his private influence came powerfully in aid of the name of the Roman Republic, in procuring their support. He had under his immediate standard an army of nine legions of Roman citizens;† five of which he had brought with him from Italy, two had been raised by order of Lentulus in the Roman Province of Asia, one was composed of the veteran soldiers who had settled in Crete and Macedonia after their term of service had expired, and one had been formed out of the soldiers of two veteran legions which had been quartered in Sicily. With these was joined an auxiliary force of infantry which Pompey had lately raised in Greece; and a reinforcement of two legions more was expected ere long to be added to the army, which Scipio, Pompey's father-in-law, was to bring with him from his Province in Syria. The cavalry is said to have amounted to seven thousand; but it seems to have consisted of the troops of so many different nations, that much time and a careful discipline must have been needed before such various elements could coalesce into one body. The light infantry were also numerous; but they, like the cavalry, were a motley force of Greeks, Cretans, Syrians, and natives of Pontus, whose steadiness was little to be trusted in the hour of difficulty. It is difficult to ascertain the real numbers of the whole army, because we know not whether the legions contained their full complement of men, or whether some of them were not mere skeletons, which it was intended to fill up from time to time with new levies. But whatever was the numerical strength of Pompey's troops, they were so decidedly inferior in quality to those of the enemy, that their General, under present circumstances, could not venture to oppose them to Cæsar's veterans in the open field. He was fully

Preparations of Pompey for war.

The Senate assembles at Thessalonica.

Strength of Pompey's army.

* Appian, *de Bello Civili*, lib. ii. c. 41.
† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. vi.
‡ Ibid. lib. x. epist. vii. Appian, lib. ii. c. 41.
§ Florus, lib. iv. c. 2. Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 171. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 36. Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 4.
‖ Florus, Dion Cassius, *ubi supra*. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cx.—Cæsar asserts that Antonius was betrayed by one of his officers, T. Pulcio, who afterwards served in Pompey's army; Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 67. It has been a favourite resource with others besides Cæsar to attribute their disasters to treason; but such statements, when resting merely on the assertion of the vanquished party, should be received with great suspicion. An officer in Antonius's army might very possibly have deserted to the enemy on this occasion, and might have carried to them some useful information; the importance of which Cæsar would gladly exaggerate, so as to ascribe the loss of the army chiefly, or entirely, to this cause. The treason of T. Pulcio, whatever it was, is not even hinted at by Florus, Suetonius, the epitomiser of Livy, Appian, nor Dion Cassius; writers, none of whom can be called unfavourable to Cæsar, and the two latter of whom have rather a bias in his favour.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 173.
† Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 4.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

sensible, indeed, of their inferiority; and exerted himself to the utmost, during the interval of leisure that was afforded him, in improving their discipline, and training them incessantly in those military exercises, which the nature of ancient warfare rendered so important.* Pompey himself took part in these exercises with all the spirit and activity of youth; and added at once to his own popularity and to the confidence of his soldiers, by his skill and strength in throwing the javelin, and the perfect address with which he managed his horse, while he was directing the manœuvres of the cavalry. He hoped to keep the enemy at a distance by the aid of his numerous fleet, till he had sufficiently organized and disciplined his army, to return to Italy with every prospect of final success. All the maritime countries of the eastern part of the Mediterranean had contributed their quotas of ships;† and the whole naval force was placed under the command of M. Bibulus, the colleague of Cæsar in his first Consulship, who felt a strong personal enmity against him, in consequence of their differences at that period. Finally, ample magazines of corn had been collected from Thessaly, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Cyrene, that the army might be enabled to wait patiently the issue of their General's plans, and might not be driven to risk any desperate measures from the want of provisions. Meantime, the language held by Pompey was in the highest degree lofty and uncompromising. Not only were Cæsar's partisans deservedly spoken of as rebels, and threatened with the vengeance of the laws, but all who had remained in Italy, and had taken no share in the defence of the Commonwealth, were considered as guilty of an abandonment of their duty; and it was proposed to confiscate their property, in order that the faithful soldiers, by whose aid the Constitution should be preserved and restored to its independence, might be rewarded by its distribution. Cicero several times speaks in the strongest terms of the severities which would have followed the victory of the Constitutionalists;‡ and declares that they would have ordered a general proscription, as unsparing as that of Sylla. We are told, indeed, by Plutarch,§ that a resolution was passed, at Cato's suggestion, by the Senate assembled at Thessalonica, declaring that no Roman citizen should be put to death out of the field of battle, nor any city subject to the Roman government given up to plunder. If this be true, we must suppose that the declaration was meant to apply only to the period of actual hostilities; nor is it unlikely that the humanity of Pompey and Cato might have been able thus far to mitigate the horrors of warfare, while the violence of some of their associates would have defied any such restraint in the event of the final triumph of their party. The character of Pompey himself is most remote from cruelty, although he may have been unable to check the excesses of his partisans, or may have threatened to punish, perhaps with an excessive severity, the treasons from which he himself, as well as the Commonwealth, had suffered so heavily. But it is also consistent with other parts of his life to believe, that whatever irritation he might now feel, while witnessing the present success of the rebellion, yet when the supreme power was placed in his hands, he would have used it with the utmost moderation and fairness, and would himself have been sincerely desirous of restoring peace and liberty to his country. On the other hand, it must be confessed, that the members of the high Aristocratical party, who had regarded him with jealousy from his earliest youth, might have overruled his own dispositions, and have either forced him to become the instrument of their rapacious and cruel designs, or have sacrificed him to secure their own exclusive ascendency. And doubtless the happiness of mankind was ultimately far better secured by the victory of Cæsar, and the establishment even of his successor's despotism, than it would have been by the unchecked dominion of the most profligate members of a corrupt Aristocracy.

His fleet.

Language held by his party.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

Such was the state of Pompey's party, when the negligence or over confidence of his naval officers allowed Cæsar, as we have already mentioned, to transport without opposition from Italy the first division of his army, and to effect a landing on the coast of Greece. On the very day of the disembarkation, Cæsar advanced to summon the town of Oricum,* which was held by an enemy's garrison under the command of L. Torquatus. But already the cause of the Commonwealth felt the disadvantage of having abandoned the seat of Government, and having allowed Cæsar to receive at Rome, from the people assembled in the ordinary place of election, the title of Roman Consul. The garrison, consisting of Illyrian soldiers, and the citizens of Oricum, alike refused to resist an officer bearing the rank of the chief Magistrate of the Roman people; and Torquatus, thus deserted, was obliged to surrender himself and the town to Cæsar. This example was followed by the people of Apollonia,† and by a great many other places in the neighbourhood; so that Cæsar immediately acquired a firm footing in the country, and, by his possession of the towns on the coast, was enabled, in a great measure, to neutralize the naval superiority of the enemy.

Operations of Cæsar after his landing.

It is probable that the lateness of the season, which though nominally the month of January was in reality the beginning of November, together with Cæsar's known want of shipping, had impressed Bibulus with the belief that no attempt to invade Greece would be made at present; and that Cæsar would require the winter months to complete his preparations, before he thought of commencing hostilities. Surprised therefore by the tidings that the enemy were actually arrived on the coast of Greece,‡ Bibulus put to sea in haste from Corcyra, in the hope of intercepting a part, at least, of the transports employed in the passage; but Cæsar had already landed in safety, and Bibulus only succeeded in cutting off about thirty of the empty vessels, which Cæsar had ordered instantly to return to Brundisium. His vexation at his own want of vigilance, combined with his general hatred against Cæsar, led him to commit an atrocious act of cruelty upon the masters and crews of the vessels which thus fell into his hands; for having set the ships on fire, he burnt the men in the same flames. He then lined the coast with detachments of his fleet

Proceedings of Pompey's fleet.

* Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 64. Appian, lib. ii. c. 49.
† Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 3. 5.
‡ *Ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. vii. x. xi. lib. x. epist. vii. lib. xi. epist. vi. *Ad Familiares*, lib. iv. epist. ix. lib. vii. epist. iii.
§ *In Pompeio*, c. 65. *in Catone*, c. 53.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 11. † Ibid. lib. iii. c. 12.
‡ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 8.

from Salone to Oricum, a distance of about two hundred miles; and as a mark of his resolution to use every possible exertion, it is said that he lived entirely on board his ship, even at that inclement season. The ancient ships of war, it should be remembered, being calculated chiefly for coasting voyages, and accustomed to send their crews ashore on every occasion to take their meals and to sleep, were very ill provided with accommodations in themselves, and could neither hold a large supply of provisions, nor afford tolerable quarters on board for the officers and men. To remain, therefore, continually at sea, was attended with great inconvenience, and considerable distress; and thus when Cæsar's occupation of the landing-places on the coast prevented the enemy from coming on shore, or from getting supplies of wood and water, he retaliated upon them to the full the annoyance which he suffered from their blockade. But Bibulus and the officers and men under his command bore their privations with the utmost patience and resolution; transports were employed in bringing them regular supplies of wood, water, and provisions from Corcyra;* and when the badness of the weather on one occasion interrupted this communication, they are said to have wrung the dew from the skins with which the holds of their ships were covered, and thus to have allayed the intensity of their thirst. They enjoyed, however, the satisfaction of feeling that they were effectually stopping the passage of the second division of Cæsar's army, which it had been intended to transport without loss of time on board the vessels which had returned to Brundisium, after carrying over the first division. The troops were actually embarked, and had just left the harbour, when a despatch arrived from Cæsar, announcing the strict blockade maintained on the opposite shore by the enemy's cruisers. Immediately the ships returned to Brundisium; and one single private vessel, which had no troops on board, resolving still to attempt the passage, was taken by Bibulus off Oricum, and, according to Cæsar,† the whole ship's company, both freemen and slaves, were, by his orders, put to death. Cæsar thus seemed left to his fate in an enemy's country with only half his army, cut off from all relief, and obliged to depend for subsistence only on the narrow district immediately subject to his control.

Cæsar attempts in vain to surprise Dyrrhachium.

But his system of always acting on the offensive, tended at once to keep up the confidence of his own soldiers, and to make public opinion think favourably of his situation. After having gained possession of Oricum and Apollonia, he hastened forward in the hope of surprising Dyrrhachium, one of Pompey's principal magazines, and the place in which he had designed to fix his winter-quarters, in order to be at hand to counteract Cæsar's expected invasion in the spring. At the moment of Cæsar's landing, Pompey was in the interior of Macedonia,‡ proceeding slowly towards his intended winter-quarters, by the great road which crossed the whole country from Thessalonica, on the Ægean, to Dyrrhachium and Apollonia on the Ionian gulf. He was already advanced as far as Candavia, which lies at nearly equal distances between the two seas, when he was met with the news of Cæsar's invasion. He immediately hastened his march towards Apollonia; but finding that this town had already fallen, he turned off to the right, and pressed on with a rapidity, almost resembling the flight of a beaten army, in order to save his magazines at Dyrrhachium. As the troops marched by day and night without halting, many of the soldiers, unable to bear the fatigue, dropped behind,* threw away their arms, and deserted; and this produced so much disorder and consequent dejection, that although Pompey accomplished his object, and, having outstripped his antagonist, encamped his army in front of Dyrrhachium to cover the town, yet T. Labienus, and the other principal officers, thought it expedient to renew, in a public and solemn manner, their oath of fidelity to their General, swearing that they would abide by him in every extremity of fortune. The troops all followed this example; and soon afterwards their spirits were revived by an order to make a movement somewhat in advance: for Cæsar, finding himself cut off from Dyrrhachium, had halted on the river Apsus; intending to winter there under canvass, in order to protect the country in his rear which had espoused his cause, and proposing there to await the arrival of the rest of his army from Italy.

The two armies are opposed to one another on the Apsus.

Cæsar thus having fixed himself on the left bank of the Apsus,† Pompey advanced with his army from Dyrrhachium, and occupied a line on the right bank of the same river, to which he brought together his entire force, both Roman and auxiliary. A pause of some length then ensued in the operations on both sides, partly on account of the season of the year, and partly because neither General wished to risk an action at present; the one being desirous of improving still further the discipline of his soldiers; and the other being anxious to gain an accession to his numbers.

Ineffectual overtures for peace.

During this interval some proposals of peace were exchanged between the two parties, but without producing any effect. Indeed, the officer from whom Pompey had received the first tidings of Cæsar's landing in Greece, was himself the bearer of a message from Cæsar,‡ conjuring Pompey to consider the evils which a protracted contest would certainly bring upon their country; proposing that each commander should take an oath, in the presence of his army, to disband his forces within three days; and that the terms of a permanent peace might be settled at Rome by the Senate and People; offering, meantime, as a pledge of his sincerity, to disband at once all his own soldiers, whether they were in the field or in garrison. There was no time for replying to these propositions, till Pompey's army was settled on the Apsus; then, when L. Vibullius Rufus, the bearer of them, was proceeding to state them in detail, Pompey is said to have interrupted him,§ and to have declared, "that he valued neither his life nor the enjoyment of his country, if he must receive them as a favour from Cæsar." A little before this, Bibulus and L. Scribonius Libo,‖ who were maintaining their blockade off the harbour of Oricum, proposed to Cæsar's officers, commanding in the town, that a truce should be concluded between the fleet and Cæsar's troops stationed along the coast, in order to allow time for entering upon a negotiation for peace. Cæsar himself had just left his lines on

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 15. † Lib. iii. c. 14.
‡ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 11. Strabo, lib. vii. p. 374. edit. Xyland.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 13. † Ibid. Appian, lib. ii. c. 56.
‡ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 10, 11. § Ibid. lib. iii. c. 18.
‖ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 15, 16, 17.

the Apsus, and had marched southward with a single legion, to secure some of the towns that were situated at a greater distance in his rear, and to procure some supplies of corn. In pursuit of these objects, he was now at Buthrotum, a town on the main land of Epirus, immediately opposite to Corcyra, when he received intelligence from his officers at Oricum, of the proposals made by Bibulus and Libo. He at once hastened in person to the spot, and Libo came on shore alone to meet him; Bibulus, it seems, thinking that an interview between himself and Cæsar was more likely to inflame the existing quarrel than to allay it. Libo assured Cæsar that nothing could be concluded without Pompey's authority; and only requested that a truce might be arranged till proposals of peace should be presented to Pompey, and till his answer to them could be known. He asserted, that Pompey was most anxious to terminate the contest; and that for himself, his advice, and that of the other officers, would all lead to the same conclusion. Cæsar, in return, pressed Libo to guarantee the safety of the officers whom he might send to Pompey's camp; and with regard to the naval armistice, he said that he was willing to grant it, if the enemy's fleet would renounce their blockade, and allow the free passage of his troops from Italy. Libo replied, that he could guarantee nothing, but referred every thing to Pompey; at the same time he again urged the conclusion of the naval armistice. But Cæsar perceiving, as he says, that nothing more was designed by the enemy than to procure some relief for their ships, by obtaining leave to get supplies from the shore, broke off the conference, and turned his thoughts to the active prosecution of the war.

Cæsar's account of these matters is to be regarded with suspicion.

Such is the representation of these transactions which Cæsar or his partisans have given to the world. We may repeat it, in the absence of all other testimony; but we should remember, that it is the statement of the chief of a victorious party, and that it relates to matters of which he himself, when his account was published, was the only witness who dared to deliver his evidence. In the narrative, also, of this very transaction, there is one remarkable expression, which seems to imply that the writer was anxious to record nothing that would not redound to Cæsar's honour. Libo, it seems, during his conference with Cæsar, entered into some representation of the merits of the cause which he espoused, and of the amount of Pompey's forces: "but on these points," says the historian,* "Cæsar thought proper to make no reply at the time, nor do we see any sufficient reason for dwelling on the subject now." The writer of this sentence, whether it was Cæsar himself, or one of his officers writing under his authority, was well aware that the merits of his cause could not bear any minute detail, and that the manner in which the friends of the Commonwealth represented them was too forcible, and in the main too just, to admit of any satisfactory reply. He acted wisely, therefore, as a party-writer, in passing by the subject altogether; but he has by so doing left us, at the same time, a sufficient proof how little he deserves the title of a historian.

Yet the narrative of this writer, such as it is, and rendered in parts still more defective from the corrupt state of the text in our present copies, is our sole authority for any particular account of the operations of this important campaign. The English reader will, perhaps, have a more lively sense of its incompetence, if he considers what sort of a history could be drawn up of the events of more modern wars, if we had no other materials than the gazettes or bulletins of one party only. We must request those, therefore, who may follow us through our narrative of the ensuing transactions, to remember, once for all, that we are fully aware of the unsatisfactory foundation on which it rests; and that if we do not repeat our sense of its uncertainty in every page, it is only to avoid unpleasant and needless interruptions to the course of our relation. Besides, in ordinary cases, we are willing to leave the reader to the exercise of his own judgment, whenever the story becomes justly suspicious, rather than attempt on every occasion to dictate to him ourselves. Unquestionably, the writer of Cæsar's *Commentaries* had the best opportunities of knowing the truth; and he is perfectly free from those blunders in indifferent matters which are the result of mere ignorance. His misrepresentations and mistatements are for the most part wilful; and it becomes a matter of great difficulty and uncertainty, to say how often the temptation was sufficiently strong to induce him to write against that better knowledge, which makes him, where no such temptation has interfered, so respectable a witness.

Irregular communication between the soldiers of the two armies.

Whilst the two armies were encamped on the Apsus,* several attempts were made, on Cæsar's part, to keep up a correspondence between the soldiers of either party, and to impress on the minds of Pompey's followers, his own eagerness to terminate the contest. The Generals of the Commonwealth, remembering the issue of a similar correspondence between the troops of Sylla and Scipio in the last civil war, were no way inclined to expose their newly-raised and ill-assorted soldiers to the seductions of Cæsar's veterans; it being sufficiently obvious which side was most likely to entice the other from its duty. The meetings between the men and the inferior officers of the two parties, which had gone on to a considerable extent, were at last forcibly broken off, on one occasion, by Pompey's Generals, and some of the centurions and soldiers of Cæsar's army were wounded. This was in the same spirit with the conduct of Petreius in Spain, and was dictated by a similar sense of danger. It was a proceeding of great severity, but yet not inconsistent with the laws of war, as the meetings were not authorized by the Commander-in-chief of the Commonwealth's army, who alone, as Cæsar had been on a late occasion particularly informed, had power to guarantee the safety of any negotiator from the enemy. The assertion of Cæsar that Labienus himself appeared at the conference, and was actually in conversation with P. Vatinius, Cæsar's officer, when the meeting was broken off by acts of hostility on the part of Pompey, is intended to convey a charge of wilful treachery, of which we cannot, in fairness, convict Labienus on the sole testimony of his personal as well as political adversary.

It is suddenly broken off by Pompey's Generals.

While the war was thus pausing in its course, and

* "*Huc addit pauca* (Libo) *de causâ, et de copiis auxiliisque suis. Quibus rebus neque tum respondendum Cæsar existimavit; neque nunc, ut memoriæ prodatur, satis causæ putamus.*" Lib. iii. c. 16, 17.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 19.

M. Antonius, with the second division of Cæsar's army, was still detained at Brundisium, unable to join his Commander, a wild attempt was made to effect a counter-revolution in Italy.* The name of M. Cælius Rufus has already been mentioned in our account of the turbulent period of Pompey's third Consulship. He was then one of the Tribunes, and exerted himself warmly in behalf of Milo, amidst the agitations which followed the murder of P. Clodius; he also made himself particularly notorious by his opposition to the laws then proposed by Pompey with a view to the regulation of Milo's trial; and he so provoked Pompey as to draw from him the threat, "that if he met with any more obstructions, he would protect the interests of the Commonwealth by force of arms." Like Curio, he was eloquent, unprincipled, and ambitious of distinction; and, therefore, during the height of Pompey's power at Rome, he delighted, like Curio, in appearing to defy him, as the readiest means of gaining favour with the multitude, who are ever ready to admire a spirit of resistance to authority. He thus was led to favour the pretensions of Cæsar; to which he was further induced by his friendship for Curio,† and his enmity to Appius Claudius, who was now closely connected with Pompey. Yet his intimacy with Cicero, to whose notice he had been early recommended by his father,‡ and who had defended him some years before under a criminal prosecution, might have restrained him from openly taking part against the Commonwealth, had he not been led to accompany Curio to Ariminum at the beginning of the war,§ and been brought to a personal meeting with Cæsar, by consenting to be the bearer of a message to him from Cicero, urging him to lay aside his designs of hostility. It seems that Cæsar's winning address and behaviour, together with a nearer view of the resources by which he was supported, decided him in remaining with the rebel army, and accepting employment in Cæsar's service. He accordingly attended him on his way towards Spain,‖ and on his return thence, at the end of the year, he was elected Prætor, as a reward for his attachment to his cause.¶ But the death of Curio had removed the principal link between him and his present associates; and although he was one of the Prætors, yet he held only the less dignified rank of *Prætor Peregrinus*; the office of *Prætor Urbanus*, which possessed exclusive jurisdiction in all causes between citizens and citizens, was conferred on C. Trebonius, who had conducted the operations by land at the late siege of Massilia. His love of distinction, therefore, was ill gratified by his present situation; he felt himself slighted, and was desirous of at once revenging his fancied affronts upon Cæsar's party, and of regaining the friendship of the Aristocrats, who were his old and natural connections, and whom his late behaviour had alienated.

Tumults excited at Rome by M. Cælius Rufus.

Under the influence of these motives, Cælius began to tread in the steps of the old popular Tribunes,* and, complaining of Cæsar's late regulations with regard to the payment of debts, he declared that he would support any debtor who should appeal against a sentence of the *Prætor Urbanus*, adjudging payment according to the terms fixed by Cæsar. Finding, if we may believe Cæsar, that no appeals were brought to him, he proceeded to propose a law of his own, directing that debts were to be paid at six instalments, without any interest. It is very probable that many of the timid and indolent part of the Aristocracy, who preferred remaining at Rome under Cæsar's government, rather than submitting to the labours and perils of a civil war, were delighted to find their new circumstances suddenly reconciled, by these innovations of Cælius, with the line they would naturally take in politics. P. Servilius, Cæsar's colleague in the Consulship, whose father had in like manner been the colleague of Sylla, and who himself, a few years before, had been remarked as affecting to imitate Cato,† was now called upon, while supporting the government of Cæsar, to act like the high Aristocratical Consuls of former times, L. Opimius, or Cn. Octavius, or Q. Catulus. Supported by the other Magistrates, he resisted the measures of Cælius, who, finding his present law not sufficiently stimulating, proposed two others of a tendency still more revolutionary; one releasing all tenants of houses in Rome from their liability to be sued for rent during one year; and the other proclaiming a general release to all insolvent debtors from the claims of their creditors. Cælius had now degraded himself low enough to become the head of the most worthless portion of the community: mobs assembled as in the days of L. Saturninus, P. Sulpicius, and P. Clodius; and Trebonius was driven by violence from his seat of judgment. Servilius laid the consideration of these disturbances before the Senate, and that body passed a resolution, the very same which had formerly been passed against Cæsar himself in his Prætorship, that Cælius should be suspended from the duties and privileges of his office. He still attempted to harangue the people, but was forcibly pulled down from the rostra; and the support of the mere rabble being, as usual, utterly powerless in the time of need, he resolved to quit Rome, professing that he was going over to Macedonia, to offer to Cæsar an explanation and apology for his conduct.

Violent measures of Cælius in his Prætorship.

He is obliged to leave Rome

There is still extant a letter from Cælius to Cicero,‡ written apparently when he was just entered on this career of fruitless opposition to Cæsar's government. He flatters himself that he had alienated the general feeling at Rome from the cause of Cæsar; and that the poorer citizens, who had hitherto regarded it as the popular side, now thought that it had abandoned their interests, and were ready to receive the friends of Pompey with open arms. He assures Cicero that it was Pompey's own fault that he had not recovered possession of Rome, for that every body there, with

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 20, 21, 22.
† Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. xvii.
‡ Ibid. *pro Cælio*, c. 3.
§ Ibid. *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. xvii.
‖ Ibid. lib. viii. epist. xv.
¶ It appears from some brief intimations in Cicero's letters to Atticus, that Cælius was already disgusted with Cæsar's party before the end of the campaign in Spain; and that he was engaged in some attempts to excite disturbances among the legions left for the protection of Italy. Possibly, therefore, Cæsar did not take him with him into Spain, but left him with those troops, in Cisalpine Gaul, which did, in fact, break out into mutiny, as already related, about the time of Cæsar's return from Spain. Vide Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. x. epist. xii. xv. xvi.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 20. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxi. Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 195.
† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. i.
‡ Ibid. *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. xvii.

the exception of a few usurers, was now become his partisan. He promises to ensure the triumph of the Aristocracy, even against their will, and laments the blindness of Pompey, in neglecting the fair field that was open to him in Italy, and persisting to combat Cæsar's veteran army in direct and open warfare. But a short time proved how greatly he had overrated the effect of his measures and of his abilities. On leaving Rome, he had entered into a correspondence with his old associate, T. Milo,* who was ready to join in any attempt against Cæsar, as he had been alone excepted by him from the general pardon granted to all who had been banished by the sentence of the Tribunals in Pompey's third Consulship. Milo still retained,† either in his service or under his influence, some of those numerous gladiators whom he had formerly employed in his contests with Clodius. At the head of a party of these he appeared in arms in the neighbourhood of Capua; and professing that he had received, through Bibulus, a commission to levy troops in Pompey's name, he began to solicit the inhabitants of the different towns to join him. His character and resources, however, held out little encouragement; but having collected a certain number of runaway slaves, and of those who were kept at work in fetters in some of the workhouses, he made an attempt upon the town of Compsa,‡ and there lost his life by a stone discharged from one of the engines on the walls. Cælius, meantime, had not entirely thrown off the mask. He had secretly endeavoured to surprise Capua by the help of some gladiators who were then kept at Naples, and of some partisans in the town itself; but the plot being discovered in time to prevent its execution, he continued his journey southward, as if still pursuing his original design of going to Cæsar in Greece. But when he reached Thurii, he conceived hopes of gaining that important place for Pompey; and accordingly he began to tamper with some of the inhabitants, and also with some Gaulish and German horse, whom Cæsar had left there as a garrison. To have secured a harbour for Pompey's ships on the coast of Italy, would have been one of the most signal services that could have been rendered at this period to the cause of the Commonwealth; but the attempt was unsuccessful; and, according to Cæsar, Cælius was killed by some of those soldiers whose fidelity he was endeavouring to corrupt. Like most other fruitless insurrections, the disturbance excited by Cælius and Milo being thus quickly suppressed, rather tended, we may suppose, to strengthen Cæsar's authority; and persons possessed of property were more reconciled to his government, when they found it ready to protect them against the violence of the needy and the desperate.

He invites Milo to join him in an attempt to revive the interests of Pompey in Italy.

Cælius and Milo are killed.

Death of M. Bibulus.

About this time Pompey sustained a severe loss in the death of M. Calpurnius Bibulus, the Commander-in-chief of his fleet.§ The vigilance which this officer had lately exerted, in order to atone for his previous neglect in suffering Cæsar to cross the Ionian gulf, had thus far been completely successful in preventing the passage of the troops under M. Antonius, but it proved in the end fatal to himself. Fatigue, anxiety, and insufficient accommodations, severely affected his health; he refused, however, to quit his post, and persisted in struggling against his complaints, till he sank under them. On his death, his place as Commander-in-chief was left vacant, possibly from some intrigues at Pompey's head-quarters, which made it difficult for the General to fix upon a successor. But the bad effects of this omission were soon notorious; for each separate Commander of a squadron began to act for himself; and L. Scribonius Libo,* departing from the defensive system of Bibulus, crossed the Ionian gulf with the fifty ships which formed his own division, and proposed to blockade the port of Brundisium itself, by occupying a small island which was opposite to the mouth of the harbour. His sudden appearance enabled him to surprise some vessels laden with corn, which he burnt or captured; he disembarked also a party of troops, with which he dislodged a body of Cæsar's cavalry from one of their posts near the shore; and, elated with these exploits, he wrote to Pompey to assure him that he might safely venture to bring the rest of the fleet into port to refit; for that he himself, with his single squadron, would engage to prevent the passage of Cæsar's reinforcements. A short time, however, proved the emptiness of these promises; for the island which Libo occupied was unable to furnish the ships with a sufficient supply of fresh water; and after the first surprise was over, Antonius stationed his parties of cavalry along the shore in such numbers, that they could not be dislodged, and thus effectually cut off the enemy from all communication with the land. The inability of an ancient fleet to act with success without military cooperation was thus again proved; and Libo was obliged to abandon the blockade of Brundisium, and resume his original station on the coast of Greece.

At length the winter was at an end,† and Pompey's naval force had kept the sea through the most unfavourable season of the year with unabated resolution. Their task would now become much easier, and the difficulty of effecting a passage would be proportionably increased to Cæsar's second division. He himself complains that his officers at Brundisium had neglected some opportunities of which they might have availed themselves; and being impatient of their long delay, he wrote to them in very strong terms, enjoining them to put to sea with the first fair wind, and recommending them to steer for the coast of Apollonia, if possible, which, from its want of harbours, was less guarded by the enemy's fleet; adding, that they might there run their ships aground, and that the loss of the vessels was comparatively of no importance. But trusting, above all things, in the effect of his own presence, he made a bold attempt to cross over in person to Brundisium; and having left his army secretly by night, he embarked in disguise on board of a small vessel, and, although the weather was very tempestuous, and the wind against him, he endeavoured, at the utmost hazard, to effect the passage of the Ionian gulf; nor was he induced to desist, till he found it utterly impossible to accomplish his purpose.‡ His letters, however, had produced a

Cæsar becomes impatient at the delay of his expected reinforcements.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 21. † Ibid. lib. iii. c. 21, 22.
‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 83.
§ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 18.

* Cæsar, c. 23, 24. † Ibid. lib. iii. c. 25.
‡ Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 8. The story, as given in the text, is copied from Valerius Maximus, the earliest writer in whom we have found any mention of it. The famous additions to it, which are given by Florus, Dion Cassius, Appian, and

M. Antonius embarks his troops at Brundisium.

sufficient effect; the soldiers themselves, he tells us, pressed their officers to risk the voyage; and M. Antonius and Q. Fufius Calenus, with four legions and about eight hundred cavalry, at length set sail with a south wind from Brundisium. But, with the wind in such a quarter, they not only failed in reaching Apollonia, but could not even make any land southward of Dyrrhachium. They were thus seen from Dyrrhachium by C. Coponius,* one of the Prætors, who commanded the Rhodian squadron at that port, and he instantly put to sea in pursuit of them. Flight was their only resource, and they ran before the wind northward, towards the harbour of Nymphæum, which, though open to the south, and threatening the loss of their ships, still held out a chance of their effecting a landing. But, by one of those remarkable instances of good fortune which have occurred in our own naval history on some memorable occasions, the wind suddenly shifted to the south-west, as soon as the transports had reached Nymphæum; and thus, owing to the position of the harbour, they were now in perfect safety, whilst sixteen of the enemy's ships, that were most forward in the chase, were all driven on shore and wrecked. Of the crews a considerable number perished, and many were taken by Cæsar's soldiers; but these last, he tells us, he treated with humanity, and dismissed them unhurt to their own homes.

Two of Antonius's transports, being heavier sailers than the rest,† were overtaken by the night, and, not knowing what was become of their companions, came to an anchor off Lissus. Otacilius Crassus, who commanded Pompey's garrison in the town, sent off a number of armed boats and vessels to attack them, and summoned them both to surrender One of them, which had on board two hundred and twenty men of a newly-raised legion, submitted immediately;‡ but the other contained about two hundred veterans, who, although weakened and wretched from the confinement and sickness of a stormy voyage, preserved their courage, and compelled the master of the transport to run the ship on shore. They found a position favourable for their defence; and, after repulsing an attack that was made upon them on the following morning, they reached the main body of their army, which had landed at Nymphæum without loss. Immediately afterwards, Lissus, which was within the limits of Cæsar's Province of Illyricum, and had received some favours from him during his government as Proconsul, opened its gates to Antonius; and that officer, having sent back most of the transports to Italy, to bring over some reinforcements that were yet expected, sent word to Cæsar of his landing, informing him of the numbers that he had brought with him, and of the part of the country at which he had effected his descent.

He lands at Nymphæum, on the east of Illyricum, and occupies the town of Lissus.

As the transports had been seen from the shore passing by Apollonia and Dyrrhachium,* their arrival in the neighbourhood was known both to Cæsar and Pompey; but neither was at first aware of the precise point at which they might have come to shore. Both Generals immediately broke up from their positions on the Apsus; Pompey, with the hope of surprising and cutting off the troops under Antonius, and Cæsar with the view of effecting his junction with them. But, as Cæsar was delayed by being obliged to march up the left bank of the Apsus for some distance, in order to find a ford, Pompey might possibly have succeeded in his object, had not his approach been communicated to Antonius by some of the people of the country. Thus aware of his danger, Antonius suspended his march, (for it seems that he had set out from Lissus to meet Cæsar,) and kept his troops during one whole day within the protection of their camp; till, on the next day, Cæsar, having recovered the ground which he had lost, came up with the main body of his army. It was now Pompey's turn to be apprehensive for his safety; and accordingly he fell back to avoid being surrounded, allowed the enemy's two divisions to effect their junction, and marching with his whole force to Asparagium, a small town subject to the people of Dyrrhachium, but whose exact situation is not known, he there encamped his army again in a favourable position. Cæsar, on the other hand, now found himself enabled to extend the scene of his operations.† To maintain a large force on the coast was become less important; he diminished, therefore, the number of his troops in that quarter, and sent three considerable detachments into Ætolia, Thessaly, and Macedonia, as he had reason to expect that the inhabitants of those countries would declare in his favour, as soon as they could do so with safety; and as his supplies by sea were rendered worse than precarious by the superiority of the enemy's navy, it was highly expedient that he should command the resources of a more extensive district than that narrow strip of coast to which he had hitherto been confined. He himself, as soon as he learned the new position in which Pompey had placed his army,‡ followed him thither, and offered him battle. The challenge was declined; for if Pompey had not thought proper to meet his enemy in the field before the arrival of Antonius, he was much less likely to risk a general action now. But an army, which feels itself superior to its antagonists, enjoys a great advantage in the freedom of its movements; for, as it is its interest to bring on a general engagement, it may attempt any enterprise it pleases, with the twofold chance either of winning that particular object, or of forcing the enemy to a battle if he endeavours to offer any opposition. In this manner Cæsar, finding that his adversary was resolved to avoid an action, conceived the plan of marching upon Dyrrhachium, which, as we have already stated, was one of the principal magazines of Pompey. To mislead his enemy, he set out at first from his camp in a different

He effects his junction with Cæsar.

Cæsar follows Pompey to Asparagium.

Plutarch, that Cæsar encouraged the terrified master of the vessel, by discovering himself to him in the midst of the storm, and telling him not to be afraid, for that he carried with him *Cæsar and his fortune*, assemble those embellishments of some simple expression or occurrence which anecdotes of great men are apt to gain in proportion to the number of persons who successively report them.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 26, 27. † Ibid. lib. iii. c. 28, 29.

‡ Cæsar adds, that they were all massacred, although their lives had been solemnly promised to them. We can only regret that we have not the report of Otacilius Crassus on this affair; but as it is, we cannot admit into the body of our narrative a statement of this nature, which is utterly improbable in its present form, although it be very likely founded on something which did actually happen under different circumstances.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 30.

† Ibid. lib. iii. c. 34, 35, *et seq.*

‡ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 41, 42.

direction; and it was not till the following morning that Pompey, having discovered in the mean time his real intention, commenced his own march towards Dyrrhachium, in order to counteract it. Cæsar, however, had gained in time more than he had lost in distance by the circuitous route which he had taken; he pressed his march, moreover, with the utmost activity, allowing his men to rest only during a short portion of the night, and thus he appeared in front of Dyrrhachium early in the morning, and formed his camp before the town, so as to cut off all approach to it. Pompey, finding himself shut out from Dyrrhachium, took up a position on some high ground near the sea, known by the name of *Petra*, or Cliff, and which commanded a small harbour or bay, where vessels with some winds might ride at anchor, or be drawn on the beach with safety. Hither, accordingly, he collected a part of his fleet, and hither he ordered his supplies to be brought by sea from all the parts of the Empire which acknowledged his authority.

He marches upon Dyrrhachium, and encamps before the town.

Pompey encamps at Petra, near Dyrrhachium.

Thus were the two contending parties opposed to one another at Dyrrhachium; and notwithstanding Cæsar's good fortune in seeing his whole army united on the eastern side of the Ionian gulf, he had as yet no prospect of bringing the war to a speedy termination. The naval force of the enemy preserved, and even improved its ascendency;* and not only cut off all chance of supplies from Italy, but had lately made one or two successful attacks on some of the ports of Epirus, which were in the possession of his troops, and had burnt or captured most of the ships which he had detained there out of the fleets used in transporting his army from Brundisium. Nor had Pompey been obliged to divide his own forces in order to oppose the detachments which Cæsar had recently sent into Thessaly and Macedonia; for his father-in-law, Scipio,† had just arrived from Asia with the legions which he had raised in his Province of Syria, and was able to occupy the attention of Cæsar's lieutenants, without requiring any assistance from the Commander-in-chief. Under these circumstances, Cæsar formed the plan of blockading Pompey's army in its position at Petra, by constructing lines of circumvallation extensive enough to intercept all the enemy's communications with the interior of the country; a measure to which, as he tells us, he was led by several considerations;‡ for he hoped, in the first place, to render useless the fine and numerous cavalry of Pompey, and to secure his own foraging parties from its attacks; and he wished, besides, to preserve the reputation of his arms, and to gain the credit of blockading Pompey the Great in his camp, and forcing him thus practically to confess his own inferiority. Above all, it was necessary for him to employ his army in some active operations; in the course of which, he flattered himself, circumstances might arise which might bring his troops into contact with the enemy, in spite of Pompey's determination to avoid every engagement, and to trust to time and his naval superiority for a successful termination of the war.

Cæsar proposes to blockade Pompey in his position

An attempt to detail minutely all the operations that followed, would scarcely be of any value, without a more intelligible guide than our present copies of Cæsar's *Commentaries* can supply, and without a more perfect knowledge of the ground, than it is now, perhaps, possible to obtain. We shall content ourselves, therefore, with a general view of the object pursued by each party, and of the manner in which this first act of the campaign, if we may use the expression, was brought to a conclusion. No sooner did Pompey perceive his adversary's design of hemming him in on the seacoast,* than he began to construct lines on his side, which he continually carried out to a greater distance, that he might command a larger space for the quarters of his own army, and might multiply the labour and difficulty of the operations of the enemy. The fortifications of each party consisted of forts placed on the most commanding points of the country, and connected with one another by a rampart and ditch. Frequent contests took place between the troops employed in these works; as the possession of any important height, if gained by Cæsar, enabled him to draw his lines more closely around the enemy; or, if secured by Pompey, threw back his adversaries to a greater distance, and gave a greater freedom of movement to his own army. The result was, that Pompey raised no fewer than twenty-four forts, all connected with each other by continuous works, and thus gained a space of fifteen miles in circuit for the accommodation and subsistence of his soldiers; while Cæsar, persevering in his original design, completed a blockading line of the extraordinary length of eighteen miles,† following the whole extent of the works of the enemy. Nor was this all; for, where his line came down to the sea, he constructed a second line parallel to it at the distance of about two hundred yards, and facing towards the opposite direction, to prevent his main line from being attacked in the rear, if Pompey should embark troops on board his ships, and direct them to cause a diversion, by landing on the outside of the blockading line, and attacking it on that quarter. For further security, these two lines were to be connected by a transverse line parallel to the sea, and closing up the opening between them; but this third work was not completed, owing to the immense magnitude of the labour which the army had to perform in other quarters; and the omission was afterwards attended, as we shall see, by some important consequences.

Description of the lines and operations in the neighbourhood of Dyrrhachium.

Both armies suffered some privations in this extraordinary kind of warfare.‡ Cæsar's soldiers were most pressed by the scarcity of wheat, an article which they seem to have considered so indispensably necessary, that their General praises their fortitude in high terms for enduring the want of it; although their condition does not seem to have been very deplorable, if, as Cæsar admits, they were plentifully supplied with meat, vegetables, barley, and a root which he calls *chara*, and which, he tells us, they used to prepare with milk, and make cakes of it. On the other side, Pompey's troops had wheat in abundance; but their situation in other respects was much worse than that of the enemy. As their position was near the sea, the streams naturally flowed down through it from the higher ground occupied by Cæsar's lines; and Cæsar was thus enabled either to turn their course, or to pond up the water with great labour in

Inconveniences suffered by both armies.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 40. 42. † Ibid. c. 31—38. ‡ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 43.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 44. † Ibid. c. 63. ‡ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 47, 48, 49. 58.

those narrow vallies or gorges into which the springs of the hills first discharged themselves, before they reached the lower and more open country. Deprived thus of the natural supply of running water, Pompey's soldiers were obliged to dig basins or reservoirs in the marshy grounds near the sea; and the water thus gained was not only bad in itself, but quickly dried up under the heat of the sun, as the season was now advanced to the middle of summer. In addition to this most severe suffering, they were reduced to the greatest want of forage for their horses, insomuch, that they were obliged to give them leaves from the trees, and the roots of reeds, to eke out the supplies which they received by sea; and thus most of the draught animals of the army, being less considered than the cavalry horses, died, and the stench of their carcasses in the hot summer weather, and in the low and comparatively confined space occupied by the troops, produced a considerable effect, we are told, on the health of the men. How far Cæsar may have exaggerated the distress which his blockade occasioned to his adversaries, it is not easy to decide; but it is probable that, in one respect, his views were answered, and that Pompey suffered in general estimation, by allowing himself, with an unbroken and numerous army, to be hemmed in by his antagonist. "He cannot escape with honour," says Dolabella in a letter to Cicero,* written about this time from Rome, "driven as he has been from Italy; deprived of Spain with the loss of a veteran army; and now even blockaded in his camp; a disgrace which scarcely any other of our Commanders has ever endured." Yet Pompey, it is likely, was daily improving the quality of his troops, by exercising them in those partial conflicts to which the nature of the operations on both sides constantly gave occasion; and it may be conjectured that Cæsar had better reasons for praising the patience and fortitude of his soldiers than he chooses to confess; for every account of these transactions dwells upon the distress which they suffered from the want of provisions, in a manner not very consistent with Cæsar's statement, that they had every thing in abundance except wheaten bread. At length Pompey thought that the time was come at which he might act on a more vigorous system. Whether he was urged, as Cæsar says, by the distress which he suffered in his present position, or whether he wished at last to make some trial of the fitness of his soldiers to oppose the enemy in the field, he resolved to break out from his confinement, and force a passage through Cæsar's lines. Having been accurately informed by some deserters of the disposition of the enemy's troops,† and of all the defects of their works, particularly of the opening left between their first and second line near the sea, owing to the unfinished state of the transverse line which was intended to connect them together, Pompey prepared his plan of attack accordingly. Directing his main effort against the weak point of Cæsar's works, he assaulted the first line in front with his legionary soldiers, whilst he embarked on board his small craft a large force of his light infantry, and caused them to be landed, some on the outside of the second line to attack it in front, and some in the opening between the two lines, where they could distract the defenders of both by assailing them in the rear. These combined movements were crowned with complete success. The attack was made at daybreak, the lines were forced with great slaughter, and Pompey had taken up a new position beyond the works which had been constructed with so much labour to confine him, before Cæsar could come up to the support of his men from the remote part of his lines in which he had fixed his usual quarters. When he did arrive on the spot, and saw that all his plans must at once be changed, he gave orders to form a new camp near that of Pompey. But scarcely was the work completed,* when some of his reconnoitring parties brought him word that a portion of the enemy's army, apparently amounting to an entire legion, was stationed by itself at some distance from its main body, and might possibly be cut off by a sudden attack. Eager to retrieve the loss which he had sustained in the early part of the day, Cæsar caught at the chance of success thus held out to him, and advanced with about three legions to assail the single legion of the enemy. But the ground, it seems, was intersected with walls and ditches which had been made in some of the multiplied operations of the last few weeks, and these impediments delayed and disarranged the order of the advancing troops, and gave Pompey time to come up with a strong reinforcement. Cæsar's soldiers, confused amidst the difficulties of the ground, and now themselves attacked both in front and rear, were seized with a panic, and fled. In vain did Cæsar attempt to stop the rout; when he caught hold of the colours which the terrified bearers were carrying off in their flight, they were thrown away, or left in his grasp; when he stopped the horses of any of his fugitive cavalry, the riders leaped off, and ran away on foot. But the same impediments, which had first thrown the vanquished party into disorder, obstructed, in their turn, the pursuit of the conquerors; and Pompey himself, it is said, surprised at his easy victory, suspected that the flight of the enemy was counterfeited, in order to draw him into some ambuscade, and accordingly did not press upon them so closely as he might have done. Still he had gained a great and decisive advantage, for Cæsar at once felt that he could not continue the campaign on his present ground; and having brought together all his scattered detachments, and abandoned all his lines, he determined to retreat from the neighbourhood of Dyrrhachium with the greatest expedition, and began to concert measures to preserve his army during its retreat from the annoyance likely to be offered by the victorious enemy.

Pompey resolves to release himself from his blockade.

He forces Cæsar's lines.

Affair of Dyrrhachium, in which Cæsar is defeated.

For this purpose he sent off all his baggage with the sick and wounded in the early part of the night, under the escort of a single legion.† The main body of the army commenced its march a little before daybreak, but Cæsar remained in the camp, with two legions, for some little time longer; and then, after the usual order had been given for the soldiers to prepare to march, he set out with the utmost expedition, and soon overtook the other legions, which had already made some progress. The order for marching was generally, it appears, conveyed through

Cæsar retreats from Dyrrhachium.

* Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. ix. epist. ix.
† Cæsar, c. 59, *et seq.*

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 66, *et seq.*
† Ibid. lib. iii. c. 75.

the camp with considerable noise,* being notified by repeated calls to get the baggage together; and thus it might easily be heard by an enemy, when posted at the little distance which was customary in Roman warfare. Pompey, accordingly, no sooner heard this signal, than he put his own army in motion, supposing that the enemy were only then beginning their retreat; but Cæsar, through the precautions which he had employed, was so much in advance, that he could not be overtaken till he came to the Genusus, a river which falls into the sea a little to the south of Dyrrhachium, and whose steep and rocky banks necessarily occasioned some delay ere the passage of it could be effected. Here Pompey's cavalry came up with the rear of the retreating army; but Cæsar ordered his own cavalry up to the scene of action, and, by supporting them with a detachment of the light-armed legionary infantry, enabled them, according to his own account, though greatly inferior in numbers, to repulse the enemy with some loss. Having thus crossed the Genusus in safety, he led his troops into a camp which they had formerly occupied, described before as being close to Asparagium,† and which was distant about eight miles from the position which they had quitted in the morning.‡ The cavalry were immediately sent out to forage, as if Cæsar intended to halt here for the night; but they were ordered to return quickly to the camp, by the gate furthest removed from the enemy; and about noon the order was given to resume the march, and the army continued its retreat for eight miles more without the least disturbance. Pompey, on his part, had occupied his old camp near Asparagium; and, concluding that Cæsar would move no further during that day, had not only sent out his cavalry as usual to collect wood and forage, but had allowed many of the soldiers to return to their position of the morning, in order to collect various articles of their baggage which they had been forced to leave behind when summoned so suddenly to move in pursuit of Cæsar. It was thus impossible for him to follow his adversary; and the advance which Cæsar had gained was so important, that no subsequent exertions of Pompey could make up for it. Accordingly, on the fourth day, he discontinued the pursuit, and Cæsar arrived at Apollonia without interruption. This town, it seems, was one of his most valuable posts,§ and he had placed there his military chest, which he now required for the payment of his soldiers; he judged it also to be the place where he could most securely leave behind his wounded; and for both these reasons he had fixed upon it as his first point of retreat. He had no intention, however, to remain there long, as he had decided to move at once into Thessaly. Accordingly, having sent orders to Cn. Domitius Calvinus, the Commander of that part of his army which was in Lower Macedonia, to join him as soon as possible, and having left garrisons at Apollonia, Lissus, and Oricum, to facilitate his communications with Italy, he set out once more to commence what may be called a new campaign; and turning aside from the coast, he commenced his march towards the interior of the country, through Epirus and Athamania.*

He is pursued by Pompey without effect.

The final success of Cæsar at Pharsalia, ought not so far to impose upon us as to prevent us from seeing that his plans, up to the moment of his retreat from Dyrrhachium, had entirely failed, and that Pompey's confidence in the wisdom of his own system had hitherto been fully justified. By exposing his soldiers gradually in partial encounters, and under favourable circumstances, he had enabled them to meet and to vanquish Cæsar's veterans; while Cæsar, after undergoing a series of labours for the purpose of tempting his adversary to fight, and having seen the patience of his troops tried to the utmost from the want of provisions arising from the enemy's naval superiority, had imposed all this suffering upon them without deriving the least benefit from it; and when at last he did meet Pompey in battle, he was beaten and obliged to change his whole plan of the campaign. But although he had thus been baffled, he allowed no signs of dejection, nor of a sense of difficulty to appear in his conduct. He had so artfully soothed the vanity of his soldiers by extenuating their defeat,† and imputing it to any cause rather than to a want of courage or zeal on their part, that the men were less dismayed than irritated by their disaster; and feeling grateful to their General for the kindness of his behaviour towards them, they were impatient for an opportunity of retrieving their disgrace, and of proving to him that his confidence in them had not been bestowed unworthily. The success with which the retreat to Apollonia had been conducted, was likely to lessen their impression of the events at Dyrrhachium; and they now had the prospect of resuming at once the offensive, of drawing away the enemy from the neighbourhood of the sea, which had hitherto given

He resolves to march into Thessaly.

His reasons for so doing.

* Cæsar, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. i. c. 66.

† Ibid. lib. iii. c. 76.

‡ This is spoken of as a day's march, although it was completed some time before noon, and the distance seems very inconsiderable. It should be remembered, however, that it was now midsummer, a season at which it would be desirable, in the climate of Greece, to avoid marching in the heat of the day; and, besides, the circumstance of finding a camp ready formed, would be a reason why the army should halt a little sooner than usual, rather than advance a few miles at the price of having to undergo the whole labour of raising the customary works for itself. The passage of the Genusus, moreover, was probably more fatiguing than a march of some length over a plain country; and the armies had both moved at an unusual pace during the whole day; so that altogether, it was not unnatural to suppose that Cæsar might really intend to halt in his camp at Asparagium.

§ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 78.

* The reading in the only two editions of Cæsar which we have consulted, (neither of them, it must be confessed, of any great value, or of recent date,) is "Acarnania;" "*per Epirum atque Acarnaniam iter facere cœpit*," c. 78. It is evident that Cæsar could not march through *Acarnania*; but *Athamania* is the name of that wild mountain region which lies between Epirus and Thessaly, and which immediately overhangs the valley in which Gomphi stands. Vid. Livy, lib. xxxi. c. 41. "*Imminet Athamaniæ huic urbi;*" *sc. Gomphis.* It should be remembered, that in the part of his history from which these words are quoted, Livy has so generally copied Polybius, that his geography is unusually clear and correct. See also Strabo, lib. vii. p. 378, and lib. ix. p. 491. Plutarch also says, expressly, ἐδίδαξε δὲ Ἀθαμᾶνας εἰς Θετταλίαν. *in Pompeio*, c. 66. Another blunder occurs in the very next chapter in the same editions of Cæsar, where the Heraclea, through which Pompey passed, is called Heraclea Sentica. Heraclea Sentica, or Sintica, was near the eastern frontier of Macedonia, between the Strymon and the Axius; Vid. Livy, lib. xlv. c. 29.; but the Heraclea, through which Pompey passed, was on the western frontier, and was, in fact, situated on the Ignatian way, at the eastern foot of the Candavian mountains. Vid. Strabo, lib. vii. p. 374.

† Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 73, 74.

him so great an advantage, and of enjoying the supplies which the approaching harvest promised them in the rich and comparatively unwasted plains of Thessaly. Still, however, the utmost expedition was necessary; for it was not to be doubted that Pompey, after having ceased to pursue Cæsar, would at once march into Macedonia by that great and direct communication called the Ignatian way,* which, as we have already mentioned, crossed the whole country from Dyrrhachium, on the Ionian gulf, to Thessalonica, on the Ægean sea. Whichever General should first arrive to support his officer who commanded in Lower Macedonia, was likely to gain an important advantage by overwhelming the detachment of the enemy; and thus, whilst Pompey was hastening to join Scipio, Cæsar was equally anxious to unite his army with that of Cn. Domitius.

Cn. Domitius Calvinus had been Consul with M. Messala during the latter part of the year 700, after the long interregnum which lasted through all the earlier months of it. He was then reputed a partisan of the Aristocracy; but was implicated, while a candidate, in that corrupt agreement with the Consuls of the preceding year which forms so remarkable an instance of audacious profligacy.† Such a man had probably little to guide him, except his interest or his passions; and, accordingly, he was now an officer under Cæsar, and had been sent into Macedonia some time before with two legions, to gain, if possible, that important Province.‡ Here he had been opposed to Scipio, who had just brought with him from Asia an army of nearly equal force; and as Scipio imitated the policy of Pompey and declined an action, the two armies lay opposite to one another for some time on the banks of the Haliacmon, without engaging in any affair of importance. It seems, however, that this system of warfare was as annoying to Cæsar's lieutenants as to himself; for we find that Cn. Domitius, having exhausted the resources of the country immediately around him, was obliged to change his position, and had moved towards Heraclea,§ a town situated on the Ignatian way, and at the eastern foot of the Candavian mountains, which are the central chain from whence the streams flow eastward to the Ægean, and westward to the Ionian gulf. This movement took place exactly at the time that Pompey was marching to join Scipo; and as Heraclea was one of the towns through which his road lay, he would have cut off Domitius and his troops without difficulty, had they not escaped in the utmost haste only four hours before his arrival. The news of Cæsar's defeat at Dyrrhachium, exaggerated as usual by report, had produced every where a strong sensation; and the people of the country, considering his cause desperate, hoped to recommend themselves to the conqueror, by cutting off his communications, and practising against him all those desultory modes of annoyance which a retreating or beaten army is so apt to suffer from such hands. For a long time, therefore, neither Cæsar nor Domitius could receive any intelligence from each other; but at last Domitius, having learnt at once the march of Cæsar towards Thessaly, and his own danger from the advance of Pompey, fell back southwards with all his haste, and met Cæsar at Æginium,* a town of considerable natural strength, standing amongst the mountains of Athamania, which immediately overhang the plains of Thessaly. Scipio, who had, perhaps, been earlier informed of the approaching change of the seat of war, left the banks of the Haliacmon, and stationed himself at Larissa, on the Peneus, one of the principal cities of Thessaly, and which it was of importance to lose no time in securing. As for the detachment which had been sent by Cæsar into Thessaly while he was himself opposed to Pompey near Dyrrhachium,† it had been driven out of the country by Scipio, just before Cn. Domitius began to engage the whole attention of that officer in Macedonia; so that Cæsar, when he arrived at Æginium, had nothing else to trust to for a favourable reception, except the affections of the Thessalians themselves; and those, he tells us, had been greatly alienated by the exaggerated reports which prevailed of the desperate situation of his affairs.

He joins Cn. Domitius, his lieutenant, on the frontiers of Thessaly.

On descending from Æginium into the plain of Thessaly, the first town of importance on the line of Cæsar's march was Gomphi.‡ He found the gates shut against him; although he tells us that the citizens had sent to him some time before to offer him their services, and to invite him to garrison their city. But when he represented to his soldiers the importance of striking terror into the Thessalians by vigorously chastising this first act of hostility, and encouraged them by promises of the plunder of a wealthy town, they were animated with such a spirit, that they scaled the walls within three or four hours after their arrival before the place, and sacked the town with all the eagerness of men who had been long unused to every indulgence. The example, however, produced the desired effect. Metropolis, the next place on the army's route, submitted at once; and here, as a contrast to the fate of Gomphi, the soldiers were forced to observe the greatest forbearance. With such a lesson before their eyes, the other towns of Thessaly followed generally the behaviour of the people of Metropolis; so that Cæsar rapidly advanced, till he found himself in the midst of a country covered with crops of corn almost ready for harvest,§ where he determined to await the approach of Pompey, and again, if possible, try the fortune of a battle. His camp was pitched a few miles to the south of Larissa, at no great distance from the right bank of the river Enipeus, in the ever memorable plains of Pharsalus or Pharsalia.

He takes Gomphi, and wins over most of the Thessalian towns.

And encamps in the plains of Pharsalia.

Meanwhile, the victory of Dyrrhachium and the retreat of Cæsar had produced a fatal effect on the mind of Pompey, and made him less firm in resisting the rash and violent counsels of his officers. His soldiers had saluted him with the title of *Imperator* on the field of battle, a name usually given in this manner by an army to its victorious General, and expressive of the sense entertained by his troops of the greatness of his success. But it is mentioned, that although Pompey adopted the title thus conferred on him,‖ he abstained from the general custom of

Confidence of Pompey's army.

* Strabo, lib. vii. p. 374. edit. Xyland.
† Vide p. 217 of our *Life of Cæsar*.
‡ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 34.
§ Ibid. c. 79. Strabo, lib. vii. p. 374.

* Cæsar, c. 79: Livy, lib. xxxi. c. 41. lib. xxxii. c. 13.
† Cæsar, c. 36.
‡ Ibid. c. 80.
§ Ibid. c. 81.
‖ Ibid. c. 71.

wreathing his fasces, or surrounding his letters with laurel; implying that he intended to claim no triumph for a victory gained over his own countrymen. His Generals immediately began to propose various plans for the future operations of the army. L. Afranius (who had brought with him from Spain a part of the troops which he had formerly commanded there,* having enlisted, perhaps afresh, some of those soldiers who had been discharged according to the capitulation granted them by Cæsar) strongly urged that Pompey should avail himself of the first renown of his victory,† and should transport his army at once into Italy; that he might thus easily recover the seat of government, and might deprive his adversary of the resources which he now drew from Sicily, Sardinia, Gaul, and Spain. But Pompey replied, that he would never consent to expose Italy and Rome itself to the miseries of war; that besides, by leaving Greece at this moment, he abandoned Scipio and his two legions to certain destruction; whereas, by effecting a junction with him, he might reasonably hope to complete the work which they had so well begun, and might return to Rome within a short period, without leaving behind them any cause for apprehension or future anxiety. It is said that some of the members of the high Aristocratical party were in the habit of reproaching Pompey for his procrastinating system of warfare,‡ and accused him of wishing to protract the contest, that he might the longer enjoy the distinction of seeing the flower of the Nobility of Rome obeying him as their Commander-in-chief. But his policy was so evidently wise, that, inclined as he was to defer too much to public opinion, he yet persevered in his own plans till after the battle of Dyrrhachium. The unexpected panic which he had on that occasion witnessed among Cæsar's veterans, inclined him, perhaps, to think that he had judged too highly of their superiority; while his confidence in his own soldiers would be proportionably raised. He thought that his long course of cautious training had at last been brought to perfection; and that with a more numerous army, now flushed with victory, and a very superior cavalry, he need not fear to face his enemy in the field. This feeling was heightened, when he found that the plains of Thessaly were to become the scene of the contest; for on no ground could his cavalry act with more advantage; and we are told that he placed his main reliance on that part of his forces.§ But be this as it may, he set out with the bulk of his army to follow Cæsar, as we have already related, having left fifteen cohorts at Dyrrhachium, under the command of M. Cato, to secure his magazines in that town.‖ Two other distinguished individuals remained also at Dyrrhachium, and thus were not present at the battle of Pharsalia; M. Varro, who had been lately one of Pompey's lieutenants in Spain, and who was accounted the most learned Roman of his time; and M. Cicero, who, though warmly attached to Pompey himself, was disgusted at the language and conduct of some of his principal officers, and was, probably, not sorry for the indisposition

* Cæsar, c. 88.
† Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 66. Appian, lib. ii. c. 65.
‡ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 67. Appian, lib. ii. c. 67. Cæsar, c. 82.
§ Cæsar, c. 86.
‖ Cicero, *de Divinatione*, lib. i. c. 31. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 55.

which, according to Plutarch,* prevented him from taking a more active part in the contest. He had always been anxious for peace, and had left Italy in the preceding summer, and joined Pompey in Greece more out of personal friendship to him, and a regard to his own character, than from any ardent zeal in the quarrel, or still less from an approbation of the manner in which it was conducted.

Pompey, on his arrival in Thessaly, formed a junction with Scipio's army, and then advanced and pitched his camp at no great distance from that of Cæsar. He was abundantly supplied with provisions from the sea, and from the country in his rear, while Cæsar could command only the resources of that part of Thessaly which was in his own immediate occupation; and these, though plentiful at present, must, of necessity, be soon exhausted. Cæsar, therefore, lost no time in offering battle to his antagonist; but this was for some days declined; and Pompey, though he drew his troops out in order, yet kept them so near to the protection of their camp, that Cæsar could not venture to attack him.† There was still, perhaps, a struggle in Pompey's mind between his own better judgment and his deference to the wishes, or rather the clamours, of his Generals, combined with that confidence in his strength with which his late victory had inspired him. At length Cæsar resolved to change his ground; calculating, he tells us, that by moving often from place to place, he should be able to subsist his troops more readily;‡ and, if he was pursued, might have some opportunity of forcing the enemy to an engagement during the march. Besides, he still looked upon Pompey's soldiers as raw levies, in comparison with his own practised veterans; and hoped to weary out their spirits and patience by harassing them incessantly, and keeping them in continual motion. But when the order for marching had been actually given, when the tents were already struck, and the troops were moving out of the gates of the camp, word was brought that the enemy was formed in line of battle at a greater distance from his intrenchments than usual, as if disposed to venture an action on equal terms. Immediately the march was stopped, the red ensign, or signal of battle, was displayed at the General's quarters,§ and the soldiers, freed from the load which they were accustomed to carry when marching, were instantly led out into the plain equipped merely for battle, and were drawn up in front of the enemy.

Pompey is persuaded to hazard a battle.

The engagements of modern warfare cannot be understood without an exact knowledge not only of the grander features of the scene of action, but even of the minutest details of its hills, vallies, streams, woods, roads, villages, and insulated houses. A space of several miles is occupied by the contending armies; and a battle is for the most part a game of positions, in which the carrying one important point renders the retreat of the enemy a matter of necessity. Generals, therefore, are obliged to calculate time and distance with the utmost exactness; as success will depend on the combined movements of different bodies of men acting out of sight of one another, and over a

Disposition of the two armies.

* *In Cicerone*, c. 39.
† Cæsar, *de Bello Civili*, lib. iii. c. 84.
‡ Cæsar, c. 85.
§ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 68.

wide extent of country; and meeting with obstacles of a very unequal nature in their respective operations. But in ancient times, the great battles, which decided the fate of a campaign or a war, were conducted on a much more simple system. The two parties descended, as by agreement, into a wide field for action; both were drawn up in parallel lines, and there decided the contest by hard fighting, man to man, with seldom any other attempts at manœuvring, than those made by either army to turn the flank of its antagonist. In this manner Cæsar and Pompey met in the plains of Pharsalia. Their lines fronted one another in the usual order of battle; the right flank of Pompey's army, and the left of Cæsar's, were covered by the river Enipeus, whose banks were steep and broken;* while Pompey had stationed his whole cavalry on his left, at once to cover that extremity of his own line, and to turn the wing of the enemy. To obviate this, Cæsar formed a reserve of six cohorts, which he had drafted from the legions of his third line, and placed them on his right, behind his own cavalry, ready to present a front and to charge the cavalry of the enemy so soon as they should prepare to execute their intended manœuvre. He, himself, besides, took his station on the right of his line, at the head of the tenth legion, the most distinguished body of troops in his army; while Pompey, equally aware that this would be the most important point in the field, placed himself on his own left wing, at the head of the two legions which had formerly belonged to Cæsar, and which had been recalled from his army in Gaul, as we have already seen, a little before the beginning of the war. The numbers on each side are, as usual, uncertain; the writer of the *Commentaries* (for the more we read them the less can we persuade ourselves to consider Cæsar as their author, although, to avoid circumlocution, we often speak of them as his work) states the amount of Pompey's infantry at forty-five thousand, and that of Cæsar's at twenty-two thousand.† In cavalry, Pompey's superiority is made out to be still greater; he had seven thousand men, and Cæsar only one thousand.‡ Appian, also, without referring directly to the *Commentaries*, gives exactly the same numbers, following, he says, the most credible authorities on the subject;§ but he mentions several other statements, some representing the disparity between the two armies to have been greater, and others to have been less than he has recorded. The auxiliary troops on both sides were very numerous, but their exact amount, says Appian, is not known; because the Romans consider the foreign part of their forces as of little importance. Almost every Province of the Empire had given assistance to one or other of the two antagonists; and it was on the foreign troops in Pompey's army that Cæsar ordered his soldiers to glut their fury, while he commanded them to spare all who were Romans, as soon as they should cease to resist. Yet it was the most beneficial result of Cæsar's final victory, that the distinction between the Italians and the inhabitants of other parts of the Empire was gradually lessened, till it was at last removed altogether. And although, to effect this equality, Rome was somewhat degraded, as well as the Provinces raised, yet the general interests of mankind were promoted by the change; inasmuch as a larger portion of it became admitted to that rank and that civil condition which were the highest and most desirable existing at the time in the world.

Their numbers.

The signal of attack was first given by Cæsar;* and his soldiers rushed forward to the onset. But finding that the enemy did not advance to meet them, and fearing to exhaust their strength before they closed, they halted, of their own accord, for a few minutes, in the middle of their course, to recover their breath; and then, renewing their charge, they launched their javelins against the adverse ranks, and instantly drawing their swords engaged the enemy hand to hand. The soldiers of the Commonwealth received the attack with coolness, and the action soon became general; when the cavalry,† which was stationed on the left of Pompey's line, moved forward to charge Cæsar's right, accompanied by all the light troops, which formed a numerous body. Cæsar's cavalry, unable to stand the attack, was presently beaten; and the victorious cavalry of Pompey were beginning to fall on the defenceless flank of the line of infantry, when the reserve of six cohorts, or about three thousand men, which Cæsar had formed for this very purpose, suddenly advanced; and, without waiting to receiving the charge of the cavalry, itself charged them with great impetuosity. Pompey's cavalry, as we have seen, consisted mainly of foreigners and those of many different nations.‡ Startled, therefore, at this unexpected attack, afraid of the high courage and discipline of Cæsar's regular infantry, galled by the terrible discharge of the javelins, and perhaps in some disorder at the moment from not having completed the manœuvre in which they were engaged, the soldiers, on whom Pompey had placed his chief dependence, were seized with a shameful panic, and fled.§ The light troops, abandoned to their fate, were instantly cut to pieces; and the reserve, still pushing its success, fell upon the flank and rear of the line of Pompey's infantry, which was at that moment warmly engaged in front with the best troops in Cæsar's army, the famous tenth legion. At the same instant Cæsar brought up the third line of his army, which had not hitherto been engaged;‖ and the arrival of a fresh force at once overpowered the resistance of the enemy; who, wearied with a long contest already, and attacked at once in front and in rear, were unable to withstand this third attack, and broke and fled. The impression communicated itself rapidly, and the whole line of Pompey's infantry began to give ground. Still, however, they disputed the approach towards their camp; when Cæsar issued the order to give quarter to all Roman

Battle of Pharsalia.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 88.
† Ibid. lib. iii. c. 88, 89.
‡ Ibid. c. 84.
§ Appian, lib. ii. c. 70,

* Cæsar, c. 90. 92. Florus, lib. iv. c. 2.
† Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 93, 94.
‡ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 4. *Confer. Lucan, Pharsalia*, lib. vii. v. 521, *et seq.*
§ The reader will recollect the similar circumstances which occasioned the disgraceful route of Preston Pans in the rebellion of 1745. The dragoons, who were ordered to charge the Highlanders as they advanced, were beaten off and fled, leaving the artillery and infantry to their fate. And it is remarkable, that, till then, the cavalry had been regarded as the particular kind of force which was likely to be most efficacious against the Highlanders.
‖ Cæsar, c. 94.

citizens, and only to kill the foreign auxiliaries.* Many of the legionary soldiers instantly embraced the safety thus offered to them, while the auxiliaries, deserted by the most effective part of the army, were slaughtered without difficulty and without mercy. In this manner the conquerors soon arrived at Pompey's camp; which they proceeded to storm, and carried it after a brief but sharp resistance from some Thracians and other auxiliaries who had been stationed to defend the rampart.† From the camp the fugitives fled in a body to some very high ground, which rose immediately behind it;‡ and Cæsar, having authority enough to call off his soldiers from the spoil that was lying before them, instantly followed to complete his victory.§ But the enemy finding that their position was destitute of water, abandoned it, and continued their retreat towards Larissa. Cæsar still pursued them with a part of his forces, having left the other part to secure his own camp, and that which he had just taken from the enemy. The fugitives, finding that he was gaining ground upon them by moving on a more practicable road, halted again on another height, which had a stream flowing at its foot. Night was coming on, and the exertions of the day had almost exhausted both parties; but Cæsar encouraged his men to make one effort more, and to raise works between the hill and the stream, that the enemy might not supply themselves with water during the night. His wish was accomplished; and the unfortunate fugitives, exposed to all the horrors of thirst after a day of intense fatigue, and at the hottest season of the year, sent some of their number to offer an immediate surrender.|| Some Senators, it is said, who were on the hill, not choosing to submit to Cæsar, escaped during the night; but the rest of the fugitives, as soon as morning came, were ordered to come down into the plain and give up their arms; after which their lives were granted them; and in the cruelty of ancient warfare they had reason to congratulate themselves on their fortune, in being preserved alike from massacre and from slavery. The indefatigable conqueror, having thus completed the destruction of the enemy's army, ordered the legions which he had with him to be relieved by those which, on the preceding afternoon, he had sent back to the camp, and then continuing his advance, he reached Larissa on that day, and entered it without resistance.

Defeat of Pompey.

Surrender of a large portion of his army.

Such was the battle of Pharsalia. It is needless to inquire what was the number of the slain on the part of the vanquished, or of the conqueror; for a victory so complete is to be estimated rather by its results, than by the immediate slaughter in the field; and where the Empire of the world was lost and won, no subordinate considerations could aggravate the defeat, nor materially lessen the joy of the victory. L. Domitius, who had been named by the Senate at the beginning of the war as Cæsar's successor in Gaul, was killed in the pursuit;* T. Labienus and L. Afranius had escaped to Dyrrhachium; whilst P. Lentulus, L. Lentulus the late Consul, Scipio, and Pompey the Great himself, were seeking shelter and protection from foreigners. But the fortunes of Pompey deserve to be traced more particularly. When he saw his cavalry defeated,† and the reserve of Cæsar's six cohorts threatening to surround that part of his line in which he had taken his place, it is agreed that he instantly left the field, and rode back to his camp. As he entered the gates, he addressed himself to the Centurions, who were stationed there on guard, charging them to do their duty in defending the camp, if it should be needful, and adding, "that he was going to visit the other gates, and to increase the guards at every point." Yet we are told that he went directly to his own tent, and there remained as if stupified, till he found that the enemy had already forced their way into his intrenchments. We find, indeed, that when he saw his cavalry routed, he suspected that he was betrayed; and this feeling, working vaguely in his mind, was likely, above all others, to make him helpless and irresolute. Yet, if he were afraid of treason in the field, it was, perhaps, his wisest plan to retire to his camp, and endeavour to secure that at least from the enemy; and his subsequent flight did not take place till all hope of resistance was clearly vanished. Then he changed his dress, and withdrawing from the camp by the back gate, he rode off, attended by about thirty horsemen, amongst whom were Publius and Lucius Lentulus, and M. Favonius,‡ the friend and professed imitator of Cato. He fled first to Larissa, but did not halt there; and thence continuing his flight during the whole night, he reached the sea at the mouth of the Peneus, and was there taken on board a small trading vessel, which happened to be passing by the coast. At first he bent his course towards the mouth of the Strymon,§ and lay there at anchor for one night, in order to learn the state of his affairs; but finding them desperate, and having procured a supply of money from his friends at Amphipolis, he crossed over to Mitylene in Lesbos, where he had left his wife Cornelia, and his younger son Sextus.|| The purity and tenderness of Pompey's private character,

Personal adventures of Pompey.

* Appian, lib. ii. c. 80.

† Cæsar, c. 95. ‡ Ibid. c. 95. 97.

§ It was on this occasion that Cæsar exclaimed, in the hearing of Asinius Pollio, upon witnessing the total defeat of the Commonwealth's army, "*Hoc voluerunt: tantis rebus gestis C. Cæsar condemnatus essem, nisi ab exercitu auxilium petiissem.*" The words of Napoleon Buonaparte were in the same spirit when he was exciting the indignation of his soldiers against the Jacobin members of the Council of Five Hundred, on the memorable 19th Brumaire, (10th November, 1799.) "*J'allais leur faire connaître les moyens de sauver la république, et de nous rendre notre gloire. Ils m'ont répondu à coups de poignard. Ils voulaient ainsi réaliser le désir des rois coalisés. Qu'aurait pu faire de plus l'Angleterre! Soldats, puis-je compter sur vous?*"—*Mémoires de Napoléon*, tome i. p. 91.

|| Pompey was murdered the day before his birthday; that is, according to Pliny, *Histor. Naturel.* lib. xxxvii. c. 2., on the 29th of September; which, allowing for the disordered state of the Roman Calendar at this time, was really about one of the latter days of July. Consequently the battle of Pharsalia must have been fought about the beginning or middle of July; but we have found no record of the precise day, and, indeed, one might imagine, from some words of Lucan, that it was not exactly known even in his time. He says.

Tempora signavit leviorum Roma malorum,
Hunc voluit nescire diem.

Phars. lib. vii. v. 410.

* Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 99. Cicero, *de Divinatione*, lib. i. c. 31. Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 190.

† Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 94. 96.

‡ Velleius Patercul. lib. ii. c. 79.

§ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 102.

|| Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 74.

rendered his meeting with his family particularly affectionate. Cornelia had heard no tidings of the war since the exaggerated reports which she had received of her husband's success at Dyrrhachium; his arrival, therefore, as a fugitive, was a shock for which she was wholly unprepared. She joined him on board his vessel immediately; for he would not go on shore, although warmly invited by the Mitylenæans to do so, and although he was detained by contrary winds for two days off the harbour. He would not, he said, expose his friends to the resentment of the conqueror, by availing himself of their kindness; but recommended them to submit to Cæsar, adding, that they would find him disposed to be merciful. But being here joined by some other small vessels he sailed to the southward, hoping to make a stand in the southern part of Asia Minor, or in Syria; and trusting that at that distance he might rally his navy, and with the assistance of the eastern Provinces again renew the contest. The effect of the battle of Pharsalia, however, was rapidly felt in every quarter. Rhodes,* which still retained some part of its old naval renown, and which had contributed a squadron to Pompey's fleet, now refused to admit the fugitives within its ports; and Pompey, mortified at this first check to his hopes, continued his voyage along the coast as far as Cilicia, without meeting any where with any decided encouragement or support. His views were now turned, it is said, towards Syria. That Province was still, by law, subject to the government of his father-in-law Scipio, and its own resources might be powerfully supported by the arms of Parthia; a power to which Pompey was inclined to look for assistance in this extremity of fortune. But when he arrived at Paphos, in Cyprus, he learnt that Antioch, the Capital of Syria, had declared against him;† that the citadel of that place had been secured for the very purpose of excluding him; and that the citizens had given notice that none of the fugitives of Pompey's party should be allowed to enter their territories. There was no hope then of renewing the war in Syria; and Pompey was strongly advised not to take refuge at the Court of Parthia;‡ a place the least calculated to offer an honourable protection to a Roman lady, who was now the wife of Pompey, and whose first husband had been the son of Crassus. It was then suggested that he should retire to Africa, where the friendship of Juba and the triumphant state of his party seemed naturally to invite him.

He resolves to seek an asylum in Egypt.

But this plan he declined, and, in an evil hour, resolved to throw himself on the gratitude of the King of Egypt. The present sovereign was a mere boy; but his father had owed the recovery of his Kingdom, as we have seen, to Pompey's influence; and this, it was hoped, would now ensure a hospitable reception from the son. Pompey, accordingly, sailed to Pelusium;§ and, before he landed, he sent a message to the young King, to request an asylum at Alexandria, and assistance for himself and his friends in their distress. It happened that Ptolemy then lay with an army on the most eastern boundary of Egypt, in order to repel an expected invasion from his sister, the famous Cleopatra; who, having been left by her father's will joint heir of the Kingdom with her brother, had been since expelled by him, and was now endeavouring, with some aid which she had procured in Syria, to effect her restoration. Pompey's messenger, accordingly, found the King near mount Casius, some miles to the eastward of Pelusium; and, having discharged his commission, was sent back with a kind answer, and an invitation to Pompey to join the King immediately. But Ptolemy had at this time in his service a number of Roman soldiers, who, having belonged to that army with which Gabinius had restored the late King to his throne, had since chosen to remain in Egypt, and to transfer their obedience to a new master. Gabinius had been raised entirely by Pompey's influence, and many of his soldiers had served against the Pirates, or against Mithridates, and might thus be supposed to retain some respect and affection for Pompey, their old and most illustrious commander. As a Roman Proconsul, Pompey would little hesitate to recall these men to his own standard; and as the Roman people had been named by the late King as his executors, their officer might interfere, more than Ptolemy wished, in the quarrels of the Royal family, and might even attempt to dispose of all the resources of Egypt by his own authority. The King's Council, therefore, resolved to tempt Pompey into their power, and to murder him; an act by which they hoped to merit the favour of Cæsar, while they freed themselves from a guest who might, if once admitted, become too powerful to be dismissed or to be resisted.

He is murdered.

At Cyprus* Pompey had supplied himself with money from the funds of the farmers of the revenue, and from the contributions of some private individuals; he had also raised, as we are told, about two thousand men, chiefly from the large slave establishments belonging to different persons in the island; and with this force, having been joined besides by several Senators from different quarters, he had crossed over to the coast of Egypt. The whole of his little squadron followed him from Pelusium, when he went to meet the King; and on board of his own ship, as we have already mentioned, were his wife Cornelia, and his son Sextus. As he came near mount Casius, the Egyptian army was seen on the shore, and their fleet lying off at some distance, when presently a boat was observed approaching the ship from the land; and it was soon found to contain one of the King's chief officers, a man of the name of Achillas, attended by two or three other persons of inferior rank. Among these was a Roman, named L. Septimius, who had served as a Centurion under Pompey in the war with the Pirates, and who, when the boat came near the ship, addressed his old General in Latin, by the title of *Imperator*, while Achillas, saluting him courteously in Greek, invited him to enter the boat, informing him that there was not water enough near the shore for a vessel of any burden. The King himself,† and a group of his principal officers, were at this time seen on the shore, as if waiting to bid their illustrious guest welcome; and Pompey accordingly descended into the boat, accompanied by two

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xiv. Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 102.

† Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 15. Cæsar, c. 102.

‡ Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, c. 76.

§ Ibid. c. 77. Cæsar, c. 103.

* Cæsar, c. 103. Plutarch, c. 78, 79.

† Appian, *Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 84. Plutarch, *ubi supra.* Cæsar, c. 104.

Centurions, by one of his freedmen, and by a single slave. As the party were borne towards the land, Pompey is said to have recognised L. Septimius, and to have observed to him, "that he thought they must have formerly served together;" to which Septimius answered by a mere movement of assent. No one seemed willing to break the silence, upon which Pompey took out an outline of a Greek address which he had intended to deliver on his introduction to the King, and amused himself with reading it. At last the boat touched the shore, and several of Ptolemy's officers crowded down to the water's edge, as if to receive Pompey immediately on his landing. He rose from his seat, and, leaning on his freedman's arm, was in the act of stepping on shore, when L. Septimius stabbed him in the back, and instantly, on this signal, Achillas and his Egyptian soldiers drew their swords to complete the work. It is said that Pompey did not utter a single cry, but, folding his gown over his face, received the blows of his assassins without attempting to resist or to escape. As soon as the murder was finished, his head was cut off and embalmed, in order to be presented to Cæsar; and his body was cast out carelessly and left upon the beach. His freedman lingered near it, till the crowd was dispersed, and then burnt it on a rude funeral pile of such broken pieces of wood as he found scattered along the shore, assisted, as it is said, by an old Roman soldier, now in the Egyptian service, and who remembered that Pompey the Great had once been his General. Cornelia and her friends, who saw the murder committed, instantly put to sea and escaped the pursuit of the Egyptian fleet, which at first threatened to intercept them. Their feelings, as is natural, were for the moment so engrossed by their own danger, that they could scarcely comprehend the full extent of their loss;* nor was it till they reached the port of Tyre in safety, that grief succeeded to apprehension, and they began to understand what cause they had for sorrow.

Character of Pompey.

But the tears that were shed for Pompey were not only those of domestic affliction; his fate called forth a more general and honourable mourning. No man had ever gained, at so early an age, the affections of his countrymen; none had enjoyed them so largely, or preserved them so long with so little interruption; and at the distance of eighteen centuries the feeling of his contemporaries may be sanctioned by the sober judgment of history. He entered upon public life as a distinguished member of an oppressed party which was just arriving at its hour of triumph and retaliation; he saw his associates plunged in rapine and massacre, but he preserved himself pure from the contagion of their crimes; and when the death of Sylla left him almost at the head of the Aristocratical party, he served them ably and faithfully with his sword, while he endeavoured to mitigate the evils of their ascendency, by restoring to the Commons of Rome, on the earliest opportunity, the most important of those privileges and liberties which they had lost under the tyranny of their late master. He received the due reward of his honest patriotism, in the unusual honours and trusts that were conferred on him; but his greatness could not corrupt his virtue; and the boundless powers with which he was repeatedly invested, he wielded with the highest ability and uprightness to the accomplishment of his task, and then, without any undue attempts to prolong their duration, he honestly resigned them. At a period of general cruelty and extortion towards the enemies and subjects of the Commonwealth, the character of Pompey, in his foreign commands, was marked by its humanity and spotless integrity; his conquest of the Pirates was effected with wonderful rapidity, and cemented by a merciful policy, which, instead of taking vengeance for the past, accomplished the prevention of evil for the future: his presence in Asia, when he conducted the war with Mithridates, was no less a relief to the Provinces from the tyranny of their Governors, than it was their protection against the arms of the enemy. It is true that wounded vanity led him, after his return from Asia, to unite himself for a time with some unworthy associates; and this connection, as it ultimately led to all the misfortunes, so did it immediately tempt him to the worst faults of his political life, and involved him in a career of difficulty, mortification, and shame. But after this disgraceful fall, he again returned to his natural station, and was universally regarded as the fit protector of the laws and liberties of his country, when they were threatened by Cæsar's rebellion. In the conduct of the civil war he showed something of weakness and vacillation; but his abilities, though considerable, were far from equal to those of his adversary; and his inferiority was most seen in that want of steadiness in the pursuit of his own plans, which caused him to abandon a system already sanctioned by success, and to persuade himself that he might yield with propriety to the ill-judged impatience of his followers for battle. His death is one of the few tragical events of those times which may be regarded with unmixed compassion. It was not accompanied, like that of Cato and Brutus, with the rashness and despair of suicide; nor can it be regarded, like that of Cæsar, as the punishment of crimes, unlawfully inflicted, indeed, yet suffered deservedly. With a character of rare purity and tenderness in all his domestic relations, he was slaughtered before the eyes of his wife and son; whilst flying from the ruin of a most just cause, he was murdered by those whose kindness he was entitled to claim. His virtues have not been transmitted to posterity with their deserved fame; and while the violent Republican writers have exalted the memory of Cato and Brutus; while the lovers of literature have extolled Cicero; and the admirers of successful ability have lavished their praises on Cæsar; Pompey's many and rare merits have been forgotten in the faults of his Triumvirate, and in the weakness of temper which he displayed in the conduct of his last campaign. But He must have been, in no ordinary degree, good and amiable, for whom his countrymen professed their enthusiastic love, unrestrained by servility, and unimpelled by faction; and though the events of his life must now be gathered for the most part from unfriendly sources, yet we think that they who read them impartially will continually cherish his memory with a warmer regard, and will feel that in themselves the prophecy of the poet has been fulfilled.

Hæc et apud seras gentes, populosque nepotum
Spesque, metusque simul, perituraque vita movebunt.
Attonitique omnes, veluti venientia, fata,
Non transmissa, legent, et adhuc tibi, Magne, favebunt.
Lucan, *Pharsalia*, lib. vii. v. 207.

* Cicero, *Tusculan. Disputat.* lib. iii. c. 27.

Cæsar was fully aware of the importance of pursuing Pompey, as he knew that the whole cause of the Commonwealth depended on him alone, and that if he were once removed, his partisans would instantly be divided, and probably only a small portion of them would be inclined to continue the contest. Accordingly, while M. Antonius led the greater part of the victorious army back to Brundisium,* Cæsar himself crossed by the Hellespont into Asia, and, by the fame of his arrival, dissipated an assemblage of some citizens of rank, who had been called together at Ephesus to sanction the removal of the treasures of the temple of Diana, for the service of Pompey and the Commonwealth. After a short stay in the Province of Asia, he received information that Pompey had been seen at Cyprus; and thinking it probable that he would seek an asylum in Egypt, he resolved to follow him thither. Already the news of the battle of Pharsalia, and of the flight of Pompey, had induced many of the squadrons, which had been sent to support the cause of the Commonwealth by the States in alliance with Rome, to return to their own countries. The Egyptian fleet had been one of this number; whilst the Rhodians, taking a more decisive part, had excluded Pompey, as we have seen, from their harbours, and now furnished Cæsar with ten ships of war, to enable him to follow the man in whose cause they themselves had been so lately engaged. These, with a few other vessels procured in the ports of the Province of Asia, sufficed to transport the two incomplete legions, which, at this moment, were the whole of Cæsar's disposable force; and of which one had followed him immediately from Pharsalia, and the other had been sent for from the south of Greece, where it had been employed on a separate service, and consequently had not been present at the late battle. With these two legions he landed at Alexandria, and there was informed of Pompey's murder, and saw his head and his ring presented to him as a grateful offering by the murderers. He is said to have shed tears at the sight;† and those signs of mere physical susceptibility, so little imply any real humanity of character, that they flowed very probably from a spontaneous feeling, and Cæsar may have indulged them with pleasure, flattering himself that they were a proof of the tenderness of his nature. At any rate it cost him no effort to refuse any expressions of gratitude to the murderers; for he was immediately involved in a quarrel with them, because he claimed the right, as Roman Consul,‡ to arbitrate in all disputes which related to the execution of the late King's will. Thus the very interference, from the fear of which Ptolemy's counsellors had resolved to murder Pompey, now threatened them in a much more alarming shape, when Cæsar announced it as his decision that Ptolemy and Cleopatra should both dismiss their armies, and repair to his quarters at Alexandria, there to state their respective pretensions before him. The King's officers, indignant at the affront thus offered to the Crown of Egypt, instantly brought up their army from the Syrian frontiers, and prepared to attack Cæsar; but the young King himself, with his tutor and minister Pothinus, was already in Alexandria, and in Cæsar's power; so that the attempts of his subjects to deliver him were represented by his oppressor as a rebellion against his authority. Cleopatra too was in Cæsar's quarters; but she was no unwilling prisoner, if the common stories of the time may be credited;* which tell us, that, trusting to the influence of her charms, she readily obeyed Cæsar's summons, and finding that access to him was precluded by the besieging army of her brother, she caused herself to be wrapped up in a package of carpeting, and in this manner was safely conveyed into Cæsar's presence. It is added, that she was not disappointed in her expectations; that Cæsar's interference in the dispute between her and her brother, which had originated in political and ambitious motives, was continued, after his interview with Cleopatra, from feelings of a different nature; and that his passion for her involved him more deeply in a contest, in which he had at first found himself engaged unexpectedly, and from which, when it became serious, he might otherwise have deemed it politic to extricate himself. Be this as it may, Cæsar remained some months at Alexandria, maintaining a difficult, and sometimes a perilous struggle with the Egyptians. Without entering here into the detail of his adventures, we must take a survey of the state of the Roman Empire during his absence, and describe the effects of his victory at Pharsalia, and of that subsequent neglect of his affairs which delayed for two years the full enjoyment of its advantages.

Cæsar pursues Pompey.

He arrives in Egypt,

He is there involved in war, by his interference in the disputes of Ptolemy and Cleopatra.

If Pompey ever received intelligence, during his flight, of the services performed by his navy in the seas westward of Greece, and of the sudden check given to this career of success by the fatal issue of the battle of Pharsalia, he must have been most bitterly sensible of his error in staking his fortunes on the event of a general action by land. At the very moment when he was escaping as a fugitive from the scene of his defeat in Thessaly, one of his squadrons was again blockading the harbour of Brundisium;† and another, under the command of C. Cassius, was infesting the coasts of Sicily, and had lately burnt the entire fleet of the enemy, amounting to thirty-five ships, in the harbour of Messina. But the news of Pompey's defeat at once deterred his lieutenants from pursuing their advantages; their squadrons retreated from the coasts of Italy and Sicily, and repaired to Corcyra, at which place the principal surviving leaders of the party of the Commonwealth were at this time assembled. We have already mentioned that M. Cato had been left with fifteen cohorts to defend Dyrrhachium, when Pompey set out in pursuit of Cæsar into Thessaly, and that M. Cicero, M. Varro, and some other distinguished individuals, had remained from different causes at Dyrrhachium also. In the midst of their anxiety for the issue of the campaign, T. Labienus arrived a fugitive from the route of Pharsalia;‡ and the tidings which he brought produced at once a general consternation and disorder. The magazines of corn were presently sacked by the soldiers, who, considering the war as ended, were resolved to pay themselves as they best

Proceedings of Pompey's partisans after the battle of Pharsalia.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 24. Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 105, 106.
† Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 48. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxii.
‡ Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 107.

* Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 49. Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 201. edit. Leunclav.
† Cæsar, lib. iii. c. 100, 101.
‡ Cicero, *de Divinatione*, lib. i. c. 31.

could for their services; nor could they be induced to accompany their officers in their flight, but proceeded to burn the transports in the harbour, that none of their number might be able to separate their fortunes from those of the rest. But the ships of war for the most part were still faithful; and in these the Chiefs of the vanquished party hastened to escape to Corcyra. When they had reached that island, a new scene of distraction ensued. The command of the forces was offered to Cicero, as he was the oldest Senator present of Consular dignity;* but he, being determined to take no further part in the contest, declined it; and being protected, as it is said, by Cato, from the violence of Cn. Pompeius, Pompey's eldest son, who wished to kill him as a deserter from the cause of the Commonwealth, he returned to Italy to throw himself on the mercy of the victorious party. D. Lælius,† one of the commanders of the Asiatic squadron in Pompey's fleet, followed the example of Cicero. There were others, and these formed a considerable body, who neither chose to continue the war, nor to submit to Cæsar; but who resolved, for the present, to remain in Greece, and there to observe, from a distance, the course of events at Rome. But Cato,‡ Cn. Pompeius,§ Labienus, and several others, hoping that Pompey would be able to make a stand in some of the eastern Provinces, determined to carry their fleet thither in order to join him; and accordingly set sail to the south without delay. They touched at Patræ, on the coast of Peloponnesus, and there took on board Petreius and Faustus Sylla; after which they continued their voyage to the coast of Africa. Here they met with Cornelia and her son Sextus Pompeius, who, finding no secure asylum in the east, were now, probably, flying to the Province of Africa, which, since the death of Curio, had remained in the peaceable possession of the friends of the Commonwealth. On receiving the disastrous tidings of Pompey's murder, a fresh division took place amongst his partisans. C. Cassius, afterwards so distinguished, abandoned his associates, and sailed at once with the Syrian squadron, which he commanded, to Syria, intending to offer his submission to Cæsar. Cato, and those who with him were resolved to persist in their opposition to the prevailing party, saw that the Province of Africa was now the quarter which held out to them the most favourable prospects. The command of the forces was, by common consent, bestowed on Cato; and he resolved to attempt to

Cato withdraws to Africa.

* Plutarch, *in Cicerone*, c. 39.

† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xi. epist. vii. xiv.

‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 190, 191. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 56.

§ We had originally added here the name of Afranius, on the authority of Dion Cassius. But if Afranius had been with Cato, the command would naturally have devolved on him, as being a person of Consular dignity; exactly on the same principle that Cato, on his arrival in the Province of Africa, ceded the chief authority to Scipio. Again, we have followed Dion Cassius in representing C. Cassius as only leaving Cato on the news of Pompey's death; but it seems probable, from one of Cicero's letters, that he sailed directly from Corcyra to Syria to offer his submission, as soon as he had received the news of the battle of Pharsalia. *Epist. ad Familiar.* lib. xv. epist. xv. Appian confounds C. Cassius with his brother Lucius, and supposes him to have been in the Hellespont with his fleet when Cæsar crossed over into Asia in pursuit of Pompey. So difficult is it to ascertain the truth, even in such indifferent matters, when good contemporary testimony fails us.

carry his troops by land across the desert from Cyrene to the frontiers of the Roman Province; whether it was that the departure of the Syrian squadron had deprived him of the means of transporting his whole force by sea; or whether the navigation of the neighbourhood of the great Syrtes was looked upon as more formidable than the fatigues and privations likely to attend on the march by land. However, the army arrived in the Province in safety, and found that Scipio had already escaped thither from Pharsalia, and that Juba, King of Mauritania, was disposed, as heretofore, to support the cause of Pompey to the uttermost. Meantime, the tyranny and exactions of Q. Cassius Longinus,* whom Cæsar had left with the chief command in what was called Further Spain, and who, when Tribune of the people, had fled with M. Antonius from Rome to Cæsar's quarters at the beginning of the contest, had provoked a very serious mutiny among the legions of his Province. The troops, supported by the inhabitants of Corduba, transferred their obedience to M. Marcellus, his Quæstor; and some of them were inclined to espouse the cause of Pompey, had not Marcellus, though not without difficulty, prevented them; being himself, it is said, not inclined to take so decisive a step till the state of Pompey's affairs in other quarters should appear more promising. At length the disturbance was appeased by the arrival of M. Lepidus, Proconsul of the Province of Hither Spain, who took the command of the revolted legions without resistance; and soon after C. Trebonius was sent to supersede Cassius Longinus in the command of the Further Province; and the ex-Governor, while proceeding to Italy by sea with the plunder which he had acquired by his exactions, was lost in a storm at the mouth of the Ebro. It appears that Cæsar attached great importance to the service which Lepidus had rendered him on this occasion, insomuch, that he afterwards rewarded him with the honours of a triumph;† and, indeed, the mutiny of the legions in Spain produced a strong sensation in Italy,‡ coupled as it was with the tidings of the great force acquired by Scipio and Cato in Africa, and of some disasters which had befallen Cæsar's arms at the same time in Illyricum and in Asia Minor. M. Octavius,§ whom we have already had occasion to mention as the commander of one of the squadrons in Pompey's fleet, had lingered in the Illyrian seas after Cato's departure from Corcyra; partly relying on the courage and fidelity of some of the native tribes of Illyricum, and partly, perhaps, hoping to organize a force out of the remains of Pompey's army, which were still numerous, although in a state of dispersion and despondency. The absence of Cæsar favoured his hopes; many persons of distinction, who had remained in Greece rather than follow Cato into Africa, and who would have submitted to Cæsar at once, if he had returned directly to Rome, began now to accuse themselves of pusillanimity, when they heard of the war which was beginning in Egypt; and some of them began to draw together into Illyricum, and to put themselves into a hostile attitude. Upon this

Unpromising state of Cæsar's affairs in different parts of the Empire.

1. In Spain. Mutiny of the troops against Q. Cassius Longinus.

2. In Illyricum. Defeat and death of A. Gabinius.

* *Auctor de Bell. Alexandrino*, c. 48, *et seq.* Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 192.

† Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 214. edit. Leunclav.

‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xi. epist. x. xvi.

§ *Auctor de Bell. Alexandrino*, c. 42, *et seq.*

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

A. Gabinius, Cicero's ancient enemy, who, in his Tribuneship, had proposed to invest Pompey with the extraordinary command against the Pirates, and who now, like most other men of equal profligacy, was the partisan of Cæsar, received orders to cross over from Italy with some legions that had been lately raised, and secure Illyricum and Macedonia. But Gabinius found himself unequal to the task imposed on him; the country, which was the seat of war, was unable to support his army, and the stormy season was by this time arrived, which rendered his supplies by sea very precarious. He struggled to relieve his wants by taking some of the strongholds occupied by the enemy; and in these attempts, being often repulsed with loss, he was at last obliged to retreat to Salona, a town on the seacoast, in which he hoped to defend himself during the winter. But the Illyrians attacked him on his march, and defeated him with considerable loss, so that he reached Salona in a very miserable condition; and being blockaded by the victorious enemy, and reduced to great extremities, he was taken ill in the course of a few months, and died. His disasters were afterwards retrieved by P. Vatinius, a man of equally profligate character, who, in his Tribuneship, had rendered himself the tool of Cæsar, and on whose motion Cæsar had been originally appointed to his fatal command in Gaul. Vatinius obliged Octavius to resign the contest and escape to Africa; and in a short time from his first arrival in Illyricum, he reduced the whole Province to a state of obedience. But before this change took place, and while Gabinius was shut up in Salona, the aspect of Cæsar's affairs was very unpromising; and it was at the same time that another of his lieutenants, Cn. Domitius Calvinus sustained a severe defeat in Asia from Pharnaces, the son of the famous Mithridates. This Prince having received from the Romans the kingdom of the Bosporus,* or what is now the Crimea, as the reward of his treason against his father, now, it seems, wished to avail himself of the distracted state of the Roman Empire to recover some other parts of his hereditary dominions, and began to invade Cappadocia and the Lesser Armenia, which were possessed by two petty Princes under the protection of Rome. Application was presently made by one of them to Cn. Domitius Calvinus for aid, as Cæsar had intrusted that officer with the chief command in the different Provinces of Asia Minor; and after some fruitless attempts at negotiation, Domitius advanced with an army into the Lesser Armenia; and there coming to an engagement with Pharnaces, he was defeated, and obliged to fall back as far as the Province of Asia. Pharnaces, meanwhile, overran the whole of Pontus, which had been the chief seat of his father's government, and congratulated himself on having so soon recovered so large a portion of that which Mithridates had lost. During all this time Cæsar was still in Egypt; and the various reports which arrived from that country, together with the certain ill success of his affairs in other quarters, produced a constant accession of strength to the party of the Commonwealth in Africa.

3. In Asia. Defeat of Cn. Domitius Calvinus by Pharnaces, son of Mithridates.

State of Rome and of Italy.

From this sketch of the condition of some of the Provinces, we turn back, with an eager curiosity, to inquire what was the state of Rome itself, and with what temper the bodies, which still retained the names of the Senate and People, were disposed to receive their new master. After Cicero had crossed over into Greece, about the middle of the year 704, to join the army of the Commonwealth, none, it is probable, remained in Italy, but such as were the active partisans, or the unresisting slaves of Cæsar. Among the latter was T. Pomponius Atticus, who, according to the tenets of the Epicureans, considered it an unwise disturbance of his enjoyments, to take any part in political contests, calculating that, whatever became of the liberties of his country, he should still retain his own villas and gardens through the influence of his friends on one side or on the other. Men of this stamp were a clay that might be moulded to any shape at the pleasure of the conqueror; and the daily growth of this selfish spirit, under pretence of an aversion to the horrors of a civil war, will easily account for the introduction of that mere despotism which was established as soon as the contest in Africa was decided. Out of the Capital it seemed vain to look for any remains of public feeling: some of the boldest and hardiest of the Italian tribes had been nearly extirpated by Sylla's victories and massacres; the general admission of the Italians to the privileges of Roman citizens would naturally attract the most enterprising and active part of the population to Rome; and their places would be ill supplied by that multitude of disbanded soldiers whom Sylla had converted into landed proprietors, by settling them in the districts which he had desolated. It is probable, that many of these soldiers would soon, moreover, be glad to part with their land, either to cover their losses in farming, or to supply their extravagances. As early as the period of Catiline's conspiracy, we find many of them ready to promote a new scramble for plunder; and in the fourteen years which had since elapsed, we may suspect that a very large proportion of the estates, granted by Sylla to his veterans, had passed into the hands of the great Nobility, by whom the soil of Italy was so generally monopolized. Wherever land was held by a proprietor of this description, the free population quickly withered away, and slaves were the only cultivators, and the only inhabitants. The towns were overwhelmed by the disproportionate greatness of the Capital, and were each of too little importance to form a rallying point in opposition to Rome; whilst the local distinctions and prejudices which divided the Tuscan from the Campanian, or the Apulian from the inhabitant of Picenum, were still too strong to admit of much habitual sympathy of feeling or concert in action between the people of different parts of the peninsula. Besides, they had no longer that peculiar and direct interest in the civil wars of Rome which they had felt in the times of Marius and Sylla. Then every town of Italy was conscious that its enjoyment of the envied privileges of Roman citizens, the elevation of its people from the rank of subjects to Sovereigns, would be secured by the victory of Cinna and Carbo, and would be at least endangered by the triumph of the Aristocracy. But now, whatever was the issue of the war, Nola and Volaterræ, Asculum, and Corfinium, would only share the fate of Rome; and what the Capital could submit to endure, the provincial towns could scarcely presume to consider as an evil.

Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

* Appian, *de Bell. Mithridat.* c. 113. *Auctor de Bell. Alexand.* c. 34, *et seq.*

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

It was this want of confidence in themselves, this political helplessness, leading the rest of Italy to follow tamely in the steps of Rome, and disposing the people of Rome itself to rely for every thing upon their Government, and to be incapable of any organized exertions among themselves, which, above all other causes, tended to lower the character of the times, and marked each successive generation, during a course of many centuries, with a deeper stain of timidity and weakness.*

Whatever, therefore, might have been their secret wishes, the people of Rome and of Italy had remained tranquil during the campaign in Greece, had given no support to the attempts of Cælius and Milo, and were now ready to receive the destruction of their liberties as the natural consequence of the battle of Pharsalia. After that battle M. Antonius, as we have seen, returned with the greater part of the victorious legions to Italy. It was soon shown that the power of the sword was henceforth to be paramount; the troops were quartered on the inhabitants of the different towns, and indulged themselves in the full license of unrestrained soldiers;* the General, after exhibiting a second time a scene of scandalous debauchery in his progress through the country, arrived at Rome, and there commenced the work of confiscation and pillage. We hear nothing further of P. Servilius, who was the nominal Consul of the Republic; the government of Italy seems to have been vested solely in Antonius, although he possessed no other title than that of Cæsar's lieutenant. But it was soon proposed that the office of Dictator should be again conferred on Cæsar, although he was then far from Italy; and when this power was bestowed on him, by a vote of the people, for the term of a year, M. Antonius was, at the same time, named his Master of the Horse, and thus appeared to be in some sort invested with a legal authority. It is said by Dion Cassius,† that a vote of the people empowered Cæsar to punish the adherents of Pompey as he thought proper, and gave him besides the power of Consul for five years, and that of Tribune of the People for life. There was no reasonable ground for bestowing these unusual honours; for the original pretext of Cæsar's rebellion was merely to place himself on a level with Pompey in retaining or resigning his Province, and to obtain the right of becoming a candidate for the Consulship. He was now at this time Consul, and Pompey's death had left him not only without a superior in dignity, but without an equal. He had already gained therefore all that he pretended to fight for; and a general amnesty might now have been passed, which, while it saved him from the punishment due to his treason, would have left him in undisputed possession of the first place in the Commonwealth. Nor had he, like Sylla, any public evils to remedy; no undue preponderance of the Aristocratical or of the popular party required the aid of a legislator with absolute powers to restore the Constitution to a healthier condition. There were no wrongs to be redressed, but those which he had himself caused; nor was there any voice which called for a reform of the Constitution, except that of his own ambition.

Cæsar appointed Dictator, M. Antonius Master of the Horse

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

It is probable that Cæsar's protracted absence, and the want of all ordinary Magistrates at Rome, impelled individuals of the victorious party to aspire to greatness independently of the patronage of their Chief. P. Dolabella,* Cicero's son-in-law, procured his election, as one of the Tribunes of the People, for the year 706; and when he had entered on his office, he began to revive the laws lately proposed by M. Cælius, for exempting tenants from all demands for the rent of their houses during one year, and for a general abolition of debts. The Master of the Horse was likely, he thought, to support him, both from personal friendship, and from his general inclination to uphold the cause of the needy and the profligate, and if his countenance could be procured, there was no effectual opposition to be dreaded. L. Trebellius, indeed, one of Dolabella's colleagues,† attempted to defend the interests of landlords and creditors, and scenes of great disorder were frequently exhibited in the streets of Rome in consequence of these disputes, in the course of which many lives were lost on both sides; but as long as M. Antonius allowed Dolabella to go on with impunity, his party was likely to prevail in the contest. But the Senate called upon the Master of the Horse to exert his power for the preservation of the public peace; and it was rumoured that he was made acquainted at this time with a criminal intercourse subsisting between Dolabella and some female friend or relation of his own.‡ This private injury made him more willing to listen to the Senate's call: he brought troops into the city, and when the populace broke out into a riot in support of Dolabella's laws, he chastised them with great severity, and is said to have put no fewer than eight hundred of the rioters to the sword.§ The present masters of the Commonwealth, although at the beginning of their career they professed to espouse the popular party, had now obtained a power which enabled them to cast off their old connections; and declared, by their conduct, that it was to the swords of a disciplined army, and not to the uncertain favour of a tumultuous populace, that they were resolved to owe their ascendency.

Disturbances caused by P. Dolabella in his Tribuneship. U. C. 706.

Yet at this very time the obedience of the army itself was beginning to waver. Antonius, while indulging in every excess himself, connived, it is probable, at many irregularities in the conduct of the

Discontents in Cæsar's army in Italy.

* It implies a much higher national character to be anxious for the general liberty, good government, and positive amelioration of the state of the whole people, than to make a desperate struggle for the removal of invidious distinctions between one class of the community and another. The Romans and the Italians had vigour enough to do the latter, but they wanted the much higher qualities requisite to ensure the former. In like manner Napoleon Buonaparte has observed, "*que le peuple Français tenait plus à l'égalité qu'à la liberté.*" (*Mémoires*, tome i. p. 145.) The revolution succeeded completely in destroying the offensive privileges possessed by the Aristocracy; but it may be doubted whether, even at this day, the French entertain a just value for the general freedom and political welfare of the whole State; and it is certain that they did not do so twenty years ago.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 25.

† Lib. xlii. p. 194.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 198. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xi. epist. xxiii.

† Cicero, *Philippic.* vi. c. 4.

‡ Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 9.

§ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxiii.

soldiers; and the other officers,* from a wish to gain popularity, or from the natural relaxation consequent upon victory, permitted the discipline of the troops to be seriously impaired. It was known that Cæsar intended to transport his veteran legions into Africa, as soon as the affairs of the East should leave him at liberty; and the soldiers were highly dissatisfied at finding that they were to be exposed to another campaign,† while no mention was heard of fulfilling the promises which had been made to them on former occasions. They confirmed one another in their resolutions not to leave Italy till their previous claims were satisfied; and when P. Sylla, an officer of high rank,‡ who had commanded the right wing of Cæsar's army at Pharsalia, endeavoured to pacify them, the soldiers of the twelfth legion assailed him with stones, so that he narrowly escaped with his life. Several other persons experienced the same treatment, and some individuals of Prætorian dignity are said to have been actually murdered by the mutineers.§ Intelligence of these disorders quickened Cæsar's wish to return to Italy. He had at last, about the middle of the year 706, brought the war in Egypt to a conclusion, by placing Cleopatra and her younger brother on the throne,‖ as the elder Ptolemy had perished in the course of the contest; and from Egypt he had marched into Syria, and thence to Cilicia and Cappadocia; arranging on his way the affairs of those several Provinces, receiving the submissions of all the petty Princes or Chiefs dependent on the Roman Empire, and continuing them in their respective governments on such conditions as he judged proper. These matters were easily and quickly settled; but Pharnaces, King of the Bosporus, was likely to occasion a longer yet an unavoidable delay. It was the boast of the Romans never to allow a foreign power to take advantage of their domestic quarrels; and it would have reflected disgrace on Cæsar had he suffered Pharnaces to enjoy his late conquest without molestation, from his eagerness to prosecute his own private contest with his countrymen. Accordingly he called upon Pharnaces to evacuate Pontus without delay; and finding, according to the statement of his anonymous partisan,¶ that his demands were evaded, because it was well known how anxious he was to return to Italy, he marched instantly in quest of the enemy. Pharnaces was at this time encamped near Zela,** a town of Pontus, on the spot on which his father had gained one of his most famous victories over the Romans; and when Cæsar arrived and encamped at no great distance from him, his confidence in the fortune of the place, and in his own recent successes, induced him to attack the Roman army in the strong position which it had occupied. His rashness was quickly punished by a total defeat; he himself fled from the field of battle with only a few horsemen; and the whole of Pontus was lost by this single blow. Cæsar, unusually delighted at this rapid and most seasonable conquest, left two legions to secure Pontus, and himself hastened on his way towards Italy; still however, as before, employing the time on his journey in settling the affairs of the Provinces, and accustoming the petty Asiatic Princes to look upon the government of Rome as already become monarchical. It was late in the year,* according to the corrupt Calendar of the period, when he arrived in the Capital, and there proceeded to exercise that sovereign authority with which his office of Dictator, and, still more the swords of his soldiers, had invested him.

M. Antonius, on his return to Italy after the battle of Pharsalia,† had published an edict by Cæsar's express orders, forbidding all the fugitives of the vanquished party to set foot in Italy without having received their pardon from Cæsar himself. In this manner a multitude of distinguished citizens were condemned to live in banishment; but their property was not in every instance confiscated, and some were afterwards allowed, as we shall see hereafter, to return to their country. The rapacity of the conqueror, however, had been abundantly gratified in the eastern Provinces; where he had amassed immense sums,‡ partly by imposing fines on those Princes or States who had supported the cause of the Commonwealth, partly by the direct plunder of their wealthiest temples, and partly by receiving a price for the grants or titles which he gave or confirmed to any city or individual. But the demands of the approaching campaign in Africa could not be answered without further exactions; and although he had a very considerable fund in the numerous golden crowns, figures, and other articles, which were presented to him from every quarter through fear or flattery, he deemed it expedient, on his arrival in Italy, to raise money to a large amount by compulsory loans from different cities as well as from private individuals; and at the same time he proceeded to confiscate and expose to public sale the property of some of his most distinguished opponents,§ which Antonius had not ventured to touch by his own authority. It was on this occasion that the house and furniture of Pompey the Great were set up to auction by the command of his father-in-law; and that Antonius, amidst the general grief and indignation of the Roman people, became their purchaser. At this time also, if we may believe Dion Cassius,‖ Cæsar made some additional regulations in favour of insolvent debtors, and actually enforced the proposed law of Dolabella, for relieving tenants from rent for one year, in all cases where the rent amounted to five hundred Denarii, or about 15*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* His chief partisans were rewarded by being appointed to various public offices, of which he assumed the complete disposal; and, as a cheap method of gratifying the vanity of some of his associates, he conferred the empty title of Consuls, for the short remainder of the year, on Q. Fufius Calenus, his late lieutenant in Achaia, and on P. Vatinius, who had rendered him most important services in Illyricum. The prostitution of a dignity so respected, excited a general disgust; and in this open assumption of absolute power he already betrayed the same contempt for the feelings of his countrymen, which afterwards, when exhibited

Cæsar leaves Egypt.

He passes through Syria and Cilicia.

He defeats Pharnaces and recovers the Province of Pontus.

He returns to Rome.

His acts of spoliation and wanton display of power.

* *Auctor de Bell. Alexand.* c. 65.
† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xi. epist. xx. xxii.
‡ Ibid. lib. xi. epist. xxi. xxii.
§ Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 51. Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 209.
‖ *Auctor de Bell. Alexand.* c. 33—65. *et seq.*
¶ Ibid. c. 71. ** Ibid. c 72. *et seq.*

* Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 51.
† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xi. epist. vii.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 208. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 54.
§ Cicero. *Philippic.* ii. c. 26. *et seq.*
‖ Lib. xlii. p. 209.

Mutiny of his army.

with still greater aggravation, contributed principally to the fatal conspiracy of the Ides of March. But amongst all this distribution of honours and benefits, the veteran legions found that they were still to trust only to promises; and that the period when they should obtain their discharge, and be rewarded with settlements of lands, was still far distant. Aware of their own importance on the eve of another campaign, but not sufficiently appreciating the able and resolute character of their commander, they broke up from their quarters in Campania,* and advanced to Rome, committing various excesses on their march, and filling the country and the Capital with terror. When they arrived before the city, Cæsar allowed them to enter the walls, retaining only their swords, and instantly presented himself before them in the Campus Martius, and demanded why they had left their quarters, and what they wanted at Rome. They replied that they were come to claim their release from any further service; upon which Cæsar answered, without any apparent reluctance, that their claim was reasonable, and that he would discharge them instantly; assuring them at the same time that all their comrades who had served their full term of years should be discharged in the same manner, and promising still to give them the settlements in lands which he had before allowed them to look for. The soldiers were not prepared for this treatment, and in proportion to his seeming readiness to part from them, their wish to continue in his service revived. Cæsar perceived his advantage, and persisted in giving them their discharge, expressing particularly his surprise and sorrow to find the soldiers of his favourite tenth legion implicated in this meeting. At last, on their repeated entreaties to be forgiven, he said that he would retain them all except the tenth legion; nor could he be prevailed on to receive that legion into his favour,† so that it followed him to Africa without his orders, from the mere zeal of the soldiers to do something that might entitle them to pardon. After all, he punished those who had been most active in the mutiny, by depriving them of a third part of their share of the plunder gained in Africa, and of the lands which he afterwards bestowed on his army; some also he actually discharged at once, and settled them in different parts of Italy; and others, it is said, he found means to employ in the most dangerous services in the ensuing campaign,‡ and thus freed himself from their turbulence, while he made their deaths useful by occasioning a loss to his enemies.

He quells it by his firmness and address.

Campaign in Africa.

Having thus reestablished his authority over his legions, he proceeded with his usual activity to carry the war into Africa. He arrived at Lilybæum in Sicily,§ on the seventeenth of December, and having waited there till he had assembled a force of six legions, and about two thousand cavalry, he embarked from Sicily on the twenty-seventh, and reached the coast of Africa on the thirtieth. He landed near Adrumetum with no more than three thousand men; the rest of his forces having been dispersed in different directions on their passage; and as he knew not what points of the coast might be least occupied by the enemy, he had been unable before his departure from Sicily to appoint any particular spot, as the place of destination for the whole armament. Finding Adrumetum too strongly garrisoned to be attacked with any hope of success, he put his troops in motion again on the first of January, and on the evening of that day halted at Ruspina; from whence he again set out on the following morning, and approached Leptis. The inhabitants of that town sent to offer their submission to him, and he accordingly occupied the gates with a guard, and having given strict orders that no other soldiers should be allowed to enter the walls, he encamped for the night in the neighbourhood of Leptis, and was joined on that very evening by a part of his army from Sicily, which had put in by a fortunate accident at this very point of the coast. On the third of January he returned to Ruspina; and there remained for some time, having collected considerable supplies of provisions from the adjacent country, and having received a large accession of strength by the arrival of another division of the troops from Lilybæum. But his numbers were as yet very inferior to those of the enemy, and he could not depend for the permanent subsistence of his army on the resources of a country which was almost entirely possessed by his opponents. He waited therefore anxiously for the arrival of additional reinforcements, as well as of supplies of provisions from Sicily, Sardinia, and other parts of the Empire;* whilst he secured himself for the present by bestowing extraordinary care on the fortifications of his camp, and by carrying lines from this and from the town of Ruspina down to the seashore, in order that ships might approach the land with safety, and that the succours of whatever kind, which might be contained in them, might reach his camp without molestation.

Forces of Scipio and Cato.

It appears that the supporters of the Commonwealth had by this time organized a very large army in Africa; and that their navy, although not possessing the command of the sea so exclusively as during the campaign in Greece, was yet strong enough to cause great annoyance to the enemy, and during Cæsar's absence in Egypt had made descents on the coasts of Sicily and Sardinia,† and had carried off from them several vessels, and a considerable quantity of arms. While Italy was suffering under the misrule of Antonius, and Rome itself was distracted by the turbulent Tribuneship of Dolabella, it was expected that Scipio and Cato would transport their forces from Africa, and avail themselves of so fair an opportunity for regaining possession of the seat of Government.‡ But we must suppose that they had not yet collected an army sufficient to encounter Cæsar's veteran legions; and perhaps the want of arms for their regular infantry was a principal obstacle to such an attempt. With cavalry and light troops they were abundantly provided; for the Numidians of the Roman Province were admirably calculated for those services, and to them was added the whole force of the Kingdom of Mauritania, which Juba furnished to the cause of the Commonwealth. Utica, the most considerable city in Africa, was held by M. Cato; § and he had made it a great magazine of

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 209, 210. Appian, *de Bello Civili*, lib. ii. c. 92. *et seq.*

† Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 70.

‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 211.

§ *Auctor de Bell. Africano*, c. 1. *et seq.*

* *Auctor de Bello Africano*, c. 20.

† Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 211.

‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xi. epist. xv.

§ *Auctor de Bello Africano*, c. 22. 36. Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 58.

arms and provisions, as well as a depot for the new levies which he was constantly forming to reinforce the main army in the field. That army was commanded by Scipio, with the title of Proconsul; and although the military talents of the General in chief were not very highly distinguished, yet Labienus and Petreius, his principal lieutenants, were officers of great experience and ability.

Difficulties of Cæsar at the opening of the campaign.

In landing on the coast of Africa with a force very inferior to that of his opponents, Cæsar may be supposed to have had two objects in view; first, to prevent the enemy from carrying the war into Italy, and to preserve his usual character of being always the assailant; and, secondly, to deprive them by his presence of some part of the resources of the Province, of which otherwise they would have had the complete disposal. His great renown as a General, his success in other parts of the Empire, and that character of the lawful representative of the Roman people, which he derived from the possession of the Capital, gained him immediately some partisans among the cities and tribes of Africa,* and thus produced at once a diversion in his favour. Yet soon after his first landing he was severely harassed by the attacks of the enemy's cavalry under Labienus and Petreius; and had Juba united his forces to those of Scipio, their combined efforts might have been too overwhelming for Cæsar to resist. He was saved from this danger by an unexpected interference. P. Sitius, of Nuceria,

Diversion made by P. Sitius in his favour. Adventures of Sitius.

had been in his early life engaged in money transactions on a very extensive scale,† not only with many persons in different parts of the Empire, but also with some foreign Princes, and amongst the rest with the King of Mauritania, the father of Juba. The sums embarked in these various speculations were not always easily to be recovered: Sitius had incurred heavy debts at Rome, which brought him into the society of dissolute and desperate men, and had made him acquainted with L. Catiline and his associates at the eve of their memorable conspiracy. Whether he himself entered into their schemes is uncertain. It appears that he went about that period to Africa, professedly to settle some business with the King of Mauritania, but, as many asserted,‡ to employ his influence with that Prince in levying an armed force against the Commonwealth. However, his innocence or his good fortune saved him from the fate of the other conspirators, and Cicero himself, while defending P. Sylla from the same charge of having been Catiline's accomplice, took occasion equally to deny the accusation against Sitius. But he was a man of ruined fortunes, and it seems that he was afterwards brought before the tribunals for some private offence,§ and was obliged to go into exile. He repaired again to Africa, with an armed force which he had raised in Italy and Spain, and which it seems could easily be collected by any adventurer of notoriety, while every part of the Empire was full of slaves and other needy and desperate persons, to whom all change was gain. Thus accompanied, Sitius appeared in Africa, like one of the Chiefs of the free companies in Italy during the fourteenth century; and sold his services to the highest bidder in the constant petty wars which the wild tribes and barbarian Sovereigns of that country were carrying on against one another. His fame soon became great, for the party which he espoused was always victorious; and if the King of Mauritania was slow in paying his debt to him, we may the less wonder that he readily associated himself with those inferior Chiefs who were constantly engaged in predatory warfare with that more powerful Sovereign. In this way he was closely united with a Prince of the name of Bogud, according to Roman orthography, at the time that Cæsar landed in Africa. By attacking Juba now, Sitius might hope to gain far more than plunder, or the pay of a poor barbarian chief; he might obtain the repeal of his banishment, and expect besides a splendid reward from the Sovereign of the Roman Empire for a service so seasonably rendered to him. Bogud himself had before shown himself friendly to Cæsar,* probably because Juba supported the party of Pompey; and now when Juba was on his march to join Scipio with a considerable army, Bogud and P. Sitius attacked his Kingdom,† took Cirta, one of his principal cities, and committed such ravages in his country, that he was obliged to return with his whole force to oppose them, and even to recall the troops which he had before sent to serve under the Roman General, his ally. Meanwhile Cæsar was reinforced by the arrival of two veteran legions from Sicily;‡ and when at length Juba yielded to Scipio's pressing applications, and came to join him, leaving one of his Generals to contend with Bogud and Sitius,§ the decisive moment was already passed, and Cæsar's army was now too formidable to be seriously injured by any force which Juba could bring against it.

From this time the event of the campaign might be looked for with little hesitation. Cæsar was soon after reinforced by two more of his veteran legions, the ninth and tenth; and he was anxious, as before in Greece, to bring the enemy to a general action as soon as possible. But his situation now was very different from what it had been in his campaign against Pompey. Then he was opposed to a General of talents far less disproportioned to his own, and of reputation equal or even superior; the fleets of his adversaries commanded every sea and cut off all hope of supplies and reinforcements; and the army of the Commonwealth was as yet unvanquished, and under the command of its great leader was daily gaining fresh strength and confidence. At present, he was continually receiving deserters from the enemy's army,‖ and offers of submission and assistance from the towns of the Province and of Mauritania; the regular infantry of his opponents was utterly unable to resist his veteran legions; and the only annoyance which he experienced was from their superior cavalry and light troops, whose attacks became daily less alarming as his soldiers grew more familiar with them, and better understood how to oppose them most effectually. Scipio, indeed, carefully avoided a battle; but the rapidity of Cæsar's movements, and the extraordinary celerity with which his troops were accustomed to construct works of

* *Auctor de Bell. Africano*, c. 7. 32, 33.

† Cicero, *pro P. Syllâ*, c. 20.

‡ Sallust, *de Bello Catilinar.* c. 21. Cicero, *pro Syllâ, ubi supra.*

§ Appian, *de Bello Civili*, lib. iv. c. 54. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 214.

* *Auctor de Bell. Alexandrino*, c. 59.

† *Auctor de Bell. Africano*, c. 25.

‡ Ibid. c. 34.

§ Ibid. c. 48.

‖ Ibid. c. 52. 56. 72.

every description, at last obliged him to depart from his system of caution. On the fourth of April Cæsar gained a march upon his antagonists by night,* and appeared on the following morning before the town of Thapsus, a place which had shown peculiar attachment to Scipio's cause, and which was at this time defended by a strong garrison. Without loss of time, Cæsar began to form lines of circumvallation, and to occupy every important post in the neighbourhood so effectually, that when Scipio arrived to protect the town, he found his communications with it already cut off. Under these circumstances, Scipio, unwilling to abandon so important a place to its fate, prepared to form his camp on a spot upon the seashore, from which he hoped to obstruct the operations of the enemy; and whilst he was employed in the construction of the rampart and ditch, he drew out his army in order of battle to cover the parties engaged in the work. In this situation he was attacked by Cæsar and completely defeated. His troops first fled to the camp, which was as yet unfinished, and this being forced, they hastened to the camp they had left the day before, in the hope of being enabled there to make a stand. But finding no officer to rally them, if we may believe the statement of Cæsar's partisan, they fled, as a last resource, towards the camp of Juba, which was at some distance from that of Scipio; but which they now found equally in possession of the victorious enemy. Despairing of any further resistance, the fugitives halted on a neighbouring hill, laid down their arms, and implored quarter. But Cæsar's soldiers, with the ferocity natural to men who respected no law, and who felt that their swords were disposing of the empire of the world, not only massacred the whole of this defenceless multitude, but wounded and murdered several persons of distinction who were present in their own army, against whom they had some supposed grounds of offence. Cæsar himself was an eye-witness of this butchery, which, according to his partisan's narrative, he in vain endeavoured to prevent. Such a scene might have taught him to what a brutal and unmanageable power he had subjected his country; but the crimes of his soldiers were forgotten in the splendour of their victory, by which the campaign was irrecoverably decided. The news of the battle spread rapidly in every direction, with an effect as powerful as the tidings of the rout of Pharsalia two years before. Scipio, with three or four other superior officers, escaped by sea from the scene of their defeat, in the hope of finding an asylum in Spain.† They were driven by contrary winds into the port of Hippo, where they were surrounded by a superior naval force, employed, as we are told, in the service of the fugitive P. Sitius. Scipio's ship was instantly boarded, and he killed himself to avoid falling into the hands of the enemy; the officers who were with with him, amongst whom we find the noble name of L. Manlius Torquatus, either followed his example or were put to death. Of the other Generals of the vanquished party, Labienus effected his escape into Spain with Atius Varus and Cn. Pompeius, who, during the late campaign, had both held commands by sea. Juba, accompanied by Petreius, fled to his own dominions;‡ but finding that the forces which he had left to protect them had been totally defeated by Bogud and P. Sitius, and being shut out of Zama, his Capital, by his own subjects, who wished to make their peace with the conqueror, he continued his flight to one of his country houses, and there Petreius and he resolved to die by each other's hands. But Juba having easily killed Petreius, and having attempted without effect to stab himself, persuaded one of his own slaves to become his executioner. The fate of Petreius was soon shared by L. Afranius, his former colleague in the command of Pompey's army in Spain. Afranius, with Faustus Sylla,* while attempting to reach Spain along the northern coast of Africa, fell, together with the wife and children of the latter, into the hands of P. Sitius. They were soon after killed, according to Suetonius and Dion Cassius, by Cæsar's orders; but the statement of Cæsar's partisan attributes their death to a disturbance in the army and the violence of the soldiers. The wife of Faustus, who was a daughter of Pompey, was spared, together with her children, and the enjoyment of all her property was granted to her.

Battle of Thapsus.

Deaths of Scipio, Juba, Afranius, and Petreius.

Intelligence of the battle of Thapsus was brought to Utica by a party of Scipio's cavalry, who were flying from the action under the command of Afranius.† With the usual temper of a defeated and desperate army, these fugitives began to revenge themselves for their defeat by plundering and murdering many of the citizens of Utica, who were supposed to be attached to the cause of Cæsar. M. Cato alone, with a spirit unbroken amidst the disasters of his party, in vain endeavoured to give their feelings a better direction, by persuading them to defend the town against the enemy; and when he saw that they could not be induced to do their duty, he distributed a sum of money to every soldier amongst them, to prevail on them to depart without committing any further excesses. They thus pursued their retreat along the coast on their way to Spain, as we have already mentioned; and in the mean time numerous parties of the vanquished army arrived in Utica, with all of whom Cato was earnest in his efforts to induce them to continue the contest, and to maintain the place. But when he found that their minds were possessed by an overwhelming panic, he furnished them with all the ships in the harbour to convey them wherever they wished to go; and recommended his son and his other friends to the intercession of L. Cæsar, his Quæstor, who, as being related to the conqueror, might be supposed to possess some influence with him. His anxiety however for the safety of those about him appears less amiable when we find him too proud to accept for himself that mercy which he wished to procure for them, and resisting with passionate violence the solicitations of his son, that he would consent to live for his sake. When the evening came he retired to his own apartment,‡ and employed himself for some time in reading one of Plato's *Dialogues*, endeavouring, it is said, to lull the suspicions of his friends by seeming to take a lively interest in the fate of those who were escaping by sea from Utica, and by sending several times to the seaside to learn the state of the wind and of the weather. But towards morning, when all was quiet, he stabbed himself. He fell from his bed with the blow, and the noise of his

Cato attempts in vain to defend Utica.

He kills himself.

* *Auctor de Bell. Africano*, c. 79. *et seq.*
† Ibid. c. 96. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxiv.
‡ *Auctor de Bell. African*, 91, 94.

* *Auctor de Bell. African.* c. 95. Florus, lib. iv. c. 2. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 219.
† *Auctor de Bell. Africano*, c. 87. *et seq.*
‡ Plutarch, *in Catone*, c. 70.

fall immediately brought his son and his servants into the room, by whose assistance he was raised from the ground, and an attempt was made to bind up the wound. Their efforts to save him were vain; for Cato no sooner had recovered his self-possession, than he tore open the wound again in so effectual a manner that he instantly expired.

Such was the end of a man whom a better Philosophy, by teaching him to struggle with his predominant faults instead of encouraging them, would have rendered truly amiable and admirable. He possessed the greatest integrity and firmness; and, from the beginning of his political life, was never swayed by fear or interest to desert that which he considered the cause of liberty and justice. He is said to have foreseen Cæsar's designs long before they were generally suspected; but his well-known animosity against him rendered his authority on the subject less weighty; and his zeal led him to miscalculate the strength of the Commonwealth, when he earnestly advised the Senate to adopt those measures which gave Cæsar a pretence for beginning hostilities. During the civil war, he had the rare merit of uniting to the sincerest ardour in the cause of his party a steady regard to justice and humanity; he would not countenance cruelty or rapine because practised by his associates or coloured with pretences of public advantage. But the pride and coarseness of mind, of which we have already given some instances in his behaviour to his private friends, overshadowed the last scene of his life, and led him to indulge his selfish feelings by suicide, rather than live for the happiness of his family and friends, and mitigate, as far as lay in his power, the distressed condition of his country. His character however was so pure, and, since Pompey's death, so superior to all the leaders engaged with him in the same cause, that even his enemy's partisans could not refuse him their respect and praise; and his name has become a favourite theme of panegyric in aftertimes, as the most upright and persevering defender of the liberties of Rome.

Character of Cato.

End of the war in Africa.

Cæsar, meantime, was advancing from Thapsus towards Utica,* and had occupied, without resistance, on his march, the towns of Usceta and Adrumetum, in both of which he found considerable magazines of arms and provisions. As he drew near to Utica, he was met by L. Cæsar, who implored his mercy; and to whom, says his partisan, he readily granted it, according to his natural temper and habits of clemency. At the same time he spared the lives of Cato's son and of a number of other individuals who threw themselves on his mercy; but he levied heavy fines on those Roman merchants and citizens of other descriptions who had formed Cato's Council, and had contributed money to the cause of the Commonwealth. He imposed also large contributions on the inhabitants of Leptis, Adrumetum, and Thapsus;† and sold by auction the property of Juba, and of all the Roman citizens resident in Mauritania who had borne arms in his service; after which he reduced his Kingdom to the form of a Roman Province, and intrusted the government of it to C. Sallustius Crispus the historian, with the title of Proconsul. On the other hand, Cæsar bestowed rewards on the people of Zama for having excluded their Sovereign from their walls; and divided the territories of another Mauritanian Prince, who had been Juba's ally, between Bogud and P. Sitius.* Having thus brought the war in Africa to a conclusion, he embarked at Utica on the thirteenth of June, and sailed to Sardinia; there to impose fresh fines, and to order confiscations against some towns and individuals that had assisted the party of his adversaries. He sailed from Sardinia again on the twenty-ninth of June, and after a tedious voyage of eight and twenty days,† arrived at Rome about the twenty-seventh of July, or, according to the true calculation, about the end of May.

From the date of Cæsar's return from Africa to his assassination, there is a period of somewhat less than two years; and even of this short time nine months were engrossed by the renewal of the war in Spain, which obliged him to leave Rome once more, and contend for the security of his power at the point of the sword. He enjoyed the sovereignty, therefore, which he had so dearly purchased, during little more than one single year; from the end of July, 707, to the middle of the winter, a period of between seven and eight months, owing to the reformation of the Calendar which he introduced during this interval; and again, from October, 708, to the Ides of March in the following spring. After giving this outline of the order of events, we shall, first, briefly notice the disturbances in Spain, and in other parts of the Empire, by which the tranquillity of Cæsar's sovereignty was interrupted; and shall then endeavour to present our readers with a general view of the nature of his government, and of the internal state of Rome under his dominion; which last subject will naturally lead us to trace the origin of the conspiracy formed against him, and to follow it up to the moment of its fatal termination.

Renewal of the civil war in Spain by Scapula and Cn. Pompeius.

The condition of Spain had become far from tranquil before the conclusion of the campaign in Africa. Cnæus Pompeius, who, as we have mentioned, was invested with a naval command, had been invited thither by some of the Spanish cities,‡ which had taken part in the resistance offered against Q. Cassius, Cæsar's lieutenant, and which were apprehensive that their conduct, though not hitherto noticed, must necessarily have excited Cæsar's resentment. Accordingly Cn. Pompeius sailed from Africa to the barbarian islands,§ and succeeded in making himself master of them; but being seized with an illness, he was detained there till after the defeat and death of Scipio, and the conclusion of the African campaign. When the tidings of Cæsar's victory arrived in Spain, the party which had invited Pompeius to be their leader, finding that he was still delayed by sickness, resolved to seek out another Chief; and for this purpose they fixed on T. Annius Scapula,‖ a man of great rank and influence in the Province, and who had been deeply concerned in the opposition against the authority of Q. Cassius. His own slaves and freedmen were a numerous body, and with them he first took up arms; but his adherents daily became more formidable, being swelled partly by the accession of Roman and native soldiers from Spain itself, and partly by the fugitives from Africa.

* *Auctor de Bell. African.* c. 89.
† Ibid. c. 97.

* Appian *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iv. c. 54.
† *Auctor de Bell. African.* c. 98.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 228.
§ Ibid. *Auctor de Bell. Africano*, c. 23.
‖ *Auctor de Bell. Alexandrino*, c. 55. *De Bell. Hispaniensi*, c. 33. Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. ix. epist. xiii.

who sought his standard as their last refuge. At length Pompeius himself appeared, and was acknowledged as Commander-in-chief of the whole assembled force. The popularity of his name gained him the zealous support of the Spaniards; and soldiers resorted to him from every quarter of the Empire, as if it were reserved for the son of Pompey to revenge the fate of his father and of the Commonwealth. Cæsar's lieutenants, to whom he had intrusted the government of Spain, were unable to withstand the progress of the enemy; and Cæsar himself was obliged to suspend his labours for the civil administration of the Empire, and once more appear at the head of an army. He set out from Rome, as has been already observed, about the end of the year 707; and exerting his accustomed activity, he is said to have arrived at Obulco,* near Corduba, in the Province of Farther Spain, in twenty-seven days from the time of his leaving the Capital. His presence, as usual, encouraged those cities which still remained faithful to him, and restrained those which were inclining to the enemy. The troops which he found in Spain, added to those which followed him from Italy, formed an army superior to that of the enemy in the quality of its infantry, and in the numbers of its cavalry; and Cæsar, therefore, as in his former campaigns, was anxious to bring on a general action; and in order to accomplish this, whilst he was advancing his own cause at the same time in other respects, he employed himself in laying siege to some of the towns that were garrisoned by his opponents. In this manner he besieged and took Alegua, and one or two other places;† till Cn. Pompeius, unwilling to discourage his partisans by appearing unable to offer any resistance to his enemy's enterprises, and having persuaded himself that the soldiers in Cæsar's present army were no longer the same veterans who had conquered at Pharsalia or at Thapsus, was induced to offer battle in the neighbourhood of Munda. He disposed his army, however, upon ground so defensible by nature,‡ and his soldiers conducted themselves so bravely, that the first attack of the enemy was vigorously repelled; and, it is said, that Cæsar dismounted from his horse, and by offering to expose his life as a common soldier in the front of the line, at last, with difficulty, rallied his men, and retrieved the fortune of the day.§ The victory, though hardly won, was complete and decisive. Labienus and Atius Varus were killed in the field, and Cn. Pompeius was wounded, but effected his escape in a litter to Carteia. From thence, mistrusting the fidelity of the inhabitants, he endeavoured to withdraw by sea to a safer refuge;‖ but being pursued by a squadron of Cæsar's, and being surprised at the very moment when his ships had put in to shore to obtain fresh supplies of water, his vessels were all taken or burnt, and he was obliged once more to pursue his flight by land. He at first attempted to defend himself with the aid of the few followers who still remained with him, on one of the strong positions which the country afforded; but when his pursuers began to construct regular works, under cover of which they might gain a footing on the high ground occupied by his party, he was forced to fly, and his men began to disperse on every side. His wound disabled him from escaping on foot, and the country was impracticable for a carriage, or even for a horse; so that concealment was his only remaining chance of safety, and he took shelter in a cavern, in one of the wild and lonely glens among the mountains, such as have afforded a sure protection to the fugitives of a vanquished or oppressed party in various periods of Spanish history. But he was discovered by the information of some prisoners whom the enemy had taken, and was slaughtered in his place of refuge. His head was cut off, and presented to Cæsar, who, at that very moment, was entering Hispalis in triumph; and this bloody trophy being instantly, by his orders, exhibited to the multitude, informed them that the ruin of Pompey's cause was complete. Scapula had put an end to his own life a short time before at Corduba,* and Sex. Pompeius, the younger son of Pompey the Great, having fled from the same place on the news of the battle of Munda, sought a refuge amongst the Iaccetani or Lacetani,† one of the tribes of Hither Spain, who lived between the Pyrenees and the Ebro, in what is now a part of Navarre and Arragon. More fortunate than his brother, Sex. Pompeius was enabled, by the attachment of the natives, to baffle the vigilance of his pursuers, and soon to commence a predatory warfare, which became more serious after Cæsar's departure from Spain, and gradually assumed the shape of an organized hostility. But for the present he was reduced to the condition of a fugitive; and Cæsar pursued a course of executions and confiscations for some months,‡ till he had destroyed every appearance of regular opposition, and had enriched himself and largely rewarded those towns or tribes which had taken part with him in the late contest. The arrangements necessary to be made of one kind or another, detained him in Spain till the autumn, so that, as we have already observed, he did not return to Rome till the month of October.

There was one other part of the Empire in which Cæsar's authority was still disputed, nor was tranquillity ever fully established in it during his lifetime. On his hasty progress from Egypt towards Pontus, when he was preparing to attack Pharnaces, he had conferred the command of the Province of Syria upon Sex. Cæsar,§ a friend and connection of his own. At this time there was a Roman knight, residing at Tyre, of the name of Q. Cæcilius Bassus,‖ who had served in Pompey's army during the late campaign, and after the battle of Pharsalia had taken refuge in Syria. As belonging to the Equestrian order, he was likely to have been engaged in commerce, and he, probably, had some friends or connections in the great trading town of Tyre, which led him to fix on that place as his asylum. He was an active and enterprising man, and when reports began to be circulated that Cæsar was in a state of great danger

Cæsar leaves Rome, and goes into Spain.

Battle of Munda.

Death of Cn. Pompeius.

The whole of Spain is reduced to submission, and Cæsar returns to Rome.

Disturbances in Syria excited by Q. Cæcilius Bassus.

* Strabo, lib. iii. p. 169, edit. Xyland.
† *Auctor de Bell. Hispan.* c. 6, *et seq.*
‡ Ibid. c. 29, *et seq.*
§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 82.
‖ *Auctor de Bell. Hispan.* c. 37, 38, 39. Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 88.

* *Auctor de Bell. Hispan.* c. 33.
† Strabo, lib. iii. p. 170, edit. Xyland. Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 275. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iv. c. 83. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xii. epist. xxxvii.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 233.
§ *Auctor de Bell. Alexandrino*, c. 66.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 342. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxiv.

Biography. From u. c. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

and difficulty in Africa,* Bassus thought that he saw a favourable opportunity for reviving the cause of Pompey in the east. His command of money enabled him easily to raise soldiers in these times of general disorder, and also to corrupt those of Sex. Cæsar, as different detachments were successively placed in garrison at Tyre: we are told also, that when his military preparations became so notorious as to excite alarm, he satisfied Sex. Cæsar by assuring him that they were intended only to assist Mithridates of Pergamus in taking possession of his Kingdom of the Bosphorus, which Cæsar had bestowed on him as a reward for the services he had rendered him in his Egyptian campaign.† Suspicion being thus lulled asleep for the present, Bassus soon afterwards pretended to have received letters from Scipio, announcing the defeat and death of Cæsar in Africa, and bestowing on himself the government of Syria. Accordingly, by virtue of this imaginary commission, he took possession of Tyre; and in a very short time won over to his side the whole army of Sex. Cæsar, whose soldiers, corrupted by the money of his antagonist, murdered him, and then deserted to Bassus. In this manner a private individual, with no other means than the money and influence which he had acquired by his commercial dealings, became master of an army, and of the Province of Syria. He fixed his head-quarters at Apamea,‡ a town of remarkable strength, situated on a hill rising out of a level country, and protected partly by the river Orontes, which flows almost round it, and partly by a large tract of marsh or stagnant water, which obstructs the approach of an enemy. It commanded, besides, the resources of a most abundant district, which had long been famous for its wealth and fertility; and there were several other strong fortresses in its neighbourhood, the petty Chiefs of which were induced by the money, or by the credit of Bassus, to support him in his enterprise. We are told, too,§ that the Chief of one of the wandering Arab tribes, inhabiting the desert between Syria and the Euphrates, was bribed by promises of high pay to himself and his followers, to offer his services to the same cause; nor did Bassus scruple to call in the more powerful succour of the Sovereigns of Parthia, who were naturally glad to foment the internal quarrels of the Romans, and who once or twice relieved Apamea by their sudden appearance, when Bassus was hard pressed by the forces employed by Cæsar against him.‖ Thus there were two private individuals acting a conspicuous part in two different extremities of the Empire, and each indebted for his political importance to the connections with foreign Princes which he had formed in the course of his commercial dealings. We have already noticed the services rendered to Cæsar in Africa by P. Sitius, at the very time that Q. Cæcilius Bassus in Syria was organizing an opposition against him. Other more important occupations prevented Cæsar from employing a very considerable force to put him down; and he continued, therefore, to retain possession of Apamea, and to command the troops which had deserted to him from Sex. Cæsar, till C. Cassius, after the death of Cæsar, became the head of the party of the Commonwealth in Asia, when the superior fame and rank of Cassius induced the soldiers of Bassus to commit a second act of desertion, to abandon him, and put themselves under the command of Cassius.*

C. Caius Julius Cæsar. From u. c. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

There are few more curious historical records, than that which Evelyn, in his *Memoirs*, has left of the state of England immediately after the great civil war. He gives a journal of an excursion which he made through the midland and northern counties just at that period; and draws a most lively picture of the state of the country and of the towns, and of the marks of havoc and confiscation which naturally attended the decision of so obstinate a contest. But when we would strain our eyes to discover what was the condition of the Roman Empire when the sword was at last sheathed, and the victory of Cæsar was no longer disputed, we are obliged to turn away in disappointment, and can only indulge a vain regret, that the materials for obtaining a really valuable knowledge of ancient history are so exceedingly scanty. We have seen that Spain and Syria were even yet disturbed by the show of actual warfare; that Sex. Pompeius was the chief of a formidable band of plunderers in the one country, while Q. Cæcilius Bassus possessed in the other a strong and important city, and the command of a Roman legion. Before we return to Italy itself, we wish to glean a few facts illustrative of the condition of the other Provinces of the Empire, and to describe the characters of some of the persons, to whose care Cæsar had committed them.

Sketch of the state of the different Provinces.

The countries on the eastern side of the Adriatic and the Ionian gulf, which had been so lately the principal seat of the civil war, were now governed by P. Vatinius and Ser. Sulpicius. We have already mentioned the services which Vatinius had rendered to Cæsar in Illyricum, when he succeeded A. Gabinius in the management of the war in that Province, and obliged M. Octavius to abandon the contest and withdraw into Africa. He had been rewarded with a titular Consulship during the last three months of the year 706,† and was afterwards appointed to command the Province of Illyricum, as Proconsul. He was continually occupied in reducing the strong holds of the neighbouring Dalmatians,‡ who had taken an active part against Cæsar throughout the late war; and it appears, too, that some Roman officers, who had probably taken refuge in Illyricum after the defeat of Pompey, were carrying on a plundering and desultory warfare, accompanied with all that wanton cruelty which usually marks the last vindictive struggles of a vanquished party in a civil war. Achaia, under which name was included the whole of Greece southward of Thermopylæ, was at this same period under the government of Ser. Sulpicius. Sulpicius, the most distinguished lawyer of his day, had been one of those who remained in Italy when Pompey first withdrew into Greece, nor had he at any subsequent time been induced to follow him. The neutrality thus observed by a man of his high birth and character, was too grateful to Cæsar to pass unrewarded;

Illyricum.

Achaia.

* Cicero, *pro Deiotaro*, c. 9. Dion Cassius, *ubi supra*.
† *Auctor de Bell. Alexand.* c. 78.
‡ Strabo, lib. xvi. p. 871. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii. p. 342.
§ Dion Cassius and Strabo, *locis citatis*.
‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. ix.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xii.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lxii. p. 211.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. v. epist. x.

and when Q. Fufius Calenus returned home, to share the honours of the Consulship with P. Vatinius, Cæsar fixed upon Sulpicius as the most fit person to succeed him in the government of Greece.* Such a task was probably not an easy one: there were several distinguished persons who had been involved in the defeat of Pompey,† and who were now living in Greece in exile; many again of the Greeks themselves had been forward in opposing Cæsar,‡ and were to pay the penalty of their conduct by the forfeiture of their properties; while the adherents of the victorious party could not, at once, lay aside the license to which the war had accustomed them, and still indulged themselves in frequent acts of lawless violence,§ which it might not be safe or practicable for Sulpicius to punish. Yet, on the whole, his professional attachment to the laws, and his moderate character, disposed him to alleviate, as far as possible, the sufferings of the people whom he governed; and the state of Greece was, perhaps, enviable, when compared with that of some of the other Provinces of the Empire.

Asia. Of the condition of Asia, little appears to be known; except that the Province, called by that name, was now under the government of P. Servilius Isauricus,‖ who had been Cæsar's colleague in the Consulship in the year 705, and whom Cicero compliments on his beneficent and equitable administration. Deiotarus,¶ King of Galatia, who had formerly assisted Pompey in the civil war, but after the battle of Pharsalia had endeavoured to appease Cæsar's anger by his active services in the war with Pharnaces, was about this time accused, by his own grandson, of having intended to assassinate Cæsar, when passing through Asia Minor two years before, on his return from Egypt. Although he had been acknowledged as an independent Sovereign by Cæsar himself, yet Deiotarus was obliged to apply to Cicero, with whom he had long been familiarly acquainted, to defend him against this charge, and the cause was tried by Cæsar in his own house. It appears that nothing was determined immediately; and as Cæsar was forming plans for an expedition into Parthia, he may have deferred his judgment on Deiotarus till he should be himself in Asia, and should be able to ascertain more fully what decision would be most conducive to his own interests.

Africa. Cæsar's late conquests in Africa had been intrusted (as we have already mentioned) to the command of C. Sallustius Crispus the historian.** His oppressions and extortions are said to have been carried to such a pitch, that he was more like a plunderer than a Proconsul; and the unfortunate inhabitants, finding the miseries of war succeeded by the tyranny of such a government, must have been amongst the most wretched of all the subjects of the Roman Empire.

The return of Cæsar from Africa, in the end of July, 707, was almost immediately followed by his Triumphs which he now celebrated in commemoration of his various successes in Gaul,* in Egypt, in Pontus, and in Africa. Each of these pageants occupied a separate day, and there was an interval of some days between them, that the interest of the people might be kept alive, and that each might pass off without weariness. In the first Triumph, Vercingetorix,† who had been made prisoner at the famous siege of Alesia six years before, was led amongst the captives in the procession, and was immediately afterwards put to death. It is mentioned that an accident happened to Cæsar's triumphal chariot on this occasion, by which he was nearly thrown out of it; and so natural is superstition, even to men of the greatest natural abilities, if unenlightened by the knowledge of God, that he was accustomed,‡ ever afterwards, as soon as he had seated himself in any carriage, to repeat a certain form of words three times over, by way of a charm for the security of his journey. The injury which the chariot had sustained, rendered it necessary that another should be substituted for it; and the procession was so long delayed, that it was dark before the final ceremony of ascending into the Capitol could take place. But the spectacle lost nothing by this circumstance; for we are told that forty elephants were ranged in order on both sides of the way,§ supporting, in their trunks, a number of candelabra filled with lights. It seems, however, that the accident of the morning had produced a strong impression on Cæsar's mind; and that, with the feeling so common in ancient times of wishing by a voluntary humiliation to disarm the envy with which the gods were supposed to regard excessive prosperity, he climbed, or rather crawled, up the steps leading to the Capitol upon his knees.‖ In his Egyptian Triumph, Arsinoe, the younger sister of Cleopatra, appeared amongst the prisoners, and excited a general feeling of compassion, which, together with Cæsar's fondness for her sister, saved her from sharing the fate of Vercingetorix. The Triumph over Pharnaces was rendered remarkable by the display of a banner, with the famous words "*Veni, Vidi, Vici;*"¶ and we may imagine that Cæsar delighted in representing his victory over the King of Pontus as so easily won, in order to depreciate Pompey's glory as the conqueror of Mithridates. In his African triumph, Juba, the son of the late King of Mauritania,** was the most distinguished prisoner; but his life was spared, and he afterwards became an historian of considerable eminence, and recovered his hereditary throne, with an accession of territory, from the favour of Augustus. The civil wars, according to the constant practice of the Romans, could not be the subject of a regular Triumph; but, if we may believe Appian,†† pictures were exhibited in the procession representing the deaths of Scipio, Petreius, and Cato, although their names were not mentioned in the list of conquered enemies, which, as usual, was displayed to the people as a part of the ceremony. Indignation was naturally

Cæsar's Triumphs.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. iv. epist. iii. iv. lib. vi. epist. vi.
† For instance, M. Marcellus, A. Torquatus, Cn. Plancius. Vid. *Ciceron. ad Familiares*, lib. iv. epist. vii. xiv. lib. vi. epist. i.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xiii. epist. xix.
§ *Magna est gladiorum licentia; sed in externis locis minor, etiam ad facinus verecundia.* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. iv. epist. ix.
‖ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xiii. epist. lxviii.
¶ Cicero, *pro Deiotaro.*
** *Auctor de Bell. African.* c. 85. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 217.

* Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxv. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 37.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 223.
‡ Pliny, *Hist. Natural.* lib. xxviii. c. 2.
§ Suetonius, c. 37.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 224.
¶ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 37.
** Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 55. Strabo, lib. xvii. p. 959.
†† *De Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 101.

excited by this indirect glorying at the deaths of some of the most distinguished citizens of the Commonwealth; but the splendour of the pageant drove all other considerations, we are told, from the eyes of the multitude;* and when they were informed that Cæsar had brought into the treasury, as the fruit of his conquests, a sum exceeding 4,843,750*l.* of our money,† few would be disposed to estimate justly the immense price of wickedness and misery at which this plunder had been purchased.

Largesses to the populace and to the soldiers.

His Triumphs were followed by various largesses of provisions and money to the populace; and by a succession of splendid spectacles, which were perhaps equally effectual in winning the affections of the multitude. Magnificent public entertainments were given, and the people were feasted, we are told, at two and twenty thousand tables;‡ besides which every one of the poorer citizens received a certain portion of meat,§ about two bushels and a half of corn, ten pounds of oil, and 3*l.* 4*s.* 7*d.* in money. A year's rent,‖ or possibly a year's house-tax, was also remitted to every person in Rome who paid for his dwelling less than 16*l.* 2*s.* 11*d.* and to every one in Italy who paid less than 4*l.* 0*s.* 8¾*d.*; or possibly the remission to the Italians was now given in addition to that which Cæsar had already given to the Romans, according to Don Cassius, before he set out for Africa, in the preceding winter.¶ But it is said that he somewhat lessened the effect of these liberalities, by a previous scrutiny and reduction of the number of citizens who were to profit by them; for finding that the list of paupers at Rome,** or of persons receiving relief from the distributions of corn issued at the public expense, amounted to three hundred and twenty thousand, he caused this account to be rigorously examined, and diminished it by about one half; providing moreover by a law, that no new claimants on the public bounty should be admitted, unless when vacancies in the number now established should be occasioned by death. To his soldiers he gave at the rate of 16*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.* to each of the common men; 322*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.* to the Centurions; and 645*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.* to the military Tribunes.* The cavalry are said to have received at the rate of 193*l.* 15*s.* a man. In addition to these presents in money, settlements in land were given to the army; yet we are told that the soldiers were dissatisfied with the rewards conferred on them;† and something of real bitterness mingled perhaps with the wild license of the moment, when, as they followed their leader in his Triumphal procession, they sang doggerel verses, attacking the infamous profligacy of his youth, reproached him with their miserable fare of roots at Dyrrhachium, and, parodying the sentiment of the Stoics, told him, that if he acted honestly, he would be condemned for his treasons, but if he played the villain, he might win the throne. Already, too, they assumed so much of the self-importance of the guards of a military despot, that they murmured loudly against the extravagance of Cæsar's spectacles; and, if we may believe Dion Cassius, they actually showed symptoms of mutiny, which were only suppressed by the vigour of their chief, in seizing one of them with his own hand, and ordering him to be executed immediately. Yet wiser and better citizens might have joined them in condemning the profusion of the entertainments now given to the multitude, and might have recognised the invariable policy of tyrants, in the conduct of Cæsar, thus pampering the populace with shows and feastings, while he was plundering and oppressing the rich, the respectable, and the industrious. He had built a Forum, or great square, which was called after his own name, an Amphitheatre, and a Temple in honour of Venus, giving her the epithet of "*Genitrix*," or "the Ancestress," in allusion to the fabled descent of the Julian family from Iulus, the son of Æneas. These various buildings were now to be opened, or consecrated; and this, together with the pretence of paying honours to the memory of his daughter Julia,‡ who had died about eight years before, furnished him with an occasion of gratifying the favourite tastes of the multitude to the utmost. Dramatic entertainments were exhibited in all the different quarters of the city,§ and were performed in several different languages, for the amusement of the numerous strangers assembled in the Capital from all parts of the Empire. It was in one of these performances that Dec. Laberius, a Roman knight, and well known as a writer of farces, was forced, at Cæsar's request, to appear as an actor on the stage in one of his own plays; and having thus forfeited his rank by becoming one of a profession which the Romans considered infamous, he recovered it again from Cæsar, as a reward for his condescension, and received besides a large present in money. But the dramatic spectacles were little regarded in comparison with the sports of the Circus, and the Amphitheatre, the combats of gladiators, and the exhibition of the Naumachia. The hunting of different animals was continued during

Shows of various kinds exhibited to the people.

Dramatic entertainments.

Sports of the Amphitheatre.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 223.

† Vell. Paterculus, lib. ii.

‡ Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 55.

§ "Visceratio," *Conf.* Suetonium *in Cæsare*, c. 38.

‖ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 38. Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 209.

¶ It is not quite clear what was the nature of the payment which Cæsar remitted on this occasion. To have deprived all landlords of a year's rent seems a measure more violently iniquitous than Cæsar was likely to have sanctioned; especially as he, or his partisan, represents this very same thing as one of the mischievous proposals of M. Cælius in his Prætorship, brought forward by him at the same time with a law for the general abolition of all debts, which exposed him to the censures of those persons to whom Cæsar had intrusted the administration of the Capital. Possibly it was a remission of all rents due to the Government, which may have been the proprietor of a large portion of the land occupied by buildings in Rome, as well as in many other towns in Italy. Dion Cassius says, that in consequence of the repeated conflicts which took place between the soldiers of Octavius Cæsar and the citizens, both in Rome and in the other towns of Italy, after the battle of Philippi, in the course of which a great many houses were burnt, there was granted also a remission of rent both in the Capital and in the country towns; but he does not say whether this was an act of the Government, or an arrangement generally made between the landlords and their tenants, in consideration of the temporary distress of the latter. Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 362.

** Suetonius, c. 41. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 224.

* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 102. The sum here stated appears enormous; yet a natural correction of the text of Suetonius, which in its present state is clearly corrupt, makes his testimony exactly confirm that of Appian; and all parts of the Empire had been plundered to furnish Cæsar with the means of enriching his soldiery.

† Pliny, lib. xix. c. 8. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 224, 226. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 49. 51.

‡ Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 55. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 225.

§ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 39.

five days; and it is said, that the camelopard, or giraffe, was on this occasion, for the first time, exhibited at Rome.* On the last day, a regular engagement took place, in which twenty elephants, thirty horsemen, and five hundred foot-soldiers fought on each side; and at another time twenty elephants,† mounted with their turrets, and assisted by sixty light-armed soldiers, were opposed to five hundred infantry and twenty horsemen. The combats of gladiators were also on the grandest scale; and, if we may believe Suetonius, Furius Leptinus, a man whose father had been Prætor, and Q. Calpenus, a Senator, fought in these contests amongst the hundreds of prisoners taken in war, or criminals condemned to die, who in general were the combatants. In like manner, the martial exercise, called the Pyrrhic dance, was performed by the sons of men of the highest rank in the Provinces of Asia and Bithynia; and many of the young Roman Nobility appeared as drivers of chariots in the races of the Circus. But the Naumachia, or sea-fight, excited greater admiration than even the combats of the gladiators or of the elephants. An immense pond or lake was dug near the Tiber, and having been filled with water, ships of war, of different sizes, of which some are said to have been quadriremes, or vessels with four rows of oars, were introduced upon it. Two fleets were formed, one consisting of Egyptians, and the other of Tyrians; and it is said that there were on board of each two thousand rowers,‡ and one thousand fighting men, who engaged with one another, and displayed all the horrors of real warfare. Even the habitual inhumanity of the Romans was shocked, we are told, in some measure, by this enormous and wanton effusion of blood; § yet they were much more shocked, it is added, at the thought of the vast sums of money which were thus prodigally expended. Amongst other instances of magnificence, it is mentioned that the whole Forum in which the gladiators fought, together with the whole length of the Via Sacra, was covered over with awnings to protect the spectators from the sun; || and some accounts which Dion Cassius had seen, added the incredible circumstance that these awnings were made of silk. Yet, however justly there might have existed a partial and temporary feeling of indignation or disgust at so much prodigality and cruelty, the entertainments were altogether so attractive, that the multitudes which flocked to Rome to witness them were obliged to live in booths or tents, with which they lined the roads near the Capital, as well as the principal streets; ¶ and many lives were continually lost from the pressure of the crowd; two Senators, it is said, perishing amongst the rest in this manner. One circumstance yet remains to be told, in order to complete the picture of these festivities. For some cause, which Dion Cassius could not learn, human sacrifices were judged to be necessary; and, accordingly, two men were offered up in the Campus Martius, by the Pontifices and the priest of Mars.** Such were the scenes exhibited in the Capital of the civilized world, under the express direction of the Sovereign of the Empire, himself a man of the highest and most cultivated intellect in his dominions.

Combats of gladiators.

Naumachia, or sea-fight.

Human sacrifices offered in the Campus Martius.

We have called Cæsar the Sovereign of the Empire; for, independently of that actual power which his sword had conferred on him, the Senate, since the tidings of his successes in Africa, had showered upon him all the dignities and offices of the Commonwealth. He had been appointed Dictator for ten years,* and *Præfectus Morum*, or Superintendent of Public Manners and Morals, with the whole vast authority formerly enjoyed by the Censors, for three years. He was to nominate the other Magistrates, who were before elected by the people; although it appears that he did not avail himself of this power to its full extent, but, with the exception of the Consuls, allowed all other public officers to be appointed half by the tribes, as usual, and half by himself.† He was allowed to have his Curule chair in the Senate placed on a level with those of the Consuls, and he was entitled to deliver his opinion before every other person in the debates. To all these were added some of those profane and disgraceful flatteries,‡ which were afterwards so commonly bestowed on the Roman Emperors. His statue, raised upon a figure representing the earth, was placed in the Capitol opposite to the statue of Jupiter, and on it was the inscription, "He is a demigod." Other divine honours were voted to him, either now, or after his return from the campaign against the sons of Pompey, in Spain. His statues were carried, together with those of the Gods, in the processions of the Circus, temples and altars were dedicated to him, and priests were appointed to superintend his worship. These things he received with a vanity which affords a striking contrast to the contemptuous pride of Sylla. Cæsar took a pleasure in receiving every token of homage, and in contemplating, with childish delight, the gaudy honours with which he was invested. It was a part of the prize which he had coveted, and which he had committed so many crimes to gain; nor did the possession of real power seem to give him greater delight than the enjoyment of these forced, and therefore worthless, flatteries.

Powers and honours bestowed on Cæsar.

When Sylla had raised himself to the supreme power, there was a definite object before him which he never lost sight of—the depression of the popular party, and the strengthening the Aristocracy; and when he had accomplished these ends, he laid aside his individual Sovereignty, and took his station as the chief of that part of the Commonwealth on which he had conferred an absolute ascendency. But Cæsar's policy was entirely selfish: he could not pretend to act for the benefit of the Aristocracy, or of the lower orders. There were no grievances in the old Constitution which could be redressed only by his despotism; there had been no offence committed by the Senate and People of Rome which deserved that their liberties should be surrendered into the hands of one profligate individual. Those therefore who draw comparisons between Sylla's proscriptions and Cæsar's

* Dion Cassius, *ubi supra.*
† Pliny, lib. viii. c. 7.
‡ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 102.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 225, 226.
|| Pliny, lib. xix. c. 1.
¶ Suetonius, c. 39.
** Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 236.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 220. Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. ix. epist. xv.
† Suetonius, c. 41.
‡ Dion Cassius, ibid. Suetonius, c. 76.

clemency, forget the utterly different circumstances in which the two Dictators were placed. Wicked as Sylla's cruelties were, they were a retaliation for former atrocities, or a security for the establishment of the interests of the high Aristocratical party at Rome. The Samnites were butchered to maintain the ascendency of the Romans over the Italian allies; the proscription lists were opened to exterminate, if possible, the adherents of the popular faction, who had abetted the violences of Sulpicius and Cinna, and had so lately trampled the Nobility under their feet. But after the deaths of Pompey, of Scipio, of L. Domitius, of M. Bibulus, of L. Lentulus, of M. Cato, and of all the most eminent citizens of the Commonwealth, whom could Cæsar wish to proscribe? His own wrongs, even if we were to admit his own statement, had been abundantly revenged already; the security of his government could not be ensured by massacres, when every one seemed ready to submit to his power; and if he had wished to get rid of all those whose interests were incompatible with his own, he must have destroyed every free citizen in the Empire. Cæsar's policy was to draw a veil over the past, as far as possible; to conciliate, by an apparent clemency, those whom he held in subjection; and to invest himself, as early as he could, with all the splendour and popularity which attend a Prince of commanding abilities ruling over a great Empire. Had he but retained a small military force about his person, to save him from the danger of assassination, there was no probability that his power would ever have been disturbed by any national resistance; he might have died, like Augustus, in a peaceful old age, quietly enjoying the Imperial Crown, and might have transmitted his dominions to his successor, without the intervention of that period of misery which elapsed, between his murder and the final exaltation of his nephew Octavius, after the battle of Actium.

Distribution of lands to Cæsar's soldiers.

One of the most necessary measures for the security of Cæsar's government, was the granting settlements of lands to his victorious soldiers. He did not wish to plant them all together in any one part of Italy;* partly that by being dispersed into different quarters they might be less likely to remember their own power, and attempt to overthrow the throne which they had raised; and partly in order to avoid the odium of expelling a large body of the lawful occupants of the soil in order to make room for them. It was professed that for this purpose Cæsar could find land enough amongst the forfeited estates of the adherents of Pompey, or in those parts of Italy and Cisalpine Gaul which were the property of the Commonwealth. But it appears that the Commissioners whom he appointed to manage this business, might extend, with little control, the limits of what they chose to call national or confiscated lands; and thus we find them dividing out the districts of Veii and Capena;† threatening the neighbourhood of Tusculum, so that Cicero entertained some fears for the safety of his own villa; seizing on estates in Cisalpine Gaul,‡ which belonged to the corporation of the town of Atella, in Campania; claiming the whole territory of Volaterræ,* because Sylla had decreed its confiscation, although it had since been protected by an especial law, passed by Cæsar himself in his first Consulship; and by a still more striking instance of arbitrary power, marking out for distribution a property which had already been sold by public auction under Cæsar's authority,† as belonging to an adherent of Pompey; and had been purchased by C. Albinus, a Senator, in the natural confidence that Cæsar would cause the validity of such sales to be religiously observed, inasmuch as his own credit and interest were concerned in maintaining his own acts. But in this manner, at whatever expense of individual oppression and misery, the veterans were provided for; and the favour of the army was conciliated towards a Chief, whose sole dependence was on their support, and who had shown himself ready to repay their services with the rewards which they most coveted.

Purchases of forfeited property by Cæsar's adherents.

It is not possible to estimate the amount of property forfeited in different parts of the Empire, on account of the support given by its owners to the party of Pompey. At Rome the sales of houses and lands were constantly going on, and as it was naturally considered odious to become a purchaser,‡ monied men of low character, and some of Cæsar's partisans, who cared not for public opinion, were able to buy splendid possessions at a very low price. It is said that M. Antonius,§ having thus bought the house which had belonged to Pompey, was very unwilling to pay the price of it; presuming that his services to Cæsar entitled him to share in his spoils gratuitously. But Cæsar, on his return from Africa, insisted absolutely on the payment being made; and when Antonius still demurred, he ordered a military guard to take possession of his property. It was now time to give up the plea of right, and to appeal to Cæsar's forbearance, that he would not press for immediate payment; and Cæsar, whose main objection was to the principle on which Antonius had before refused to pay, having no wish to distress so useful an adherent, readily allowed him a longer time to discharge his debt. It does not appear that it was ever paid; for the profligacy of Antonius kept him always poor, and Cæsar did not wish to exasperate him, and to run the risk of offending a large party among his principal officers, by seeming to grudge them any portion of the fruits of his usurpation. We are told that, whilst Cæsar was in Spain,‖ Antonius proceeded as far as Narbo, in Gaul, to join him, but went no further; and after staying there some time returned to Rome, in order to prevent the sale of his property with which he was at that period threatened for his insolvency. During his stay at Narbo,¶ he is said to have communicated with C. Trebonius some design against Cæsar's life; and it was owing to this circumstance that Trebonius afterwards led him aside out of the Senate-house, when Cæsar was assassinated, supposing that he, who had once himself proposed the very same deed, would feel no regret when it was carried into execution. But it is not

* Suetonius, c. 38. Dion Cassius, lib. xlii. p. 210. Appian, lib. ii. c. 94.
† Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. ix. epist. xvii.
‡ Ibid. lib. xiii. epist. vii.

* Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. xiii. epist. iv.
† Ibid. lib. xiii. epist. viii.
‡ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xii. epist. iii.
§ Ibid. *Philippic.* ii. c. 29.
‖ Ibid. c. 30, 31. *Ad Atticum*, lib. xii. epist. xviii.
¶ Ibid. c. 14.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

unlikely that some among the conspirators were actuated by the same motives which had led Antonius to contemplate the murder of Cæsar.; and that it was the creditor rather than the tyrant whom they wished to destroy. Be this as it may, the friends of Cæsar seized largely upon the spoils of the defenders of the Commonwealth; and although in many instances the property thus gained was speedily dissipated, yet the scandal and the suffering occasioned by these proceedings was great and deplorable.

Sketch of the lives of Cæsar's principal adherents.

We shall take this opportunity of noticing some of those persons who had been Cæsar's principal supporters in the civil war, and who were now raised by his victory to the highest situations in the Commonwealth. Of all these M. Antonius was the most distinguished.

M. Antonius.

He has been, necessarily, often mentioned already in the course of this history; and we have seen that his flight from Rome during his Tribuneship, furnished Cæsar with a pretence for commencing his rebellion in the year 704; that he was afterwards intrusted with the government of Italy during Cæsar's absence in Spain in the same year; that he held a high command in Cæsar's army in the subsequent campaign in Greece; and that, after the battle of Pharsalia, he carried the greatest part of the victorious legions back to Italy, and enjoyed the government of that country for the second time till the return of Cæsar from Egypt in the autumn of 706. He was then named Master of the Horse to Cæsar in his second Dictatorship; but he did not follow him into Africa, and employed himself, during his stay at Rome, in wasting, amidst the grossest excesses, the property which he had purchased at Cæsar's auctions. Next

P. Dolabella.

to Antonius we may rank P. Cornelius Dolabella, Cicero's son-in-law, whose early profligacies and extravagances had led him to join Cæsar at the beginning of his rebellion as the natural patron of men of broken fortunes; who had since fought under him at Pharsalia,* had distinguished himself by his revolutionary proceedings when Tribune, during Cæsar's absence in Egypt, and afterwards had gone with him into Africa, and had served under him through the whole of that campaign. On his return to Italy, after Cæsar's final victory, he appears to have lived in a style of great magnificence, and the excellence of his entertainments is recorded by Cicero,† who at this time often visited him, and through him, and one or two other friends, maintained a friendly intercourse

M. Æmilius Lepidus.

with the prevailing party. M. Æmilius Lepidus is entitled to our notice, more from the elevated situation to which circumstances afterwards raised him, than from any merit or abilities of his own. Having been Prætor at the beginning of the rebellion, he had remained at Rome when the Consuls and the great majority of the Senate left it to follow Pompey;‡ and when Cæsar returned from Spain, towards the end of the year 704, Lepidus presided at the Comitia, which conferred on him the office of Dictator. For thus giving the sanction of a lawful Magistrate to Cæsar's proceedings, he was rewarded with the government of the Province of Hither Spain,§ which he retained for two years; and having made himself useful in quieting the disturbances occasioned by the unpopularity of Q. Cassius, he received the honours of a Triumph on his return to Rome, and was named Cæsar's colleague in the Consulship for the year 707. This dignity he was now enjoying; and when Cæsar again set out for Spain, at the close of the year, being then invested with the Dictatorship, Lepidus was appointed his Master of the Horse, and was intrusted with the care of the Capital during his absence. The principal partisans of Cæsar are enumerated by Cicero in one of his letters,* where we find the names of Pansa, Hirtius, Balbus, Oppius, Matius, and Postumius.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

C. Vibius Pansa.

C. Vibius Pansa had been Tribune in the year 702, and being already devoted to the interests of Cæsar, he interposed his negative upon some of the earliest resolutions passed by the Senate,† with a view to the appointment of a new Proconsul in the Province of Gaul. We know not how actively he was engaged in the civil war; but it appears that he preserved, through the whole of it, an unblemished character,‡ and so distinguished himself by various acts of kindness and protection towards distressed individuals of the vanquished party, that when he was appointed to succeed M. Brutus in the government of Cisalpine Gaul, in the year 708, he received from the people, on leaving Rome, the liveliest tokens of

A. Hirtius.

their good-will and gratitude. A. Hirtius was also a friend of Cæsar before the civil war broke out, and was with him in Gaul in the year 703,§ from whence he was despatched to Rome, to make arrangements with some of Cæsar's partisans in the Capital, and returned to Cæsar immediately after, so that he was probably with him when he first began his rebellion. We hear of him again as residing in Italy in the year 707,‖ when he, like Dolabella, was famous for the sumptuousness of his table, and flattered Cicero's vanity by coming frequently to receive instructions from him in the art of oratory. He is known as the author of the eighth book of the *Commentaries of Cæsar's Wars in Gaul*;¶ and was by some said to have written also those narratives of the campaigns in Egypt, Africa, and Spain, to which we have so often referred in our account of those events. He also took upon himself to write an invective against Cato in answer to Cicero's panegyric on him;** and he is said to have displayed some talent in the work, but to have incurred much greater ridicule, for the evident spirit of flattery to Cæsar by which it was dictated. Both Hirtius and Pansa appeared inclined, after Cæsar's death, to acknowledge the authority of the old Constitution; they were both Consuls together in the year 710, and both perished in the actions fought at Mutina, when commanding the armies of the Commonwealth against the rebellious attempts of M. Antonius. The names of Balbus and Oppius are generally coupled together in Cicero's letters, as if either personal or political friendship had established

* Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 30.
† *Ad Familiares*, lib. ix. epist. xvi.
‡ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. ix. Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 170.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 214. *Auctor de Bell. Alexand.* c. 50, 51.

* *Ad Familiares*, lib. vi. epist. xii.
† Cicero, *ad Familiar.* lib. viii. epist. viii.
‡ Ibid. lib. xv. epist. xvii. xix. *Ad Atticum*, lib. xii. epist. xxvii.
§ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. iv.
‖ Ibid. lib. xii. epist. ii. *Ad Familiares*, lib. vii. epist. xxxiii. lib. ix. epist. xvi. xvii. xx.
¶ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 56.
** Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xii. epist. xl. xli. xliv. xlv.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

the closest union between them. L. Cornelius Balbus was a native of Spain, and by birth a citizen of Gades. He distinguished himself in the service of the Roman Government in the war so long carried on against Sertorius, and was rewarded by Pompey with the rights of a Roman citizen.* From this period he removed to Rome, where he lived in a style of affluence, and, as it appears, was exposed to some odium on account of his wealth and luxury.† He soon became acquainted with Cæsar, to whom, perhaps, his money enabled him to be useful; and his intimacy with him was already firmly established, when Cæsar, after his Prætorship, obtained the Province of the Farther Spain; for we find that Cæsar conferred many kindnesses for his sake on his native city Gades.‡ When Cæsar was afterwards Consul, Balbus was one of those whom he most warmly patronised; and when, in the year 697, his title to the character of a Roman citizen was disputed in a Court of justice, by the instigation, probably, of those who hated him as Cæsar's friend, Crassus, Pompey, and Cicero pleaded for him in his defence. Whilst Cæsar was in Gaul, Balbus occasionally visited him,§ and found opportunities, we may suppose, of adding to his fortune from the plunder of that country and Britain; for Cicero, in one of his letters,|| alludes to the gardens and a Tusculan villa of the favourite, as the fruits of Cæsar's friendship. When the civil war broke out, he remained at Rome, and was not required by Cæsar to take any active part in the quarrel,¶ as he was under great obligations to Pompey, and to L. Cornelius Lentulus, then Consul, from whom he had taken his name when he became a Roman citizen. But he was always highly valued by Cæsar, and possessed great influence with him; insomuch, that Cicero relied chiefly on his interest to procure for him the favour of the conqueror after the battle of Pharsalia.** He was an Epicurean in principle and in practice, building splendid villas after Cæsar's victory in Africa,†† and enjoying the gifts of fortune to the uttermost. According to the philosophy which he professed, he seems to have been a selfish but easy tempered man, willing to keep up a friendly intercourse with persons of all parties, and studying to preserve his fortune unhurt through all the political changes which he witnessed. In this object he was fully successful; for after the battle of Philippi he obtained the title of Consul from M. Antonius and Octavius in the year 713,‡‡ being the first individual who rose to that honour without being an Italian or a Roman citizen by birth; and at his death he was rich enough to bequeath the sum of 16*s.* 1*d.* to every individual of the Roman people.

L. Cornelius Balbus.

C. Oppius.

His associate, Oppius, was a man of mean, or at least of humble birth,§§ and apparently became acquainted with Cæsar by furnishing him with money at a time his profligacies were continually draining his means and ruining his credit. When Cæsar was in Gaul, Oppius seems to have been employed by him as his agent at Rome,* and was in the habit of forwarding the letters which passed between him and his principal officers and their friends in the Capital. Like Balbus, he enjoyed the confidence of Cæsar without interruption, and his name is constantly mentioned as that of a person whose influence in the internal administration of affairs was very considerable. But we have been unable to find any particulars recorded of him which throw light upon his individual character.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

C. Matius was a citizen of the Equestrian order,† and became at an early period of his life acquainted with Cæsar. He was with him for some time in Gaul,‡ and exerted himself at that period to reconcile him to Cicero, for whom he entertained an old regard. At the beginning of the civil war, he did his utmost to preserve peace; but when his efforts proved fruitless, a most false estimate of the claims of private friendship led him to follow Cæsar, though at the same time he disapproved of his cause. He does not appear, however, to have taken much part in the war, nor did he acquire either riches or honours by its event; but availed himself of his influence with the conqueror to mitigate the sufferings of the vanquished party, and to recommend a system of clemency. After the death of Cæsar, when his assassins were at the height of their power, Matius never disguised his sorrow for the loss of his friend, and was one of the first persons to notice and support C. Octavius, when he came forward to claim the name and inheritance of his uncle. Octavius did not forget his kindness, but lived on terms of friendship with him,§ when the course of events had raised him to the Imperial throne: and Matius lived to old age, possessed of fortune and influence, without reproach, amusing himself with his gardens and trees, and, like our own Evelyn, leaving a name behind him for his attention to the practice of horticulture, and the ornamenting of pleasure grounds.

C. Matius.

Of Postumius we have been able to collect no other notices, than that he was employed by Cæsar in the civil war,|| and after his death undertook, together with C. Matius, the directions of the games which were celebrated by Octavius in honour of his uncle's victories.

Postumius.

One reflection naturally presents itself when we read over this list of names hitherto unknown in Roman history, and now raised to the highest eminence of wealth and political importance. With all the misery which they had occasioned, the civil wars had yet produced the beneficial effect of depriving the oligarchy of great Roman families of that predominant share of power and honours which they had been accustomed to enjoy. In times of commotion, men of wealth, or of personal qualifications, naturally made their way to distinction and greatness; and more monied men and foreigners were thus introduced into the highest class of society, and gave a severe wound to that narrow Aristocratical spirit which would perpetuate Nobility in one particular caste, and considers it as a

* Cicero, *pro Balbo*, c. 2, 3.
† Ibid. c. 25.
‡ Ibid. c. 19.
§ Cicero, *Epist. ad Q. Fratrem*, lib. iii. epist. i.
|| *Ad Atticum*, lib. vii. epist. vii.
¶ Ibid. lib. ix. epist. vii.
** Ibid. lib. xi. epist. vii. viii. &c.
†† Ibid. lib. xii. epist. ii.
‡‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 376. Pliny, lib. vii. c. 43. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii.
§§ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ix. epist. vii. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 60.

* Cicero, *ad Q. Fratrem*, lib. iii. epist. i.
† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 60.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. xxvii. xxviii.
§ Pliny, lib. xii. c. 2. lib. xv. c. 14.
|| Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 58. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. ii.

profanation to admit individuals taken from the mass of the people into the ranks of this privileged order. It was a general benefit to the Provinces of the Roman Empire when Balbus obtained the Consulship; it was a general elevation of the commercial and monied classes of the Roman people, when Oppius and Matius were raised to a degree of power and importance above the families of the oldest Nobility in the Commonwealth; while, at the same time, it was a fortunate circumstance towards maintaining a just but not excessive respect for noble ancestry, that the person who had seized the very highest place in the Republic, was one whose birth made him on a level with the proudest of the Patricians, and thus rendered his sway less galling than if his abilities and crimes alone had exalted him above them.

It may be remarked, also, that almost all the friends of Cæsar whom we have enumerated, were men of Epicurean principles; and the same may be said of T. Pomponius Atticus and C. Mecænas, two of the most distinguished individuals of the Equestrian order, who flourished about this same period. The doctrines of Epicurus naturally suited a class of men who enjoyed wealth without political dignity; and such was the general character of the Equestrian order, to which the persons of whom we have been speaking originally belonged. Where these principles were united with an amiable temper and kindly feelings, the mischief to which they led was either indolence and a sort of elegant selfishness, or, in the most favourable circumstances, it was a preference of feeling to principle, and a habit of substituting kind and generous actions for the harder task of balancing the claims of conflicting duties, and following that which was right, rather than that which was agreeable. It is probable that Matius and Pansa thought that their conduct in supporting Cæsar was amply atoned for by their acts of personal kindness and disinterestedness after his victory; so prone are men to purchase the privilege of declining a painful duty by the practice of those amiable virtues which confer at once the greatest self-complacency on themselves, and most attract the admiration of others. This tendency was especially encouraged by the doctrines of Epicurus, which making pleasure the end of human conduct, represented virtue as the surest means of attaining it. Men of coarser and viler natures abused this philosophy, as was natural, far more grossly; but its evil tendency was most shown in the lives of its best disciples: for they who believed virtue to be indeed the truest road to pleasure, were yet misled by perceiving that the virtues most agreeable to their natures, led them to pleasure most readily; and, content with the practice of these, they failed altogether in assigning to each virtue its proper comparative rank, and in disciplining their natures to choose their highest duty, when the gratification of their intellect or their feelings was to be the necessary sacrifice.

Laws and regulations of Cæsar.

Meantime, Cæsar proceeded to turn his attention to the general settlement of the Commonwealth, and, like Sylla, to attempt to terminate the disorders from which he had now nothing further to gain. With this view he proposed and carried a law, restricting to two years the term during which any command in the Provinces might be held;* and ordering that all those Provinces which were governed by Prætors or Proprætors should be held only for one year. But as he had himself marched with his army out of his Province by his own sole authority, in open defiance of the Cornelian law of Sylla, which rendered such conduct treasonable, so a popular adventurer, or an able and ambitious General, would not fail to procure or to retain the command of a Province for as long a time as might suit his purposes, notwithstanding the prohibitions of this law of Cæsar. Another law, in which also the example of Sylla was followed, proposed to increase the severity of the criminal code.* Wilful murderers were to incur the forfeiture of all their property, in addition to the penalty of exile, which had hitherto been the utmost extent of punishment legally inflicted on the most enormous crimes; other criminals, when banished, were to forfeit the half of their fortunes; and persons condemned for disturbing the public peace,† or for any other of those offences against the public welfare, included under the term "*Majestas imminuta*," or "*læsa*," were to be expelled from Italy by the form of forbidding them the use of fire and water within so many miles of the Capital. But this strictness ill accorded with the indemnities which he had himself granted to so many persons condemned for bribery and other offences;‡ or with his reversing the sentences of degradation formerly passed by the Censors upon several who had since served him in the civil war. A third law, which was most completely at variance with the popular principles on which he had professed heretofore to act, contained an alteration of the Aurelian law respecting the persons to whom the judicial power was to be intrusted. By that law, passed as we have seen in the first Consulship of Pompey and Crassus, (u. c. 683) the Judges were to be chosen from the Senate, the Equestrian order, and from a description of men among the Plebeians who possessed a competent fortune, and were known by the name of *Tribuni Ærarii*. But Cæsar now made the *Tribuni Ærarii* no longer eligible, and confined the judicial power, exclusively, to the members of the Senate, or of the Equestrian order.§ Another of Cæsar's measures was directed against extravagance in the expenses of the table, being a renewal and an enforcement of the old sumptuary laws. Intemperance in eating and drinking was not Cæsar's favourite sensuality; and perhaps his feelings as a soldier may have made him dislike an indulgence which he might think inconsistent with the hardiness of a military nation. But he found that the impatience which men feel at being controlled by law, in a matter so entirely of a domestic nature, was too strong in this point for his authority; and learning that as soon as he left Rome his enactments were disregarded, he wrote angrily from Spain to say that he was resolved henceforward to remain constantly in the Capital, that his laws might be duly observed;‖ and afterwards, he is said not only to have posted guards at the markets, to prevent the sale of any forbidden articles,¶ but sometimes to have sent his lictors and soldiers into private houses,

* Cicero, *Philippic.* i. c. 8.

* Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 42.
† Cicero, *Philippic.* i. c. 10.
‡ Suetonius, c. 41.
§ Ibid. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 226.
‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiii. epist. vii.
¶ Suetonius, c. 43.

and to have actually carried off from the table any dishes which exceeded the allowed expense of private entertainments. There were others of his acts which excited great odium against him at the time, and which proceeded, indeed, very probably, from selfish motives; but which were really wise and liberal, and loudly called for by the existing circumstances of the Empire. He conferred the rights of Roman citizenship on a whole legion of soldiers whom he had raised in Transalpine Gaul, and called by the name of the Alaudæ.* He bestowed also the same privilege on many of the inhabitants of Cisalpine Gaul, and intended to communicate it to all the people within the Alps,† a purpose which was carried into effect soon after his death by M. Antonius and Octavius. He gave also the inferior distinction of the rights of Latin citizenship, "*Jus Latii*," to all the inhabitants of Sicily.‡ He introduced a number of persons into the Senate, so that the majority of the whole body were said to owe their admission to him;§ and amongst the rest were several Transalpine Gauls;‖ upon which an ironical notice was handed about in Rome, ordering "that no one should pretend to show the new Senators the way to the Senate-house." He raised several new families to the dignity of Patricians,¶ in order to supply the diminution of that Order in the late war; and he admitted all physicians, as well as the professors of all other liberal arts and sciences, resident at Rome, to the right of citizenship. All these acts had a beneficial tendency, as far as they contributed to place the inhabitants of different parts of the Empire on a level with each other; and prepared the way for their forming gradually one united nation, instead of regarding one another, as hitherto, in the light of masters and slaves, between whom there existed an insuperable barrier. Another class of Cæsar's measures regarded the important subject of population, and was an attempt to relieve the Capital from some portion of that multitude of indigent citizens by which it was overburdened, and to substitute free inhabitants in the room of some of the slaves, who were now almost the sole cultivators of the soil in many parts of Italy. He is said to have settled no fewer than eighty thousand citizens,** many of them freedmen, in different colonies; and to have restored on this occasion many towns which had been ruined in former wars, particularly Carthage and Corinth. These two famous cities had been both destroyed in the same year, exactly a century before the period of their restoration; they were now rebuilt together, and in a very short time rose to a high degree of wealth and importance. Then, to ensure the existence of a free population in Italy,* he forbade all citizens, between the ages of twenty and forty, from being abroad for more than three years together, except on military service; nor were the sons of Senators allowed to leave the country at all, except they travelled in the suite of a Magistrate. He also insisted that all graziers, and persons who fed sheep or other animals on a large scale, should employ freedmen in the proportion of at least one third out of the whole number of their shepherds or herdsmen. But the short duration of Cæsar's power prevented these regulations from producing any sufficient effect; and in the reign of Augustus,† it was still matter of complaint that many districts of Italy were only redeemed from desolation by the number of slaves belonging to the great landed proprietors of Rome.

The reform of the Calendar, which was accomplished by Cæsar, is too famous to be altogether passed over in silence. It has been observed several times in the course of this history, that the nominal time was about two months in advance of the real season of the year, so that what was called Midsummer, was, in reality, the latter end of April. This confusion was mainly owing to the strange power allowed to the Pontifices of intercalating or adding to the year what number of days they pleased; and this power was very capriciously exercised, as the interests of their friends might require a greater number to be added to lengthen the period of their being in office, or a less number in order to shorten the term, when the annual Magistracies were held by men of the opposite party. Cæsar now employed the ablest astronomers of the age to place the computation of time on a true footing;‡ and two months were added to the current year, that on the ensuing first of January the real and nominal time might agree with one another. For the future, the year was to consist of three hundred and sixty-five days, and a single day was to be added every fourth year, according to our present practice; so that this Julian Calendar has been followed ever since by the nations of Europe, with only the slight correction introduced by Pope Gregory XIII. in 1582, and adopted in Great Britain in 1752, under the denomination of the New Style.

Reform of the Calendar.

Such were the principal public measures of Cæsar's government; but it was not by these that he provoked the conspiracy to which he fell a victim, so much as by the arrogance of his personal behaviour, and his open assumption of the state, as well as of the power, of an absolute Sovereign. After his last victory over the sons of Pompey in Spain, the flattery of the Senate added yet more to the extravagant honours which they had already lavished on him; and it appears that the homage thus profusely offered to him was more than he could bear, and that he fancied himself greater in proportion to the increased servility with which he was regarded. It was voted that he should be styled the "Father of his country," and that the title *Imperator* should be prefixed to his name;§ that his person should be declared sacred; and that he should be appointed Dictator for life. His statue

Additional honours bestowed on Cæsar after his victory in Spain.

U. C. 708.

* Suetonius, c. 24.
† Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. v. c. 3.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. xii.
§ Ibid. *de Divinatione*, lib. ii. c. 9.
‖ Suetonius, c. 76. 80.
¶ Ibid. c. 41. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 25. Dion Cassius makes Q. Fufius Calenus say, in his speech in defence of M. Antonius, that Cicero's family was among those raised, on this occasion, to the rank of Patricians. This is not impossible; as Cæsar would naturally fix upon those families which were noble, though not Patricians: and, as Cicero was almost the only man surviving who had been Consul before the civil wars, his family would readily suggest itself as one of the first to receive this accession of dignity.
** Suetonius, c. 42. Strabo, lib. viii. p. 436. lib. xvii. p. 968. edit. Xyland.

* Suetonius, *ubi supra.*
† Livy, lib. vi. c. 12.
‡ Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 59. Suetonius, c. 40.
§ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxvi. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 235—236.

was placed in the temple of Quirinus or Romulus,* and in the Capitol, next to those of the seven traditional Kings of Rome, and of L. Junius Brutus, the founder of the Commonwealth. He was allowed to wear, on all public festivities, the dress used by victorious Generals at their Triumphs;† and at all times to have a crown of laurel on his head. The month in which he was born, and which had till then been called Quintilis, was now named Julius, or July, in honour of him. Money was stamped with his image; and a guard of Senators and citizens of the Equestrian order was voted for the security of his person. It was apparently soon after his return from Spain, that the whole body of the Senate waited upon him to communicate to him the decrees which they had passed in his honour. He received them in state in front of the temple of Venus Genitrix which he had himself founded;‡ but he never rose from his seat, either when they first approached him, or when they presented to him so many tokens of their submission and devotion. This was an affront which was never forgiven; and it was particularly remarked,§ that during his own Triumph, a short time before, when L. Pontius Aquilia, one of the Tribunes, allowed his triumphal chariot to pass by the benches appropriated to himself and his colleagues without rising from his place, Cæsar noticed it with great indignation, openly saying, that Aquila had better at once take from him the administration of the Commonwealth; and for some days afterwards, whenever he promised any thing to any one who waited upon him, he used, ironically, to add, "But you must obtain the consent of Pontius Aquila!" On another occasion when, at the time of the Latin holydays,|| Cæsar was riding into Rome in solemn procession, after having performed the usual sacrifices on the Alban hill, some voices amongst the multitude saluted him with the title of King; and a laurel crown, bound round with the white fillet or diadem, which was the well-known ornament of royalty, was placed upon one of his statues. Two of the Tribunes, Epidius Marullus and C. Cæsetius Flavius, ordered the diadem to be taken off from the laurel wreath, and the man who had put it on the statue to be taken into custody. Upon this Cæsar upbraided them in strong language for endeavouring to excite the popular odium against him, as if he were really ambitious of the Kingly title; and by an exercise of what Paterculus calls his Censorian power,¶ he forbade them acting any more as Tribunes, and expelled them from the Senate; deploring at the same time, we are told, his own hard fortune, in being thus obliged either to do violence to the clemency of his nature, or to suffer his dignity to be compromised. It is added, that Cæsar so deeply resented the conduct of these Tribunes,** that he applied to the father of Cæsetius to renounce his son for his seditious behaviour; promising him that he would amply provide for his two other sons, if he complied with his wishes. But the old man replied,

He gives offence by the arrogance of his behaviour.

"that Cæsar should rather deprive him of all his children, than prevail on him to turn one of them out of his house as deserving to be given up by his father." Yet Cæsar was probably well aware of the odium to which he would be exposed if he were suspected of aiming at the honours of royalty; and it was to remove any such impression from the public mind, that he took occasion to answer to the acclamations of the populace, on one occasion, when they were saluting him with the title of King, "that he was Cæsar, and not a King." With the same view it is not unlikely that he had concerted beforehand the famous scene which took place on the fifteenth February, at the festival of the Lupercalia, when M. Antonius, who then held the office of Consul, approached Cæsar, as he was sitting in state in the rostra above the forum, and presented to him a royal diadem. A murmur ran through the multitude;* but it was instantly changed into loud applause, when Cæsar rejected the proffered ornament, and persisted in his refusal, although Antonius threw himself at his feet, imploring him, in the name of the Roman people, to accept it. To complete the purpose for which this scene was in all probability acted, Antonius caused a memorandum to be entered in the Calendar for the year, "That on the day of the Lupercalia M. Antonius the Consul had, by the command of the people, offered the dignity of King to C. Cæsar, perpetual Dictator, and that Cæsar had refused to accept it." Yet the opinion was still entertained, that Cæsar coveted this unlawful and abhorred title; and as mankind are the slaves of words, the imputation of aspiring to be King was eagerly laid to his charge by his enemies, as one which would most surely provoke against him the popular hatred.

Cæsar gives offence by his irregular manner of bestowing offices.

Another part of Cæsar's conduct which gave great offence, was his assuming so openly not only the patronage of the ordinary offices of the State, but the power of bestowing them in an unprecedented manner, in order to suit his own policy. At the beginning of the year 708, he had assumed the title of Consul, together with his Dictatorship, but he had no colleague, and the office was, in fact, merely nominal. But on his return to Rome in October,† after he had finished the campaign in Spain, wishing for an opportunity of rewarding two of his adherents, he resigned his Consulship, and appointed Q. Fabius Maximus and C. Trebonius to succeed him for the remaining three months of the year. It happened that Q. Fabius died on the thirty-first of December, early in the morning;‡ and, that no occasion of exercising his patronage might be lost, Cæsar caused the Comitia to assemble about two o'clock in the afternoon, and to elect C. Caninius Rebilus for the few remaining hours of the year. The benefit of this short-lived honour appears to have been, that it conferred on the person who enjoyed it, the rank of Senator for life. Cæsar, in like manner, increased the number of Prætors to fourteen,§ that of Ædiles to six, and that of Quæstors to forty; he also added one new member to the college of Augurs, one to that of the Pontifices, one to the Quindecemviri or keepers of the Sibylline

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xii. epist. xlv.
† Suetonius and Dion Cassius.
‡ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxvi. Dion Cassius, lib. xliv. p. 244.
§ Suetonius, c. 78.
|| Dion Cassius, lib. xliv. p. 245. Suetonius, c. 79. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii.
¶ Lib. ii. c. 94.
** Valerius Maximus, lib. v. c. 7.

* Cicero, *Philippic* ii. c. 34.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 236.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. vii. epist. xxx. Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 58.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 237. 239, 240. lib. xlii. p. 209.

books, and three to the *Septemviri Epulonum*, who had the care of providing the feasts of the Gods on all great solemnities. He made a point of rewarding every one who had served him; and thus he did not hesitate to intrust the charge of the public mint to some of his own slaves,* and even to appoint the son of one of his freedmen to command three of his legions which he left in Egypt, after his departure from that country in the autumn of the year 706. He allowed the same spirit to interfere in the administration of justice; and we are told that one of his veterans,† who had received a grant of land, having been brought before him on a charge of violent and oppressive behaviour towards his neighbours, was not only acquitted, but was presented by his Judge with the very land on which he had unjustly encroached, as soon as he reminded Cæsar of some personal services which he had rendered him during his first campaign in Spain. In fact, Cæsar openly avowed, that if ruffians and cut-throats had supported him in his quarrel, he should think himself bound fully to requite them.‡ Yet, after all, in spite of his multiplication of offices, and the profusion with which he bestowed them, the claims of his partisans were more than he could satisfy; and many of those who had served him through all his career of wickedness, were afterwards in the number of his assassins, because they did not think themselves sufficiently rewarded.§

Sketch of his personal manners and behaviour.

Cicero has left us a curious sketch of a visit which he received from Cæsar at his villa near Puteoli, in the month of December, 708.‖ On the twentieth of December Cæsar arrived at the house of L. Philippus, the father-in-law of Octavius, attended by two thousand soldiers, who followed him either for the security of his person, or as a mere guard of honour. He spent the morning of the following day at the house of Philippus, but was engaged the whole time in transacting business in private with L. Balbus. About one or two o'clock he took a walk on the seashore; after which he went into a bath, and heard, with the utmost composure, a most virulent epigram of Catullus against him, in which he was taxed, in plain terms, with those abominable profligacies to which we have before alluded.¶ After this he took his place at the table at Cicero's house, his immediate attendants forming part of the company, whilst the rest of his suite were entertained in separate apartments, according to their rank and respectability. "Cæsar seemed to enjoy himself exceedingly," says Cicero, "and was in very good spirits. The conversation did not touch at all on politics, but we talked much on literary subjects."** Yet, however agreeable he might make himself in private society, he kept up a degree of state at Rome, which rendered access to his person difficult and humiliating to those who had lived with him so long, in former times, on a footing of equality. Cicero complains of the vexations and mortifications which he was obliged to endure in obtaining an audience from him;* and he was told by C. Matius,† that once, when he had been detained for a long time, waiting till Cæsar could receive him, Cæsar had himself observed, "that he must necessarily be very unpopular, when M. Cicero was thus kept in attendance, and could not see him whenever it suited him." "I know," he continued, "that no one would be more ready than himself to make allowances for me, but I am sure that he must detest me." There were, however, many incautious expressions of his own, which found their way into general circulation, and excited a much stronger feeling against him. He was accustomed to ridicule Sylla for resigning the Dictatorship;‡ he used to say, "that the Commonwealth was now nothing; it was a mere name totally devoid of any reality;" and in language, yet more arrogant, he added, "that he ought now to be spoken to with more deference, and that what he said should be considered as law." Yet he would not believe that he had any thing to fear from popular resentment, insisting that his life was of the utmost importance to his country; for that his ambition was now satisfied; but that if he were to die, the Republic would again be involved in civil wars more miserably than ever. Besides, his great courage rendered him insensible to danger, and impatient of precautions. In spite of the advice of his friends Hirtius and Pansa,§ who advised him to guard by the sword that power which the sword had won for him, he used to say that he would rather die than make himself an object of terror to the people; and he so far confided in his popularity, or in the ascendency which he had acquired, that he dismissed the guard of Spanish soldiers which had been in the habit of attending him. Meantime, as if his government at home were settled in full security, he formed plans of foreign conquests on the most extensive scale, which would employ him for some years at a distance from Rome. He talked of attacking the Parthians,‖ and of subduing those wild tribes who dwelt on the banks of the Danube, and who occasionally made inroads upon the Roman territory in Thrace; and in order to provide for the administration of affairs during his absence, he drew out a list of persons who were to hold the principal offices of state for the next two years,¶ still retaining to himself the title and authority of Dictator. Nor, whilst projecting schemes of conquest, was he neglectful of the internal improvement of his dominions. It is mentioned, that he was intending to frame a digest of all the Roman laws;** to form public libraries, containing all the most valuable works of Greek, as well as of Roman literature; to build in the Capital a temple in honour of Mars, and a theatre, both in the highest style of magnificence; to drain the Pomptine marshes; to make a grand line of communication across the Apennines from the Tiber to the Adriatic; to carry a canal from Rome to Tarracina,

His confidence in his own security.

His plans of conquest and of internal improvement.

* Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 76.
† Seneca, *de Beneficiis*, lib. v. c. 24.
‡ Suetonius, c. 72.
§ Seneca, *de Irâ*, lib. iii. c. 30.
‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiii. epist lii.
¶ Catullus, *Carm.* 29 and 57.
** "Συεδοῶν δὲν, *in Sermone*: φιλόλογα, *multa*."

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. vi. epist. xiv. "*Quum omnem adeundi et conveniendi illius indignitatem et molestiam pertulissem.*"
† *Epistol. ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. i. ii.
‡ Suetonius, c. 77. 86.
§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 83. Suetonius, c. 86.
‖ Suetonius, c. 44. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 239. Plutarch, c. 58.
¶ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. vi. Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 239.
** Suetonius, c. 44.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

in order to facilitate the arrival of goods in the Capital from Sicily and the East; to improve and enlarge the harbour of Ostia, and to dig through the Isthmus of Corinth. Such are said to have been his designs; and preparations were already made for carrying the military part of them into execution. His nephew, C. Octavius,* whom he had named as his Master of the Horse for one of the years of his intended absence, was sent over to Apollonia, in Epirus, there to remain, and to pursue his literary studies, till Cæsar should arrive in Greece to put himself at the head of his army; and a force both of infantry and cavalry had been already transported across the Ionian gulf,† and was quartered in Macedonia, waiting till the return of spring should enable them to commence their expedition against Parthia.

Report that it was intended to declare him King.

It was about this time reported, that L. Cotta, one of the Quindecemviri, or keepers of the Sibylline books, was intending to propose to the Senate that Cæsar should be declared King;‡ and this step was to be urged on the authority of the Sibylline oracles, which declared that a King was necessary to the safety of Rome, in the event of a war with Parthia. Whether the rumour was true or false, it is said to have hastened the resolution of those persons who had already formed a conspiracy against Cæsar's life, and to have determined them to choose the fifteenth, or Ides of March, for the execution of their purpose, that being the day on which it was believed that L. Cotta would bring forward his proposal before the Senate. It remains, therefore, that we give some account of the origin of this famous conspiracy, and of the principal persons who were engaged in it.

A conspiracy formed against his life.

Sketch of the principal conspirators.

M. Junius Brutus.

It is agreed on all sides that M. Junius Brutus and C. Cassius Longinus were the chief promoters of the design. The former of these was the son of that M. Brutus, who had taken part in the rebellion of M. Lepidus immediately after the death of Sylla, and who had in consequence been put to death at Mutina, by the orders of Pompey, in the year 676. The son, M. Brutus, was, by his mother's side, the nephew of M. Cato, and he accompanied his uncle to Cyprus in the year 695, when he was sent by P. Clodius to annex that island to the Roman Empire. It appears, however, that he did not copy the example of Cato's integrity; for having become the creditor of the citizens of Salamis to a large amount,§ he employed one M. Scaptius, a man of infamous character, to enforce the payment of his debt, together with an interest four times exceeding the rate allowed by law. And when Cicero governed the Province of Cilicia, to which Cyprus seems to have been attached, Brutus wrote to him, and was supported by T. Atticus in his request, entreating him to give Scaptius a commission as an officer of the Roman Government, and to allow him to employ a military force to exact from the Salaminians the usurious interest which he illegally demanded. Cicero was too upright a Magistrate to comply with such requests; but they were so disagreeable to the practice of the times, that he continued to live on intimate terms with the man who could prefer them; and the literary tastes of Brutus were a recommendation which he could not resist; so that he appears soon to have forgotten the affair of Scaptius, and to have spoken and thought of Brutus with great regard. They both, indeed, were of the same party in politics; and we are told that Brutus exerted himself very actively in Pompey's service in the campaign of 705 in Greece,* and being taken prisoner after the battle of Pharsalia, received his life from the Conqueror. Before Cæsar set out for Africa to carry on war against Scipio and Juba, he conferred on Brutus† the Government of Cisalpine Gaul;‡ and in that Province Brutus accordingly remained, and was actually holding an office under Cæsar, while his uncle Cato was maintaining the contest in Africa, and committing suicide rather than fall alive into the hands of the enemy. His character, however, seems to have been greatly improved since his treatment of the Salaminians; for he is said to have governed Cisalpine Gaul with great integrity and humanity;§ insomuch, that his statue was preserved in Milan when Augustus had obtained the Sovereignty of the Empire; and the popularity which he obtained was reflected, in some measure, we are told, upon the government of Cæsar, from whom he had received his appointment. In the year 708 he returned to Rome, but afterwards set out to meet Cæsar on his return from Spain, and in an interview which he had with him at Nicæa,‖ pleaded the cause of Deiotarus, King of Galatia, with such warmth and freedom, that Cæsar was struck by it, and was reminded of what he used frequently to say of Brutus; that what his inclinations might be, made a very great difference, but that whatever they were, they would be nothing lukewarm. It was about this time, also, that Brutus divorced his first wife, Appia, the daughter of Appius Claudius, and married the famous Porcia, his cousin, the daughter of Cato. Soon after he received another mark of Cæsar's favour,¶ in being appointed *Prætor Urbanus* for the year 709; and he was holding that office when he resolved to become the assassin of the man whose government he had twice acknowledged, by consenting himself to act in a public station under it. Sir Matthew Hale

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710 — A. C. 59. to 44.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 239. lib. xlv. p. 271. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 85.

† Appian, *Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 10. Appian says there were seventeen legions, and ten thousand cavalry; a most ridiculous exaggeration. But Appian is the worst authority, and that is saying not a little, of all the writers who have left us accounts of these times.

‡ Suetonius, c. 79. Cicero, *de Divinatione*, lib. ii. c. 54.

§ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. v. epist. xxi. lib. vi. epist. i. ii. iii.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xi. epist. iv. Dion Cassius, lib. xli. p. 184. Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 6.

† Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. vi. epist. vi.

‡ "Where," says Ferguson, "he remained, perhaps, rather under safe custody, than high in the confidence of Cæsar." Vol. iv. p. 147, 8vo. edit. 1805. "He was induced," says Middleton, "by Cæsar's generosity, *and his mother's prayers*, to lay down his arms and return to Italy. Cæsar endeavoured to oblige him by all the honours which his power could bestow; but the indignity of receiving from a master what he ought to have received from a free people, shocked him much more than any honours could oblige."—*Life of Cicero*, vol. ii. p. 210, 8vo. edit. 1819.

Ferguson's conjecture, so far as we have been able to find, is as destitute of any authority or probability, as Middleton's insertion of the words which we have printed in italics, and which endeavour to represent Brutus as sacrificing his patriotic independence to the entreaties of his mother. As to the rest of Middleton's statement, we can only wonder that a writer, in a Christian country, should think that he was panegyrizing his hero by imputing to him such a disposition.

§ Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 6. *Comparat. Diona. cum Bruto*, c. 5.

‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. i.

¶ Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 7. Dion Cassius, lib. xliv. p. 246.

Biography. From v. c. 695: to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

did well to accept the place of Judge during the usurpation of Cromwell; but what should we think of him, if, whilst filling that office, he had associated himself with Colonel Titus, and other such wretches, in their plans to remove the Protector by assassination.

C. Cassius Longinus.

C. Cassius Longinus was remarkable, even when a boy, for the pride and violence of his temper, if we may believe the anecdotes reported of him by Plutarch* and Valerius Maximus. He accompanied M. Crassus into Parthia as his Quæstor, and distinguished himself, after the death of his General, by conducting the wreck of the Roman army back to Syria in safety. We have already spoken of him as being one of the Tribunes at the beginning of the civil war; and have mentioned his having the command of the Syrian squadron in Pompey's fleet, and the interruption which he met with, whilst engaged successfully against the enemy, from the news of the battle of Pharsalia. He afterwards resigned the contest, and submitted himself to Cæsar in Asia Minor, when Cæsar was returning from Egypt into Italy; yet Cicero asserts† that at that very time he had intended to assassinate the man whose clemency he was consenting to solicit, had not an accident prevented the accomplishment of his purpose. He was not only spared by Cæsar, but was appointed by him one of his lieutenants;‡ a favour bestowed by Magistrates on their friends, in order to invest them with a public character, and thus enable them to reside or to travel in the Provinces with greater comfort and dignity. Even during the last campaign of Cæsar in Spain, Cassius wrote to Cicero, saying that he was anxious that Cæsar should be victorious,§ for that he preferred an old and merciful master to a new and a cruel one. He also, together with Brutus, was appointed one of the Prætors for the year 709;‖ at a moment in which he was entirely discontented with Cæsar's government, and is said to have been the person by whose intrigues the first elements of the conspiracy were formed.

Decimus Brutus and C. Trebonius.

Next to M. Brutus and C. Cassius, may be ranked Decimus Brutus and C. Trebonius. These had both served Cæsar in the civil war, and had commanded the land and sea forces employed by him in the siege of Massilia. Since that time Trebonius had been appointed Proconsul of the Further Spain, and more recently, as we have seen, had enjoyed the title of Consul during the last three months of the year 708. Decimus Brutus was chosen to succeed to the Consulship in the year 711,¶ and to the command of the Province of Cisalpine Gaul immediately; he was also named by Cæsar in his will, amongst those persons who were to inherit his fortune, in case of the failure of his direct heirs. Another of the conspirators was L. Tillius Cimber.

L. Tillius Cimber.

L. Tillius Cimber, a man notorious for his drunkenness and low violence,** who had been throughout the civil war a vehement partisan of Cæsar, and had received from him lately the appointment to the Province of Bithynia.* Ser. Sulpicius Galba, the great grandfather of the Emperor of that name, had also served under Cæsar in Gaul, and, probably, in the civil war; but he was now offended, because Cæsar had not given him the honour of the Consulship.† L. Minucius Basilus is also mentioned as having had a command in Cæsar's army in Gaul,‡ and as now being one of the conspirators against him; while P. Servilius Casca, Cn. Domitius Ænobarbus, L. Pontius Aquila, and Q. Ligarius, had been attached to the party of Pompey, although they had since submitted, and received the conqueror's pardon. Ligarius, in particular, had been suffered to return to Italy in consequence of the earnest solicitations of his friends, amongst whom Cicero had appealed most strongly to Cæsar's clemency,§ and had gone so far as to represent Ligarius penitent for his fault, taking refuge in Cæsar's mercy, and imploring pardon for his past conduct. Cn. Domitius‖ was the son of that L. Domitius, who had been the unsuccessful candidate for the Consulship, in opposition to Pompey and Crassus, in the year 698, who had been appointed as Cæsar's successor in Gaul at the beginning of the civil war, who had been taken prisoner at Corfinium, and had afterwards been killed at Pharsalia. His son was also the nephew of Cato, whose sister L. Domitius had married; so that this young man was likely to inherit a violent hatred against Cæsar; nor does it appear that he had ever imitated the conduct of Brutus in accepting places of confidence and honour from the conqueror.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From v. c. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

Ser. Galba.

L. Minucius Basilus.

Q. Ligarius Cn. Domitius Ænobarbus.

The motives by which the conspirators were actuated, which perhaps they themselves could not have analyzed exactly, have been variously guessed by historians, according to their own prevailing opinions. Personal and party feelings may be confounded unconsciously with patriotism, even by the very man who is influenced by them; nor would it be reasonable to deny that many of Cæsar's murderers had persuaded themselves that the interests of their country were promoted by their act. But if we could inquire by what process they had acquired this persuasion, and with how much self-deception it was accompanied, we should, it is probable, find that their motives were widely distinct from that purity and singleness and sincerity of purpose which are essential to real goodness. At any rate it is clear that they who had served Cæsar in the civil war, and had shared in the honours and advantages of his victory, could with no shadow of justice become his murderers. Their patriotism ought to have been shown when

* *In Bruto*, c. 9. Valerius Maximus, lib. iii. c. 1.
† *Philippic.* ii. c. 11.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. vi. epist. vi.
§ *Ad Familiares*, lib. xv. epist. xix.
‖ Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 7. Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. ii. iii.
¶ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 84. 86. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 83.
** Seneca, epist. lxxxiii. *De Irâ*, lib. iii. c. 30.

* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iii. c. 2. Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xiii.
† Suetonius, *in Galbâ*, c. 3.
‡ Cæsar, *de Bell. Gallico*, lib. vi. c. 27. He had afterwards fought in Spain under Cneius Pompeius in 708, and had then submitted to Cæsar, promising to be faithful to him hereafter, as he had been to Pompeius. *Auctor de Bell. Hispan.* c. 19.
§ Cicero, *pro Ligario*, c. 10.
‖ His name is mentioned amongst the assassins of Cæsar by Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 11.; but Suetonius (*in Nerone*, c. 3.) says that he was accused, without foundation, of having had a share in the deed. Was he among those Patrician youths who joined the conspirators immediately after the murder, wishing to appear concerned in it, and did Cicero favour from policy this false pretension? or were Domitius himself and his posterity anxious in aftertimes to deny the fact, when he was receiving the favours of Augustus, or when one of them, Nero, ascended the Imperial throne?

Cæsar first commenced his rebellion; and had they then followed the example of Labienus, and forsaken their General when he began to be guilty of treason against his country, their motives might have been unquestioned, and their conduct would have been really just and honourable. Nor can even Brutus and Cassius be excused for accepting honours and offices from a government which they must have considered as unlawful and tyrannical. If Cæsar's power were required by the circumstances of the Commonwealth, to destroy him was mischievous; if it were an evil which was only to be endured so long as it was inevitable, to countenance it by acting under it in a public station, was an abandonment of their duty to their country. But above all, the act of assassination is in itself so hateful, and involves in it so much dissimulation and treachery, that whatever allowance may be made for the perpetrators, when we consider the moral ignorance of the times in which they lived, their conduct must never be spoken of without condemnation. And it is satisfactory to find that crimes of this nature have generally been as fruitless as they deserved to be. Harmodius and Aristogiton, by murdering Hipparchus, only subjected Athens to a heavier tyranny; and the assassination of Cæsar furnished something of a pretence to his surviving followers, to involve the most eminent friends of the Commonwealth in one unsparing destruction.

The whole number of the conspirators is said to have exceeded sixty; and their intention was at first to have effected their purpose either in the street in which Cæsar lived, or in the Campus Martius when he was presiding at the elections of Magistrates; but when they heard that the Senate was summoned to meet on the fifteenth of March, and it was rumoured that the proposal of bestowing on Cæsar the title of King was then to be brought forward, they fixed upon that day, and on that meeting of the Senate, as the time and place best suited for their attempt.

Events which happened previous to Cæsar's murder.

On the evening of the fourteenth of March, Cæsar was supping with M. Lepidus, his Master of the Horse, who was now at the head of a body of troops without the walls,* and was preparing shortly to march with them into Transalpine Gaul, which had been assigned to him by Cæsar as his Province. It happened that Cæsar was engaged in writing, when the rest of the party began to discuss the question, "What kind of death is most to be desired?" The subject on which they were talking caught his attention, and he cried out, before any one else had expressed an opinion, "That the best death was a sudden one." A coincidence so remarkable was likely to be remembered afterwards by all who had been present; but it is said, also, that he had been often warned by the Augurs to beware of the Ides of March;† and these predictions had probably wrought on the mind of his wife Calpurnia, so that, on the night that preceded that dreaded day, her rest was broken by feverish dreams, and in the morning her impression of fear was so strong, that she earnestly besought her husband not to stir from home. He himself, we are told, felt himself a little unwell;‡ and being thus more ready to be infected by superstitious fears, he was inclined to comply with Calpurnia's wishes, and allowed some part of the morning to pass away, and the Senate to be already assembled, without having as yet quitted his house. At such a moment the conspirators were alive to every suspicion; and becoming uneasy at his delay, Decimus Brutus was sent to call on him,* and to persuade him to attend the Senate, by urging to him the offence that he would naturally give, if he appeared to slight that body at the very moment when they were preparing to confer on him the title of King. Decimus Brutus visited Cæsar, and being entirely in his confidence, his arguments were listened to, and Cæsar set out about eleven o'clock to go to the Senate-house.

He is nearly warned in time of his danger.

When he was on his way thither, Artemidorus of Cnidus, a Greek Sophist, who was admitted into the houses of some of the conspirators, and had there become acquainted with some facts that had excited his suspicions, approached him with a written statement of the information which he had obtained, and putting it into his hand, begged him to read it instantly, as it was of the last importance. Cæsar, it is said, tried to look at it, but he was prevented by the crowd which pressed around him, and by the numerous writings of various sorts that were presented to him as he passed along. Still, however, he held it in his hand, and continued to keep it there when he entered the Senate-house.

Antonius is taken aside by Trebonius at the entrance of the Senate

M. Antonius, who was at this time Cæsar's colleague in the Consulship, was on the point of following him into the Senate, when C. Trebonius called him aside,† and detained him without by professing to desire some conversation with him. It is said that some of the conspirators had wished to include him in the fate of Cæsar; but Brutus had objected to it as a piece of unnecessary bloodshed; and when it was remembered that he himself, not along ago, had proposed to Trebonius the very act which they were now about to perform, they consented that his life should not be endangered. Meantime, as Cæsar entered the Senate-house, all the Senators arose to receive him. The conspirators had contrived to surround his person in the street, and they now formed his immediate train as he passed on to the Curule chair, which had been prepared, as usual, for his reception. That chair had been placed near the pedestal of a statue of Pompey the Great; for the building in which the Senate was assembled had been one of Pompey's public works;‡ and it is said that Cassius,§ labouring under the strong feeling of the moment, turned himself to the image, and seemed to implore its assistance in the deed which was to be perpetrated.

Assassination of Cæsar, March fifteenth, U. C. 709. A. C. 44 or 45.

When Cæsar had taken his seat, the conspirators gathered more closely around him, and L. Tillius Cimber approached him as if to offer some petition,‖ which he continued to press with vehemence when Cæsar seemed unwilling to grant it, and the other conspirators joined in supporting his request. At last, when Cæsar appeared impatient of further importunity, Cimber took hold of his robe and pulled it down from his shoulders; an action which was the

* Dion Cassius, lib. xliii. p. 240. lib. xliv. p. 249. Plutarch, in *Cæsare*, c. 63. Suetonius, c. 87.

† Plutarch, ibid. Suetonius, c. 81.

‡ Suetonius, ibid.

* Suetonius, c. 81. Plutarch, c. 64.

† Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 14. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 84.

‡ "*Curia Pompeia.*" Cicero, *de Divinatione*, lib. ii. c. 9.

§ Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 66.

‖ Suetonius, c. 82. Plutarch, c. 66.

signal agreed upon with his associates for commencing their attack. It is said that the dagger of P. Casca took the lead in the work of blood, and that Cæsar, in the first instant of surprise, attempted to resist and to force his way through the circle which surrounded him. But when all the conspirators rushed upon him, and were so eager to have a share in his death, that they wounded one another in the confusion, he drew his robe closely around him, and having covered his face, fell without a struggle or a groan. He received three and twenty wounds, and it was observed that the blood, as it streamed from them, bathed the pedestal of Pompey's statue. No sooner was the murder finished, than M. Brutus,* raising his gory dagger in his hand, turned round towards the assembled Senators, and called on Cicero by name, congratulating him on the recovery of their country's liberty. But to preserve order at such a moment was hopeless: the Senators fled in dismay; Antonius made haste to escape to his house; and a universal consternation was spread through the city; till the conspirators, going in a body to the Forum, addressed the people, and by assuring them that no violence was intended to any one, but that their only object had been to assert the liberty of Rome, they succeeded in restoring comparative tranquillity. Still, however, distrusting the state of the popular feeling, they withdrew into the Capitol, which Decimus Brutus had secured with a band of gladiators whom he retained in his service; and there, having been joined by several of the Nobility, they passed the first night after the murder. Meanwhile, the body of Cæsar was left for some hours, amidst the general confusion, on the spot where it fell;† till at last three of his slaves placed it on a litter, and carried it home, one of the arms hanging down on the outside of the litter, and presenting a ghastly spectacle. It was asserted by the surgeon, who examined the wounds, that, out of so many, one alone was mortal; that, namely, which he had received in the breast when he first attempted to break through the circle of his assassins.

Character of Cæsar.

Cæsar is said to have been in his stature tall,‡ and of a fair complexion, but with black and lively eyes. In attention to his person and dress he almost exceeded the bounds of mere neatness; and in gratifying his tastes for villas, furniture, pictures, statues, and in the choice of his slaves, he was accustomed to spare no expense or trouble. He was temperate in his eating and drinking, as became a soldier; and his activity of body corresponded with the extraordinary vigour of his mind. It is a remarkable feature in his character, that he seems to have been alive to so many and such various enjoyments; excessively addicted to gross sensualities, a lover of every kind of intellectual gratification, from the humblest of the fine arts to the highest and deepest parts of philosophy, enamoured at the same time of popular honours, and, above all things, ambitious of political greatness. He is said to have composed two books,§ *On the Method of speaking Latin with the greatest Propriety*, while he was crossing the Alps on his return from his winter quarters in the north of Italy to rejoin his army in Gaul; and on another occasion he wrote a poem entitled *The Journey*, while he was travelling into Spain with the utmost rapidity to oppose the progress of the sons of Pompey in the year 708. His *Commentaries*, which alone, of all his writings, have reached posterity, are admirably calculated to answer the purpose for which they were designed, the impressing his readers with the most favourable notions of himself. Although the representations which they contain are a continued picture of his abilities and successes, yet, because they are given in a quiet and unpretending style, they have gained credit for truth and impartiality; and critics, in their simplicity, have extolled the modesty of the author, because he speaks of himself in the third person. As a General, it is needless to pronounce his eulogy; we may observe, however, that the quality which most contributed to his success on several occasions, was his great activity; and although this may seem a virtue no way peculiar to men of superior minds, yet in the practical business of life there is none which produces more important results. Nor is it, in fact, an ordinary quality, when exhibited in persons invested with extensive power; for then it implies quickness and decision in difficulties, than which nothing confers on one man a more commanding superiority over others. In his political career, Cæsar was at once patient and daring; and the uniform success of all his schemes through so many years, must prove his judgment in the choice of means to accomplish his purposes. One weakness he seems to have possessed, and that was vanity; which he indulged unseasonably and fatally in receiving so greedily the honours which were at last heaped upon him, and in disgusting the public feeling by expressing, with so little reserve, his sense of his own superiority. The submissions which he met with were, indeed, enough to excite his arrogance; for not the most servile flattery of our own clergy and lawyers to the Tudor and Stuart Princes can equal the meanness and extravagance of the language addressed to Cæsar by the Republican Romans. In fact, we see from different parts of Cicero's works, and particularly from many of the letters inserted in the collection of his correspondence, that the expressions used by inferiors towards their superiors in rank, seem to imply very little independence of feeling in the bulk of the Roman people; and the excessive compliments which Cicero delighted to receive, and which he paid with equal liberality, betray a littleness and indelicacy of mind which we should not have expected to meet with in men of high birth and station, the citizens of a free Commonwealth.

If from the intellectual we turn to the moral character of Cæsar, the whole range of history can hardly furnish a picture of greater deformity. Never did any man occasion so large an amount of human misery, with so little provocation. In his campaigns in Gaul, he is said to have destroyed one million of men in battle,* and to have made prisoners a million more,

* Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 12. 35. Dion Cassius, lib. xliv. p. 249, 250.

† Suetonius, c. 82. ‡ Ibid. c. 45, 46, 47

§ Cicero, *de claris Oratoribus*, c. 72. Suetonius, c. 56.

* Plutarch, *in Cæsare*, c. 15. Pliny has estimated the sum with greater minuteness, probably from the returns exhibited at Cæsar's Triumphs of the number of enemies whom he had destroyed. He makes the persons whom Cæsar had killed in war to amount altogether to one million one hundred and ninety-two thousand, exclusive of those who had perished in the civil war, and of whom no account was taken. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* lib. vii. c. 25.

Biography. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

many of whom were destined to perish as gladiators, and all were torn from their country and reduced to slavery. The slaughter which he occasioned in the civil wars cannot be computed; nor can we estimate the degree of suffering caused in every part of the Empire by his spoliations and confiscations, and by the various acts of extortion and oppression which he tolerated in his followers. When we consider that the sole object of his conquests in Gaul was to enrich himself and to discipline his army, that he might be enabled the better to attack his country; and that the sole provocation on which he commenced the civil war, was the resolution of the Senate to recall him from a command which he had already enjoyed for nine years, after having obtained it in the beginning by tumult and violence; we may judge what credit ought to be given him for his clemency in not opening lists of proscription after his sword had already cut off his principal adversaries, and had levelled their party with the dust. Yet, after all his crimes, the circumstances of his death render him almost an object of compassion; and though it cannot be said of his assassins, that

> "Their greater crime made his like specks appear,
> From which the sun in glory is not clear,"

yet we naturally sympathize with the victim, when the murderers, by having abetted or countenanced his offences, had deprived themselves of all just title to punish them, and when his fall was only accomplished by the treachery of assassination.

Caius Julius Cæsar. From U. C. 695. to 710. — A. C. 59. to 44.

MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO.

FROM U. C. 647. TO 711. A. C. 107. TO 43.

Biography. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

We now turn to consider the political character, oratorical talents, and philosophical writings of one whose public conduct we have had frequent occasion to mention in our preceding pages, and part of which still remains to be narrated hereafter.

Marcus Tullius Cicero was born at Arpinum, the native place of Marius,* in the year of Rome 647, (A. C. 107.) the same year which gave birth to the Great Pompey. His family was ancient and of Equestrian rank, but had never taken part in the public affairs of Rome,† though both his father and grandfather were persons of consideration in the part of Italy in which they resided.‡ His father, being a man of cultivated mind, determined to educate his two sons on an enlarged and liberal plan, and to fit them for the prospect of those public employments which his weak state of health incapacitated himself from undertaking.

Birth and education.

Marcus, the elder of the two, soon displayed indications of a superior mind, and we are told that his schoolfellows carried home such accounts of his extraordinary parts, that their parents often visited the school for the sake of seeing a youth who gave such promise of future eminence.§ One of his earliest masters was the poet Archias, whom he defended afterwards in his Consular year; under his instructions he made such proficiency as to compose a poem, though yet a boy, on the fable of Glaucus, which had formed the subject of one of the tragedies of Æschylus. Soon after he assumed the manly gown, he was placed under the care of Scævola the celebrated lawyer, whom he introduces so beautifully into several of his philosophical dialogues; and in no long time he gained a thorough knowledge of the laws and political institutions of his country.‖

This was about the time of the Social war; and according to the Roman custom, which made it a necessary part of education to learn the military art by personal service, Cicero took the opportunity of serving a campaign under the Consul Pompeius Strabo, father of Pompey the Great. Returning to pursuits more congenial to his natural taste, he commenced the study of Philosophy under Philo the Academic, of whom we shall speak more particularly hereafter.¶ But his chief attention was reserved for Oratory, to which he applied himself with the assistance of Molo, the first rhetorician of the day; while Diodotus the Stoic exercised him in the argumentative subtilties for which the disciples of Zeno were so celebrated. At the same time he declaimed daily in Greek and Latin with some young noblemen who were competitors in the same race of honours with himself.

Early campaign U. C. 664. A. C. 89.

Of the two professions,* which from the existence of external and internal disputes are inseparable alike from all forms of government, while that of arms by its splendour and importance secures the almost undivided admiration of a rising and uncivilized people, legal practice on the other hand becomes the path to honours in later and more civilized ages, from the oratorical accomplishments by which it is usually attended. The date of Cicero's birth fell precisely during that intermediate state of things, in which the exclusive glory of military exploits was undermined by the very opulence and luxury which they had been the means of procuring; he was the first Roman who found his way to the highest dignities of the State with no other recommendation than his powers of eloquence, and his merits as a civil magistrate.†

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

Choice of profession.

The first cause of importance he undertook was his defence of Roscius Amerinus; in which he distinguished himself by his spirited opposition to Sylla, whose favourite Chrysogonus was prosecutor in the action. This obliging him, according to Plutarch, to leave Rome on prudential motives, he employed his time in travelling for two years under pretence of his health, which, he tells us,‡ was as yet unequal to the exertion of pleading. At Athens he met with T. Pomponius Atticus, whom he had formerly known at school, and there renewed with him a friendship which lasted through life in spite of the change of interests and estrangements of affection so commonly attendant on turbulent times.§ Here too he attended the lectures of Antiochus, who, under the name of Academic, taught the dogmatic doctrines of Plato and the Stoics. Though Cicero evinced at first considerable dislike of his philosophical views,‖ he seems afterwards to have adopted the sentiments of the Old Academy, which they much resembled; and not till late in life to have relapsed into the sceptical tenets of his former instructor Philo.¶ After visiting the principal philosophers and rhetoricians of Asia, in his thirtieth year he returned to Rome, so strengthened and improved both in bodily and mental powers, that he soon eclipsed in speaking all his competitors for public favour. So popular a talent speedily gained him the suffrage of the Commons, and being sent to Sicily as Quæstor, at a time when the metropolis itself was visited with a scarcity of corn, he acquitted himself in that delicate situation with such address, as to supply the clamorous wants of the people without oppressing the Province from which the provisions were raised.** Returning thence with greater honours than had ever been before

Defence of Roscius Amerinus his first cause.

His travels.

Returns to Rome. U. C. 677. A. C. 77.

Quæstor of Sicily.

Prosecution of Verres.

* *De Legg.* 2, 3. † *Contra Rull.* 2. 1.
‡ *De Legg.* 2. 1. 3. 16. *de Orat.* 2. 65. § Plutarch, *in Vitâ.*
‖ Middleton's *Life*, vol. i. p. 13. 4to. *de clar. Orat.* 89.
¶ Ibid.

* *Pro Murænâ*, 14. *de Orat.* 1. 9.
† *In Catil.* 3. 6. *in Pis.* 3. *pro Sylla*, 30. *pro Dom.* 37. *de Harusp. resp.* 23. *ad Fam.* 15. 4. ‡ *De clar. Orat.* 91.
§ Middleton's *Life*, vol. i. p. 42. 4to. ‖ Plutarch, *in Vitâ.*
¶ Warburton, *Div. Leg.* lib. iii. sec. 3. and Vossius, *de Nat. Logic*, c. viii. sec. 22. ** *Pro Planc.* 26. *in Verr.* 5. 14.

Biography. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

decreed to a Roman Governor, he ingratiated himself still farther in the esteem of the Sicilians, by undertaking his celebrated prosecution of Verres; who, though defended by the influence of the Metelli and the eloquence of Hortensius, was at length driven in despair into voluntary exile.

Ædile.

Five years after his Quæstorship, Cicero was elected Ædile, a post of considerable expense from the exhibition of games connected with it.* In this magistracy he conducted himself with singular propriety †† for it being customary to court the people by a display of splendour in these official shows, he contrived to retain his popularity without submitting to the usual alternative of plundering the Provinces or sacrificing his private fortune. The latter was at this time by no means ample; but, with the good sense and taste which mark his character, he preserved in his domestic arrangements the dignity of a literary and public man, without any of the ostentation of magnificence which often distinguishes the candidate for popular applause.‡

Prætor.

After the customary interval of two years, he was returned at the head of the list as Prætor;§ and now made his first appearance in the rostrum in support of the Mamilian law, which has already come before us in our narrative of the public history of Rome. About the same time he defended Cluentius. At the expiration of his Prætorship, he refused to accept a foreign Province, the usual reward of that magistracy;‖ but having the Consulate full in view, and relying on his interest with Cæsar and Pompey, he allowed nothing to divert him from that career of glory for which he now believed himself to be destined.

Different estimates of Cicero by his contemporaries and by posterity.

It may be doubted, indeed, whether any individual ever rose to power by more virtuous and truly honourable conduct; the integrity of his public life was only equalled by the purity of his private morals; and it may at first sight excite our wonder, that a course so splendidly begun should afterwards so little fulfil its early promise. We have already, in our memoir of Cæsar, traced this course from the period of his Consulate to his Proprætorship in Cilicia, and found each year diminish his influence in public affairs, till it expired altogether with the death of Pompey. This surprise, however, arises in no small degree from measuring Cicero's political importance by his present reputation, and confounding the authority he deservedly possesses as an *author*, with the opinions entertained of him by his contemporaries as a *Statesman*. From the consequence usually attached to passing events, a politician's celebrity is often at its zenith in his own generation; while the author, who is in the highest repute with posterity, may perhaps have been little valued or courted in his own day. Virtue indeed so conspicuous as that of Cicero, studies so dignified, and oratorical powers so commanding, will always invest their possessor with a large portion of reputation and authority; and this is no where more apparent than in the enthusiastic joy displayed on his return from exile. But unless other qualities be added, more peculiarly necessary for a Statesman, they will hardly of themselves carry that weight of political consequence which some writers have attached to Cicero's public life, and which his own self-love led him to appropriate.

* *Pro Planc.* 26. *in Verr.* 5. 14.
† *De Offic.* 2. 17. Middleton.
§ *In Pis.* 1.
‡ *Pro Dom.* 58.
‖ *Pro Murænâ*, 20.

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

The advice of the Oracle,* which had directed him to make his own genius, not the opinion of the people, his guide to immortality, (which in fact pointed at the above-mentioned distinction between the fame of a Statesman and of an author,) at first made a deep impression on his mind; and at the present day he owes his reputation principally to those pursuits which, as Plutarch tells us, exposed him to the ridicule and even to the contempt of his contemporaries as "a pedant and a trifler."† But his love of popularity overcame this philosophical temper, and he commenced a career which gained him one triumph and ten thousand mortifications.

It is not indeed to be doubted that in his political engagements he was considerably influenced by a sense of duty. To many it may even appear that a public life was best adapted for the display of his particular talents; that, at the termination of the Mithridatic war, Cicero was in fact marked out as the very individual to adjust the pretensions of the rival parties in the Commonwealth, to withstand the encroachments of Pompey, and to baffle the arts of Cæsar. And if the power of swaying and controlling the popular assemblies by his eloquence; if the circumstances of his rank, Equestrian as far as family was concerned, yet almost Patrician from the splendour of his personal honours; if the popularity derived from his accusation of Verres, and defence of Cornelius, and the favour of the Senate acquired by the brilliant services of his Consulate; if the general respect of all parties which his learning and virtue commanded; if these were sufficient qualifications for a mediator between contending factions, Cicero was indeed called upon by the voice of his country to that most arduous and honourable post. And in his Consulate he had seemed sensible of the call: *Ita est à me Consulatus peractus*, he declares in his speech against Piso, *ut nihil sine consilio Senatûs, nihil non approbante populo Romano egerim; ut semper in Rostris Curiam, in Senatu Populum defenderim; ut multitudinem cum Principibus, Equestrem ordinem cum Senatu conjunxerim.*

His Consulate. U. C. 690. A. C. 63.

Want of political firmness.

Yet after that eventful period, we see him resigning his high station to Cato, who, with half his abilities, little foresight, and no address,‡ possessed that first requisite for a Statesman, firmness. Cicero on the contrary was irresolute, timid, and inconsistent.§ He talked indeed largely of preserving a middle course,‖ but he was continually vacillating from one to the other extreme; always too confident or too dejected; incorrigibly vain of success, yet meanly panegyrizing the government of an usurper. His foresight, sagacity, practical goodsense, and singular tact in directing men's measures, were lost for want of that strength of mind which points them steadily to one object. He was never decided, never, (as has sometimes been observed,) took an important step without afterwards repenting of it. Nor can we account for the firmness and resolution of his Consulate, unless we discriminate between the case of resisting a party, and that of balancing contending interests. Boldness in opposition differs widely from steadiness in mediation; the latter implying a coolness of judgment, which a direct attack

* Plutarch, *in Vitâ.*
† Γραικὸς καὶ σχολαστικὸς. Plutarch, *in Vitâ.*
‡ *Ad Atticum*, 1. 18. 2. 1.
§ See Montesquieu, *Grandeur des Romains*, ch. xii.
‖ *Ad Atticum*, 1. 19.

Biography. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

is so far from requiring, that it even inspires minds naturally timid with unusual excitation.

First Triumvirate. U. C. 694. A. C. 60.

His Consulate was succeeded by the return of Pompey from the east, and the establishment of the First Triumvirate; which, disappointing his hopes of political greatness, induced him to resume his forensic and literary occupations. From these he was recalled, after an interval of four years, by the threatening measures of Clodius, who at length succeeded in driving him into exile. This event, which considering the circumstances connected with it, was one of the most glorious of his life, filled him with the utmost distress and despondency. He wandered about Greece bewailing his miserable fortune, refusing the consolations which his friends attempted to administer, and shunning the public honours with which the Greek cities were eager to load him.* His return, which took place in the course of the following year, reinstated him in the high station he had filled at the termination of his Consulate, but the circumstances of the times did not allow him to retain it. We have already, in our previous history, described his vacillations between the several members of the Triumvirate; his defence of Vatinius to please Cæsar; and of his bitter political enemy Gabinius, to ingratiate himself with Pompey. His private life in the meanwhile furnishes little worth noticing, except his election into the college of Augurs, a dignity which had been a particular object of his ambition. His appointment to the government of Cilicia, which took place about five years after his return from exile, was in consequence of Pompey's law, which obliged those Senators of Consular or Prætorian rank, who had never held any foreign command, to divide the vacant Provinces among them. This office, which we have above seen him decline, he now accepted with feelings of extreme reluctance, dreading perhaps the military occupations which the movements of the Parthians in that quarter rendered necessary. Yet if we consider the state and splendour with which the Proconsuls were surrounded, and the opportunities afforded him for almost legalized plunder and extortion, we must confess that this insensibility to the common objects of human desire, was the characteristic of no ordinary mind. The singular disinterestedness and integrity of his administration, as well as his success against the enemy, have already come before us in our memoir of Cæsar. The latter he exaggerated from the desire universally felt of appearing to excel in those things for which nature has not adapted us.

Governor of Cilicia.

His return to Italy was followed by earnest endeavours to reconcile Pompey with Cæsar, and by very spirited behaviour when Cæsar required his presence in the Senate. On this occasion he felt the glow of self approbation with which his political conduct seldom repaid him: *credo*, he writes to Atticus, *credo hunc (Cæsarem) me non amare; at ego me amavi: quod mihi jam pridem usu non venit.** But this independent temper was but transient. At no period of his public life did he display such miserable vacillation as at the opening of the civil war. We find him first accepting a commission from the Republic;† then courting Cæsar; next, on Pompey's sailing for Greece, resolving to follow him thither; presently determining to stand neuter; then bent on retiring to the Pompeians in Sicily; and, when after all he had joined their camp in Greece, discovering such timidity and discontent, as to draw from Pompey the bitter reproof, *cupio ad hostes Cicero transeat, ut nos timeat.*‡

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

On his return to Italy, after the battle of Pharsalia, he had the mortification of learning, that his brother and nephew were making their peace with Cæsar, by throwing the blame of their opposition on himself. And here we see one of those elevated points of character, which redeem the weaknesses of his political conduct; for, hearing that Cæsar had retorted on Quintus the charge which the latter had brought against himself, he wrote a pressing letter in his favour, declaring his brother's safety was not less precious to him than his own, and representing him not as the leader, but as the companion of his voyage.§

General conduct after the battle of Pharsalia.

Now too the state of his private affairs reduced him to great perplexity; the sum he had advanced to Pompey had impoverished him, and he was forced to stand indebted to Atticus for present assistance.‖ These difficulties led him to take a step which it has been customary to regard with great severity; the divorce of his wife Terentia, though he was then in his sixty-second year, and his marriage with his rich ward Publilia, who was of an age disproportionate to his own.¶ Yet in reviewing this proceeding, we must not adopt the modern standard of propriety, forgetful of the character of an age which reconciled actions even of moral turpitude, with a reputation for honour and virtue. Terentia was a woman of a most imperious and violent temper, and (what is more to the purpose) had in no slight degree contributed to his present embarrassments by her extravagance in the management of his private affairs.** By her he had two children, a son, born the year before his Consulate, and a daughter whose loss he was now fated to experience. To Tullia he was tenderly attached, not only from the excellence of her disposition, but from her love of polite literature; and her death tore from him, as he so pathetically laments to Sulpicius, the only comforts which the course of public events had left him.†† At first he was inconsolable; and retiring to a little island near his estate at Antium, buried himself in the woods, to avoid the sight of man.‡‡ His distress was increased by the unfeeling conduct of Publilia; whom he soon divorced for testifying joy at the death of her step-daughter. On this occasion he wrote his Treatise on consolation, with a view to alleviate his mental sufferings; and with the same object, he determined on dedicating a temple to his daughter as a memorial of her virtues and his affection. His friends were assiduous in their attentions; and

Private embarrassments.

Divorces Terentia, and marries Publilia.

His children.

Grief at the loss of Tullia. U. C. 708. A. C. 46.

Secedes from public life.

Divorces Publilia.

* *Ad Atticum*, lib. iii. *ad Fam.* lib. xiv. *pro Sext.* 22. *pro Dom.* 36. Plutarch, *in Vitâ.* It is curious to observe how he converts the alleviating circumstances of his case into exaggerations of his misfortune, he writes to Atticus: *Nam quod me tam sæpe et tam vehementer objurgas, et animo infirmo esse dicis, quæro ecquod tantum malum est quod in meâ calamitate non sit? ecquis unquam ex tam amplo statu*, tam in bonâ causâ, *tantis facultatibus ingenii, consilii, gratiæ*, tantis præsidiis bonorum omnium, *concidit?* 3. 10. Other persons would have reckoned the justice of their cause, and the countenance of good men, alleviations of their distress; and so, when others were concerned, he himself thought; *pro Sext.* 12.

* *Ad Atticum*, 9. 18.
† Ibid. 7. 11. 9. 6. 119. 10. 8 and 9, &c.
‡ Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 2, 3.
§ *Ad Atticum*, 11. 8, 9, 10 and 12. ‖ Ibid. 11. 13.
¶ *Ad Fam.* 4. 14. Middleton, vol. ii. p. 149. ** Ibid.
†† *Ad Fam.* 4. 6. ‡‡ *Ad Atticum*, 12. 15, &c.

Cæsar, who had treated him with the utmost kindness on his return from Egypt, signified the respect he bore his character, by sending a letter of condolence from Spain,* where the remains of the Pompeian party still engaged him. He had shortly before given a still stronger proof of his favour, by replying to a work which Cicero had drawn up in praise of Cato;† but no attentions, however considerate, could soften Cicero's vexation at seeing the country he had formerly saved by his exertions, now subjected to the tyranny of one master. His speeches, indeed, for Marcellus and Ligarius, exhibit traces of inconsistency; but for the most part he retired from public business, and gave himself up to the composition of those works, which, while they mitigated his political sorrows, have secured his literary celebrity.

The murder of Cæsar, which took place in the following year, once more brought him on the stage of public affairs; but as we intend our present paper to be an account of his private life and literary character, we shall reserve the sequel of his history, including his unworthy treatment of Brutus, his coalition with Octavius, his orations against Antonius, his proscription and death, for our subsequent pages. On the whole, antiquity may be challenged to produce an individual so virtuous, so perfectly amiable as Cicero. None interest more in their life, none excite more painful emotions in their death. Others, it is true, may be found of loftier and more heroic character, who awe and subdue the mind by the grandeur of their views, or the intensity of their exertions. But Cicero engages our affections by the integrity of his public conduct, the purity of his private life, the generosity,‡ placability and kindness of his heart, the playfulness of his temper, the warmth of his domestic attachments. In this respect his letters are invaluable. "Here we may see the genuine man without disguise or affectation, especially in his letters to Atticus; to whom he talked with the same frankness as to himself, opened the rise and progress of each thought; and never entered into any affair without his particular advice."§

His private virtues.

It must however be confessed, that the publication of this correspondence has laid open the defects of his political character. Want of firmness has been repeatedly mentioned as his principal failing; and insincerity will infallibly characterise a timid and irresolute mind. Openness, however, and candour are rare qualities in a statesman; but, while the duplicity of weakness is despised, the insincerity of a powerful, but crafty mind, though incomparably more odious, is too commonly regarded with feelings of indulgence. Cicero was timid, not designing; his disposition too was conciliatory and forgiving; and much which has been referred to inconsistency, should be attributed to the generous temper which induced him to remember the services rather than the neglect of Plancius, and to relieve the exiled and indigent Verres.‖ Much too may be traced to his professional habits as a pleader; which led him to introduce the licence of the Forum into deliberative discussions, and (however inexcusably) even into his correspondence with private friends.

Apologies for his inconsistency in public life.

Some writers, as Lyttleton, have considered it an aggravation of Cicero's inconsistencies, that he was so perfectly aware of what was philosophically upright and correct. It might be sufficient to reply, that there is a wide difference between calmly deciding on an abstract point, and acting on that decision in the hurry of real life; that Cicero in fact was apt to fancy, (as all will fancy when assailed by interest or passion,) that the circumstances of his case constituted it an exception to the broad principles of duty. As he eloquently expresses himself in his defence of Plancius. *Neque enim inconstantis puto, sententiam, tanquam aliquod navigium, et cursum, ex Reipublicæ tempestate moderari. Ego vero hæc didici, hæc vidi, hæc scripta legi; hæc de sapientissimis et clarissimis viris, et in hac Republicâ, et in aliis civitatibus, monumenta nobis literæ prodiderunt; non semper easdem sententias ab iisdem, sed quascunque Reipublicæ status, inclinatio temporum, ratio concordiæ postularet, esse defendendas.**

Thus he seems to consider it the duty of a mediator alternately† to praise and blame both parties more than truth allows, if by these means it be possible either to flatter or to frighten them into an adoption of temperate measures.

The Philosophy of the ancients, more speculative than practical.

But the argument of the objectors proceeds on an entire misconception of the design and purpose with which the ancients prosecuted Philosophical studies. The motives and principles of Morals were not so clearly perceived as to lead to a practical application of them to the conduct of life. Even when they proposed them in the form of precept, they still regarded the perfectly virtuous man, as the creature of their imagination rather than a model for imitation—a character whom it was an amusement rather than a duty to contemplate; and if an individual here or there, as Scipio or Cato, attempted to conform his life to his Philosophical conceptions of virtue, he was sure to be ridiculed for singularity and affectation.

Even among the Athenians, by whom Philosophy was, in many cases, cultivated to the exclusion of every active profession, pleasure, not the discovery of Truth, was the principal object of their discussions. That we must thus account for the ensnaring questions and sophistical reasonings of which their disputations consisted, has been noticed in our article on Logic; and it was their extension of this system to the care of morals, which brought upon their Sophists the irony of Socrates, and the sterner rebuke of Aristotle. But if this took place in a State in which the love of Philosophy pervaded all ranks, much more was it to be expected among the Romans, who busied as they were in political enterprises, and deficient perhaps in intellectual acuteness, had neither time nor inclination for abstruse investigations; and who considered Philosophy simply as one of the many fashions introduced from Greece, "a sort of table furniture," as Warburton well expresses it, a mere refinement in the arts of social enjoyment.‡ This character it bore both among friends and enemies. Hence the popularity which attended the three Athenian philosophers,

* *Ad Atticum*, 13. 20. † Ibid. 12. 40 and 41.

‡ His want of jealousy towards his rivals was remarkable; this was exemplified in his esteem for Hortensius, and still more so in his conduct towards Calvus. See *ad Fam.* 15. 21.

§ Middleton, vol. ii. p. 525. 4to.

‖ *Pro Planc.* Middleton, vol. i. p. 108.

* C. 39. † *Ad Fam.* 6. 6. 7. 3.

Ἰδίᾳ συνεβούλευεν ὁ Κικέρων, πολλὰ μὲν Καίσαρι γράφων, πολλὰ δ' αὐτῷ Πομπηΐῳ δεόμενος, πραΰνειν ἑκάτερον καὶ παραμυθέμενος. Plutarch, *in vitâ Cic.* See also *in vitâ Pomp.*

‡ Lactantius, *Inst.* 3. 16.

who had come to Rome on an embassy from their native city; and hence the inflexible determination with which Cato procured their dismissal, through fear, as Plutarch tells us,* lest their arts of disputation should corrupt the Roman youth. And when at length by the authority of Scipio,† the literary treasures of Sylla, and the patronage of Lucullus, Philosophical studies had gradually received the countenance of the higher classes of their countrymen, we still find them, in consistency with the principle above laid down, determined in the adoption of this or that system, not so much by the harmony of its parts, or by the plausibility of its reasonings, as by its suitableness to the profession and political station to which they respectively belonged. Thus because the Stoics were more minute than other sects in inculcating the moral and social duties, we find the *Jurisconsulti* professing themselves followers of Zeno;‡ the Orators, on the contrary, adopted the disputatious system of the later Academics;§ while Plato and Epicurus were the respective masters of the imaginative recluse, or the careless and selfish voluptuary. Hence too, they confined the profession of Philosophical science to Greek teachers; considering them the sole proprietors, as it were, of a foreign and expensive luxury, which the vanquished might have the trouble of furnishing, but themselves could readily afford to purchase.

Introduction of the Greek Philosophy to Rome.

Before the works of Cicero, no attempts worth considering had been made for using the Latin tongue in Philosophical subjects. The natural stubbornness of the language, conspired with Roman haughtiness to prevent this application.‖ The Epicureans, indeed, had made the experiment, but their writings were even affectedly harsh and slovenly,¶ and we find Cicero himself, in spite of his inexhaustible flow of rich and expressive diction, making continual apologies for his learned occupations, and extolling Philosophy as the parent of every thing great, virtuous, and amiable.**

First application of the Latin language to Philosophical subjects.

Yet, with whatever discouragements his design was attended, he ultimately triumphed over the pride of an unlettered people, and the difficulties of a defective language. He was possessed of that first requisite for eminence, an enthusiastic attachment to the studies he was recommending. But occupied as he was with the duties of a Statesman, mere love of literature would have availed little, if separated from the energy and capriciousness of intellect by which he was enabled to pursue a variety of objects at once, with equally persevering and indefatigable zeal. "He suffered no part of his leisure to be idle, or the least interval of it to be lost; but what other people gave to the public shows, to pleasures, to feasts, nay even to sleep and the ordinary refreshments of nature, he generally gave to his books, and the enlargement of his knowledge. On days of business, when he had any thing particular to compose, he had no other time for meditating, but when he was taking a few turns in his walks, where he used to dictate his thoughts to his scribes who attended him. We find many of his letters dated before daylight, some from the Senate, others from his meals, and the crowd of his morning levee." Middleton's *Life*, vol. ii. p. 254. Thus he found time, without apparent inconvenience, for the business of the State, for the bustle of pleading, and for Philosophical studies. During his Consulate he delivered twelve orations in the Senate, Rostrum or Forum. His Treatises *de Oratore* and *de Republicâ*, the most finished perhaps of his compositions, were written at a time when, to use his own words, "not a day passed without his taking part in forensic disputes."* And in the last year of his life, he composed at least eight of his Philosophical works, besides the fourteen orations against Antony, which are known by the name of Philippics. Being thus ardent in the cause of Philosophy, he recommended it to the notice of his countrymen, not only for the honour which its introduction would reflect upon himself, (which itself was a motive of no inconsiderable influence,) but also with the fondness of one who esteemed it "the guide of life, the parent of virtue, the guardian in difficulty, and the tranquillizer in misfortune."† Nor were his mental endowments less adapted to the accomplishment of his object, than the spirit with which he engaged in the work. Gifted with great versatility of talent, with acuteness, quickness of perception, skill in selection, art in arrangement, fertility of illustration, warmth of fancy, and extraordinary taste; he at once seizes upon the most effective parts of his subject, places them in the most striking point of view, and arrays them in the liveliest and most inviting colours. His writings have the singular felicity of combining brilliancy of execution, with never-failing good sense. It must be allowed, that he is deficient in depth; that he skims over rather than dives into the various departments of literature; that he had too great command of the plausible, to be a patient investigator or a sound reasoner. Yet if he has little originality of thought, if he does not grapple with his subject, if he is unequal to a regular and lengthened disquisition, if he is frequently inconsistent in his opinions, we must remember that soundness, without display, has few charms for those who have not yet imbibed a taste even for the outward form of knowledge,‡ that system nearly precludes variety, and depth almost implies obscurity. It was this very absence of uniformity, which constituted in Roman eyes a principal charm of Cicero's compositions.§

Character of Cicero's Philosophical writings.

Nor must his profession as a pleader be forgotten in enumerating the circumstances which concurred to give his writings their peculiar character. For however his design of interesting his countrymen in Greek literature, however too his particular line of talent may have led him to explain rather than to invent; yet he expressly informs us it was principally with a view to his own improvement in Oratory that he devoted himself to Philosophical studies.‖ This induced him

* Plutarch, *in vitâ Caton.* See also *de Invent.* 1. 36.

† Paterculus, 1. 12, &c. Plutarch, *in vitâ Lucull. et Syll.*

‡ Gravin. *Origin. Juriscivil.* lib. i. c. 44.

§ Quint. 12. 2. *Auct. de dialog. de Orator.* 31.

‖ *De Nat. Deor.* 1. 4. *de Off.* 1. 1. *de fin. Acad. Quæst.* &c.

¶ *Tusc. Quæst.* 1. 3. 2. 3. *Acad. Quæst.* 1. 2. *de Nat. Deor.* 1. 21. *de Fin.* 1. 3, &c. *de clar. Orat.* 35.

** *Lucullus*, 2. *de Fin.* 1. 1—3. *Tusc. Quæst.* 2. 1 2, 3. 2, 5. 2. *de Legg.* 1. 22—24. *de Off.* 2. 2. *de Orat.* 41, &c.

* *Ad Quint. fratr.* 3. 3

† *Tusc. Quæst.* 5. 2. ‡ *De Off.* 1. 5. *init.*

§ Johnson's observations on Addison's writings, may be well applied to those of Cicero; who would have been eminently successful in short miscellaneous essays like those of the Spectators, had the manners of the age allowed it.

‖ *Orat.* 3, 4. *Tusc. Quæst.* 2, 3. *de Off.* 1. 1. *præfat. Paradox. Quint. de Instit.* 12. 2. Lactantius, *Inst.* 3. 16.

Biography. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C 107. to 43.

to undertake successively the cause of the Stoic, the Epicurean, or the Platonist, as an exercise for his powers of argument; while the wavering and unsettled state of mind, occasioned by such habits of disputation, led him in his private judgment to prefer the sceptical tenets of the New Academy.

Here then, before examining Cicero's Philosophical writings, an opportunity is presented to us of redeeming the pledge we gave in our memoir of PLATO, by considering the system of doctrine which the reformers (as they thought themselves) of the Academic school introduced about 300 years before the Christian era.

The New Academy.

We have already traced the history of the OLD ACADEMY, and spoken of the innovations on the system of Plato, silently introduced by the austere Polemo. When Zeno, however, who was his pupil, advocated the same rigid tenets in a more open and dogmatic form,* the Academy at length took the alarm, a reaction ensued, Arcesilas, who had succeeded Polemo and Crates, determined to revert to the principles of the elder schools;† but mistaking the profession of ignorance, which Socrates had used against the Sophists on *physical* questions, for an actual scepticism on points connected with *morals*, he fell into the opposite extreme, and declared, first, that nothing could be known, and therefore, secondly, nothing should be advanced.‡

Arcesilas.

Whatever were his private sentiments, (for some authors affirm his esoteric doctrines to have been dogmatic,§) he brought forward these sceptical tenets in so unguarded a form, that it required all the argumentative powers possessed by this eminent individual to maintain them against the obvious objections which were pressed upon him from all quarters. On his death, therefore, as might have been anticipated, his school was deserted for those of Zeno and Epicurus; and during the lives of Lacydes, Evander, and Hegesinus, who successively filled the Academic chair, being no longer recommended by the novelty of its doctrines,‖ or the talents of its masters, it became of little consideration amid the wranglings of more popular Philosophies.

Carneades.

Carneades,¶ therefore, who succeeded Hegesinus, found it necessary to use more cautious and guarded language; and by explaining what was paradoxical by reservations and exceptions, in short by all the arts which an acute and active genius could suggest, he contrived to establish its authority, without departing, as far as we have the means of judging, from the principle of universal scepticism which Arcesilas had so pertinaciously advocated.**

The New Academy* then taught with Plato, that all things in their own nature were fixed and determinate; but that, through the constitution of the human mind, it was impossible *for us* to see them in their simple and eternal forms, to separate appearance from reality, truth from falsehood.† For the conception we form of any object is altogether derived from and depends on the sensation, the impression, it produces on our own minds, (πάθος ενεργείας, φαντασία.) Reason does but deduce from premises ultimately supplied by sensation. Our only communication then with actual existences being through the medium of our own impressions, we have no means of ascertaining the correspondence of the things themselves with the ideas we entertain of them; and therefore can in no case be certain of the fidelity of our senses. Of their fallibility, however, we may easily assure ourselves; for in cases in which they are detected contradicting each other, all cannot be correct reporters of the object with which they profess to acquaint us. Food, which is the same as far as *sight* and *touch* are concerned, *tastes* differently to different individuals; fire, which is the same to the *eye*, communicates a sensation of *pain* at one time, of *pleasure* at another; the oar *appears* crooked in the water, while the *touch* assures us it is as straight as before it was immersed.‡ Again, in dreams, in intoxication, in madness, impressions are made upon the mind, vivid enough to incite to reflection and action, yet utterly at variance with those produced by the same objects when we are awake, or sober, or in possession of our reason.§

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

Modified scepticism of the New Academy.

It appears then that we cannot prove that our senses are *ever* faithful; but we do know they *often* produce erroneous impressions. Here then is room for endless doubt; for why may they not deceive us in cases in which we cannot detect the deception? It is certain they *often* act irregularly; is there any consistency *at all* in their operations, any law to which these varieties may be referred?

It is granted that an object often varies in the impression which it makes upon the mind, while on the other hand the same impression may arise from different objects. What limit is to be assigned to this disorder? is there any sensation strong enough to *assure* us of the presence of the object which it seems to intimate, any such as to preclude the possibility of deception? If when we look into a mirror our minds are impressed with the appearance of unreal trees, fields, and houses, how can we ascertain whether the scene we directly look upon has any more substantial existence than the former.‖

From these reasonings the Academics taught that nothing was certain, nothing was to be known, (καταλημτόν.) For the Stoics themselves, their most deter-

---

* *Acad. Quæst.* 1. 10, &c. *Lucullus*, 5. *de Legg.* 1. 20. 3. 3, &c.

† *Acad. Quæst.* 1, 4. 12, 13. *Lucullus*, 5 and 23. *de Nat. Deor.* 1. 5. *de Fin.* 2. 1. *de Orat.* 3. 18. Austin. *contra Acad.* 2. 6. Sext. Emp. *adv. Mathem.* lib. vii. Ὁ Αρκεσίλαος τοσοῦτον ἀπέβαι τῆ καινοτομίας τινὰ δόξαν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ὑποτοιεῖσθαι τῶν παλαιῶν, ὥστε ἐγκαλεῖν τῆς τότε σοφιστὰς ὅτι προστρίζεται Σωκράτει καὶ Πλάτωνι καὶ Παμενίδη καὶ Ἡρακλείτῳ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐποχῆς δόγματα καὶ τῆς ἀκαταλήψίας, οὐδὲν δεομένοις, ἀλλα ὁλον ἀναγωγὴν καὶ βεβαίωσιν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀνδρας ἐνδόξες ποιέμενος. Plutarch, *in Colot.* 26.

‡ *Arcesilas negabat esse quidquam, quod sciri posset, ne illud quidem ipsum quod Socrates sibi reliquisset. Sic omnia latere censebant in occulto, neque esse quicquam quod cerni quod intelligi possit; quibus de causis nihil oportere neque profiteri neque affirmare quenquam, neque assertione approbare, &c. Acad. Quæst.* 1. 12. See also *Lucullus*, 9 and 18. They were countenanced in these conclusions by Plato's doctrine of ideas. *Lucullus*, 46.

§ Sext. Empir. *Pyrrh. Hypot.* 1. 33. Diogenes Laertius, lib. iv. *in Arcesil.*

‖ *Lucullus*, 6. ¶ Austin. *adv. Acad.* 3. 17.

** *Lucullus*, 18. 24. Austin. *in Acad.* 3. 39.

* See Sext. Empir. *adv. Mathem.* lib. vii.

† *Acad. Quæst.* 1. 13. *Lucullus*, 23. 38. *de Nat. Deor.* 1. 5. *Orat.* 71.

‡ *Tu autem te negas infracto remo neque columbæ collo commoveri. Primum cur? nam et in remo sentio non esse id quod videatur, et in columbâ plures videri colores, nec esse plus uno, &c. Lucullus*, 25.

§ *Lucullus*, 16—18. 26—28.

‖ *Scriptum est ita: Academicis placere, esse rerum cujusmodi dissimilitudines ut aliæ probabiles videantur, allæ contra—id autem non esse satis cur alia percipi posse dicas, alia non posse: propterea quod multa falsa probabilia sint, nihil autem falsi perceptum et cognitum possit esse. Itaque ait vehementer errare eos qui dicant ab Academiâ sensus eripi, à quibus nunquam dictum sit aut colorem aut saporem aut sonum nullum esse: illud sit disputatum, non inesse in his propriam, quæ nusquam alibi esset, veri et certi notam. Lucullus*, 32. See also 18. 24. 31. *de Nat. Deor.* 1. 5.

Biography. From v. c. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From v. c. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

mined opponents, defined the καταληπτικὴ φαντασία (or impression which led to knowledge,*) to be one that was capable of being produced by no object except that to which it really belonged.†

Since then we cannot arrive at Knowledge, we must suspend our decision, pronounce absolutely on nothing, nay, according to Arcesilas, never even form an opinion.‡ In the conduct of life, however, Probability§ must determine our choice of action; and this admits of different degrees. The lowest kind is that which suggests itself on the first view of the case, (φαντασία πιθανή;) but in all important matters we must correct the evidence of our senses by considerations derived from the nature of the medium, the distance of the object, the disposition of the organ, the time, the manner, and other attendant circumstances. When the impression has been thus minutely considered; the φαντασία becomes περιωδευμένη, or *approved on circumspection*; and if during this examination no objection has arisen to weaken our belief, the highest degree of Probability is attained, and the impression is pronounced *complete*, (ἀπερίσπαστος.||)

Sextus Empiricus illustrates this as follows:¶ If on entering a dark room we discern a coiled rope, our first impression may be that it is a serpent,—this is the φαντασία πιθανή. On a closer inspection, however, after *walking round it* (περιοδεύσαντες) we observe it does not move, nor has it the proper colour, shape, or proportions; and now we conclude it is not a serpent; here we are determined into our belief by the περιωδευμένη φαντασία. For an instance of the third and most accurate kind, viz. that with which no contrary impression interferes, we may refer to the conduct of Admetus on the return of Alcestis from the infernal regions. He believes he sees his wife; every thing confirms it; but he cannot acquiesce in that opinion; his mind is *divided* (περισπᾶται) from the impression he has of her death; he asks ἀλλ' ἦν ἔθαπτον εἰσορῶ δάμαρτ' ἐμήν; (*Alc.* 1148.) Hercules resolves his difficulty, and his φαντασία becomes ἀπερίσπαστον.

The suspension then of assent (ἐποχή) which the Academics then injoined was, at least from the times of Carneades,** nearly a speculative doctrine;†† and herein lay the chief difference between them and the Pyrrhonists; that the latter altogether denied the existence of the Probable, while the former admitted there was sufficient to allow of action provided we pronounced absolutely on nothing.

Causes which made the New Academy a school of Rhetoric.

Little more can be said concerning the opinions of a sect whose fundamental maxim was that nothing could be known, and nothing should be taught. It lay midway between the other Philosophies; and in the altercations of the various schools it was at once attacked by *all*,* yet appealed to by *each* of the contending parties, if not to countenance its own sentiments, at least to condemn those advocated by its opponents,† and thus to perform the office of an umpire.‡ From this necessity then of being prepared on all sides for attack,§ it became as much a school of Rhetoric as of Philosophy,|| and was celebrated among the ancients for the eloquence of its masters.¶ Hence also its reputation was continually varying: for requiring the aid of great abilities to maintain its exalted and arduous post, it alternately rose and fell in estimation, according to the talents of the individual who happened to fill the chair.** And hence the frequent alterations which took place in its Philosophical tenets; which, depending rather on the arbitrary determinations of its present head, than on the tradition of settled maxims, were accommodated to the views of each successive master, according as he hoped by sophistry or concession to overcome the repugnance which the mind ever will feel to the doctrines of universal scepticism.

And in these continual changes it is pleasing to observe, that the interests of virtue and good order were uniformly promoted; interests to which the Academic doctrines were certainly hostile, if not necessarily fatal. Thus although we find Carneades, in conformity to the plan adopted by Arcesilas,†† opposing the *dogmatic* principles of the Stoics concerning moral duty,‡‡ and studiously concealing his private views even from his friends;§§ yet, by allowing that the suspense of judgment was not always a duty, that the wise man might sometimes *believe* though he could not *know*;||| he in some measure restored the authority of those great instincts of our nature which his predecessor appears to have discarded. Clitomachus pursued his steps by innovations in the same direction;¶¶ Philo, who followed next, attempting to reconcile his tenets with those of the Platonic school,*** has been accounted the founder of a fourth Academy.

Philo and Antiochus.

---

* Οἱ γὰρ Στωϊκοὶ καταλήψιν εἶναί φασι καταληπτικὴν φαντασίαν συγκατάθεσιν. Sext. Empir. *Pyrrh. Hypot.* 3. 25.

† *Verum non posse comprehendi ex illâ Stoici Zenonis definitione arripuisse videbantur, qui ait id verum percipi posse, quod ita esset animo impressum ex eo unde esset, ut esse non posset ex eo unde non esset. Quod brevius planiusque sic dicitur, his signis verum posse comprehendi, quæ signa non potest habere quod falsum est.* Austin. *contra Acad.* 2. 5. See also Sext. Empir. *adv. Math.* lib. vii. περὶ μεταβολῆς, and of *Lucullus*, 6 with 18.

‡ *Lucullus*, 18. 21. 40.

§ Τοῖς φαινομένοις οὖν προσέχοντες κατὰ τὴν βιωτικὴν τήρησιν ἀδοξάστως βιῶμεν· ἐπεὶ μὴ δυνάμεθα ἀνενέργητοι παντάπασιν εἶναι. Sext. Empir. *Pyrrh. Hypot.* 1. 11.

|| Cicero terms these three impressions, *visio probabilis; quæ ex circumspectione aliquâ et accuratâ consideratione fiat; quæ non impediatur. Lucullus*, 11. ¶ *Pyrrh. Hypot.* 1. 33.

** Numen. *apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.* 14. 7.

†† *Lucullus*, 31. 34. *De Off.* 2. 2. *de Fin.* 5. 26. Quint. 12. 1.

* *Lucullus*, 22. *et alibi. Tusc. Quæst.* 2. 2.

† See a striking passage from Cicero's *Academics*, preserved by Austin. *contra Acad.* 3. 7. and *Lucullus*, 18.

‡ *De Nat. Deor. passim. de Div.* 2. 72. *Quorum controversiam solebat tanquam honorarius arbiter judicare Carneades. Tusc. Quæst.* 5. 41.

§ *De Fin.* 2. 1. *de Orat.* 1. 18. *Lucullus*, 3. *Tusc. Quæst.* 5. 11. Numen. *apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.* 14. 6, &c. Lactantius, *Inst.* 3. 4.

|| *De Nat. Deor.* 1. 67. *de Fat.* 2. *Dialog. de Orat.* 31, 32.

¶ *Lucullus*, 6. 18. *de Orat.* 2. 38. 3. 18. Quint. *Inst.* 12. 2. Plutarch, *in vitâ Caton. et Cic.* Lactantius, *Inst.* Numen. *apud Euseb.*

** *Hæc in philosophiâ ratio contra omnia disserendi nullamque rem apertè judicandi, profecta à Socrate*, repetita *ab Arcesilâ* confirmata *à Carneade, usque ad nostram viguit ætatem; quam* nunc *propemodum* orbam *esse in ipsâ Græciâ intelligo. Quod non Academiæ vitio, sed* tarditate hominum *arbitror contigisse. Nam si singulas disciplinas percipere magnum est, quanto majus omnes? quod facere iis necesse est, quibus propositum est, veri reperiendi causâ, et contra omnes philosophos et pro omnibus dicere. De Nat. Deor.* 1. 5.

†† *De Nat. Deor.* 1. 25. Austin. *contra Acad.* 3. 17. Numen. *apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.* 14. 6.

‡‡ *De Fin.* 2. 13. 5. 7. *Lucullus*; 42. *Tusc. Quæst.* 5. 29.

§§ *Lucullus*, 45.

||| *Lucullus*, 21. 24. for an elevated moral precept of his see *de Fin.* 2 18.

¶¶ Ἀρξὰμενος ἐν τοῖς τριτὸν αἱρέσεσι διατρίψας ἐν τε τῇ Ἀκαδημαϊκῇ καὶ Περιπατητικῇ καὶ Στωϊκῇ. Diogenes Laertius, lib. iv. *sub fin.*

*** *Philo, magnus vir, negat in libris duas Academias esse; erroremque eorum qui ita putarunt coarguit. Acad. Quæst.* 1. 4.

Biography. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

—while, to his successor Antiochus, who embraced the doctrines of the Porch,* and maintained the fidelity of the senses, it has been usual to assign the establishment of a fifth.

We have already observed, that Cicero in early life inclined to the systems of Plato and Antiochus, which at the time he composed the bulk of his writings he had abandoned for that of Carneades and Philo.† Yet he was never so entirely a disciple of the New Academy, as to neglect the claims of morality and the laws. He is loud in his protestations, that Truth is the great object of his search;—*Ego enim*, he says, *si aut ostentatione aliqud adductus, aut studio certandi, ad hanc potissimum Philosophiam me applicavi; non modò stultitiam meam, sed etiam mores et naturam condemnandam puto.... Itaque, nisi ineptum putarem in tali disputatione id facere, quod, cùm de Republicâ disceptatur, fieri interdum solet, jurarem per Jovem Deosque Penates, me et ardere studio Veri reperiendi, et ea sentire quæ dicerem.*‡ And however inappropriate this boast may appear, he at least pursues the useful and the magnificent in Philosophy; and uses his Academic character as a pretext rather for a judicious selection from each system, than for an indiscriminate rejection of all.§ Thus, in the capacity of a Statesman he calls in the assistance of doctrines which as an Orator he does not scruple to deride; those of Zeno in particular, who maintained the truth of the popular Theology and the divine origin of Augury, and (as we noticed above) was more explicit than the other masters in his views of social duty. This difference of sentiment between the magistrate and the pleader, is strikingly illustrated in the opening of his Treatise *de Legibus*; where, after deriving the principles of law from the nature of things, he is obliged to beg quarter of the Academics, whose reasonings he feels could at once destroy the foundation on which his argument rested. *Ad Republicas firmandas, et ad stabiliendas vires, sanandos populos, omnis nostra pergit oratio. Quocirca vereor committere, ut non bene provisa et diligenter explorata principia ponantur: nec tamen ut omnibus probentur, (nam id fieri non potest) sed ut iis, qui omnia recta atque honesta per se expetenda duxerunt, et aut nihil omnino in bonis numerandum nisi quod per se ipsum laudabile esset, aut certè nullum habendum magnum bonum, nisi quod verè laudari sud sponte posset.* And then apparently alluding to the arguments of Carneades against justice, which he had put into the mouth of Philus in the third book of his *de Republicâ*, he proceeds; *Perturbatricem autem harum omnium rerum Academiam, hanc ab Arcesila et Carneade recentem* exoremus, ut sileat. *Nam, si invaserit in hæc, quæ* satis scitè *nobis instructa et composita videntur*, nimias edet ruinas. *Quam quidem ego* placare cupio, submovere non audeo.‖

Mixed Philosophy of Cicero.

And as, in questions connected with the interests of society, he thus uniformly advocates the tenets of the Porch, so in discussions of a physical character, we find him adopting the sublime and kindling sentiments of Pythagoras and Plato. Here, however, having no object of expediency in view to keep him within the bounds of consistency, he scruples not to introduce whatever is most beautiful in itself, or most adapted to his present purpose. At one time he describes the Deity as the all-pervading soul of the world, the cause of life and motion.* At another he is the intelligent preserver and governor of every separate part.† At one time the soul of man is in its own nature necessarily eternal, without beginning or end of existence;‡—at another it is represented as reunited on death to the one infinite spirit;§—at another it is to enter the assembly of the Gods, or to be driven into darkness, according to its moral conduct in this life;‖—at another the best and greatest of mankind are alone destined for immortality¶—which is sometimes described as attended with consciousness and the continuance of earthly friendships;** sometimes, as but an immortality of name and glory;†† more frequently however he confuses these separate notions together in the same passage.‡‡

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

Though the works of Aristotle were not given to the world till Sylla's return from Greece, Cicero appears to have been a considerable proficient in his Philosophy,§§ and he has not overlooked the important aid it affords in those departments of science which are alike removed from abstract reasoning and fanciful theorizing. To Aristotle he is indebted for most of the principles laid down in his Rhetorical discussions,‖‖ while in his Treatises on morals not a few of his remarks may be traced to the same acute Philosopher.¶¶

His acquaintance with Aristotle.

The doctrines of the Garden alone, though some of his most intimate friends were of the Epicurean school, he regarded with aversion and contempt; feeling no sort of interest in a system which cut at the very root of that activity and fervour of mind for which he himself both in public and private was so honourably distinguished.***

His abhorrence of Epicurus.

Such then was the New Academy, and such the variation of opinion, which in Cicero's judgment, was not inconsistent with the profession of an Academic. And however his adoption of that Philosophy may be in part referred to his oratorical habits, or the natural cast of mind; yet, considering the ambition which he felt to inspire his countrymen with a taste for literature and science,††† we must conclude with Warburton,‡‡‡ that, in acceding to the system of Philo, he was strongly influenced by the freedom of thought and reasoning which it allowed to his compositions; the liberty of developing the principles and doctrines,

---

* *De Fin.* 5. 5. *Lucullus*, 22. 43.
† *Acad. Quæst.* 1. 4. *de Nat. Deor.* 1. 7.
‡ *Lucullus*, 20. see also *de Nat. Deor.* 1. 7. *de Fin.* 1. 5.
§ *Nobis autem nostra Academia magnam licentiam dat, ut, quodcunque maximè probabile occurrat, id nostro jure liceat defendere. De Off.* 3, 4. see also *Tusc. Quæst.* 4. 4. 5. 29. *de Invent.* 2, 3.
‖ *De Legg.* 1. 13.

* *Tusc. Quæst.* 1. 27. *de Div.* 2. 72. *pro Milon.* 31. *de Legg.* 2. 7.
† *Fragm. de Rep.* 3. *Tusc. Quæst.* 1. 29. *de Univ.*
‡ *Tusc. Quæst.* 1. *passim. de Senect.* 21, 22. *Somn. Scip.* 8.
§ *De Div.* 1. 32. 49. *Fragm. de Consolat.*
‖ *Tusc. Quæst.* 1. 30. *Somn. Scip.* 9. *de Legg.* 2. 11.
¶ *De Amic.* 4. *de Off.* 3. 28. *pro Cluent.* 61. *de Legg.* 2. 17. *Tusc. Quæst.* 1. 11. *pro Sext.* 21. *de Nat. Deor.* 1. 17.
** *Cat.* 23. †† *Pro Arch.* 11. 12. *ad Fam.* 5. 21. 6. 21.
‡‡ *Pro Arch.* 11. 12. *ad Fam.* 5. 21. 6. 21.
§§ He seems to have fallen into some misconceptions of Aristotle's meaning. *De Invent.* 1. 35. 36. 2. 14. see Quint. *Inst.* 5. 14.
‖‖ *De Invent.* 1. 7. 2. 51. *et passim. ad Fam.* 1. 9. *de Orat.* 2. 36.
¶¶ *De Off* 1. 1. *de Fin.* 4, 5. *ad Atticum.*
*** *De Fin.* 2. 21. 3. 1. *de Legg.* 1. 13. *de Orat.* 3. 17. *ad Fam.* 13. 1. *pro Sext.* 10.
††† *De Nat. Deor.* 1. 4. *Tusc. Quæst.* 1. 1. 5. 29. *de Fin.* 1. 3. 4. *de Off.* 1. 1. *de Div.* 2. 1. 2.
‡‡‡ *Div. Legg.* lib. iii. sec. 9

the strong and weak parts of every Grecian school. Bearing then in mind his design of recommending the study of Philosophy, it is interesting to observe the artifices of style and manner which, with this end, he adopted in his Treatises; and though to enter minutely into this subject would be foreign to our present purpose, it may be allowed us to make some general remarks on the character of works so eminently successful in accomplishing the object for which they were undertaken.

His form of dialogue.

The most obvious peculiarity of Cicero's Philosophical discussions is the form of dialogue in which most of them are conveyed. Plato, indeed, and Xenophon had, before his time, been even more strictly dramatic in their compositions; but they professed to be recording the sentiments of an individual, and the Socratic mode of argument could hardly be displayed in any other shape. Of that interrogative and inductive conversation, however, Cicero affords but few specimens;* the nature of his dialogue being as different from that of the two Athenians, as was his object in writing. His aim was to excite interest; and he availed himself of this mode of composition for the life and variety, the ease, perspicuity, and vigour which it gave to his discussions. His dialogue is of two kinds; according as his subject is, or is not, a controverted point, it assumes the shape of a continued Treatise, or a free disputation; in the latter case imparting clearness to what is obscure, in the former relief to what is clear. Thus his practical and systematic Treatises on Rhetoric and Moral duty are either written in his own person, or merely divided between several speakers who are the organs of his own sentiments; while in questions of a more speculative cast, on the nature of the Gods, on the human soul, on the greatest good, he uses his Academic liberty, and brings forward the theories of contending Schools under the character of their respective advocates. The advantages gained in both cases are evident. In controverted subjects he is not obliged to discover his own views, he can detail opposite arguments forcibly and luminously, and he is allowed the use of those oratorical powers in which, after all, his great strength lay. In those subjects, on the other hand, which are uninteresting because they are familiar, he may pause or digress before the mind is weary and the attention begins to flag; the reader is carried on by easy journies and short stages, and novelty in the speaker supplies the want of novelty in the matter.

Advantages of it.

Beauty of execution.

Nor does Cicero discover less skill in the execution of these dialogues, than address in their design. It were idle to enlarge upon the beauty, richness, and taste of compositions which have been the admiration of every age and country. In the dignity of his speakers, their high tone of mutual courtesy, the harmony of his groups, and the delicate relief of his contrasts, he is inimitable. The majesty and splendour of his introductions which generally address themselves to the passions or the imagination, the eloquence with which both sides of a question are successively displayed, the clearness and terseness of his statements on abstract points, the warmth of his illustrations, his exquisite allusions to the scene or time of the supposed conversation, his digressions in praise of Philosophy or great men, his quotations from Grecian and Roman poetry, lastly, the melody and fulness of his style, unite to throw a charm round his writings peculiar to themselves. To the Roman reader they especially recommended themselves by their continual and most artful references to the heroes of the old Republic, who now appeared but exemplars, and (as it were) patrons of that eternal Philosophy, which he had before, perhaps, considered as the short-lived reveries of ingenious, but inactive men. Nor is there any confusion, harshness, or appearance of effort in the introduction of the various beauties we have been enumerating, which are blended together with so much skill and propriety, that it is sometimes difficult to point out the particular causes of the delight left upon the mind.

In proceeding to enumerate Cicero's Philosophical writings,* it may be necessary to premise that our intention is rather to sketch out the plan on which they are conducted, than to explain the doctrines which they recommend; for an account of which the reader is referred to our articles on the Schools by which they were respectively entertained.

Rhetorical works.

The series of his Rhetorical works has been preserved nearly complete, and consists of the *De Inventione, De Oratore, Brutus sive de claris Oratoribus, Orator sive de optimo genere Dicendi, De partitione Oratoriâ, Topica de optimo genere Oratorum.* The last-mentioned, which is a fragment, is understood to have been the proem to his translation (now lost) of the speeches of Demosthenes and Æschines, *De Corond.* These he translated with the view of defending, by the example of the Greek Orators, his own style of eloquence, which, as we shall afterwards find, the critics of the day censured as too Asiatic in its character; and hence the preface, which still survives, is on the subject of the Attic style of Oratory. This composition and his abstracts of his own orations,† are his only Rhetorical works not extant, and probably our loss is not very great. The Treatise on Rhetoric, addressed to Herennius, though edited with his works, and ascribed to him by several of the ancients, is now generally attributed to Cornificius, or some other writer of the same period.

These works consider the art of Rhetoric in different points of view, and thus receive from each other mutual support and illustration, while they prevent the tediousness which might else arise from sameness in the subject of discussion. Three are in the form of dialogue; the rest are written in his own person. In all, except perhaps the *Orator*, he professes to have digested the principles of the Aristotelic and Isocratean Schools into one finished system, selecting what was best in each, and, as occasion might offer, adding remarks and precepts of his own.‡ The subject is considered in three distinct lights;§ with reference to the *case*, the *speaker*, and the *speech*. The *case*, as respects its nature, is definite or indefinite; with reference to the hearer, it is judicial, deliberative, or descriptive; as regards the opponent, the division is fourfold; according as the fact, its nature, its quality, or its propriety is called in question. The art of the *speaker* is directed to five points; the discovery of persuasives,

* See *Tusc. Quæst.* and *de Republ.*

* See Fabricius, *Bibliothec. Latin.*; Olivet. in Cic. *op. omn.*; Middleton's *Life.*

† Quint. *Inst.* 10. 7.

‡ *De Invent.* 2. 2 et 3. *ad Fam.* 1. 9.

§ Confer *de part. Orat.* with *de Invent.*

(whether ethical, pathetical, or argumentative,) arrangement, diction, memory, delivery. And the *speech*, itself, consists of six parts; introduction, statement of the case, division of the subject, proof, refutation, and conclusion.

De Inventione.

His Treatises, *De Inventione* and *Topica*, the first and nearly the last of his compositions, are both on the invention of arguments, which he regards, with Aristotle, as the very foundation of the art; though he elsewhere confines the term *eloquence*, according to its derivation, to denote excellence of diction and delivery, to the exclusion of argumentative skill.* The former of these works was written at the age of twenty, and seems originally to have consisted of four books, of which but two remain.† In the first of these he considers Rhetorical invention *generally*, supplies common places for the six parts of an oration promiscuously, and gives a full analysis of the two forms of argument, syllogism, and induction. In the second book he applies these rules *particularly* to the three subject-matters of Rhetoric, the deliberative, the judicial, and the descriptive, dwelling principally on the judicial, as affording the most ample field for discussion. This Treatise seems nearly entirely compiled from the writings of Aristotle, Isocrates, and Hermagoras;‡ and as such he alludes to it in the opening of his *De Oratore* as deficient in the experience and judgment which nothing but time and practice can impart. Still it is an entertaining, nay useful, work; remarkable, even among Cicero's writings, for its uniform good sense, and less familiar to the scholar, only because the greater part has been superseded by the compositions of his riper years. His *Topica*, or Treatise on common places, has less extent and variety of plan, being little else than a compendium of Aristotle's work on the same subject. It was, as he informs us in its proem, drawn up from memory on his voyage from Italy to Greece, soon after Cæsar's murder, and in compliance with the wishes of Trebatius, who had sometime before urged him to undertake the translation.§

Topica.

De Oratore.

Cicero seems to have intended his *De Oratore*, *Brutus*, and *Orator*, to form one complete system.‖ Of these three noble works, the first lays down the principles and rules of the Rhetorical art; the second exemplifies them in the most eminent speakers of Greece and Rome; and the third shadows out the features of that perfect Orator, whose superhuman excellences should be the aim of our ambition. The *De Oratore* was written when the author was fifty-two, two years after his return from exile; and is a dialogue between some of the most illustrious Romans of the preceding age on the subject of Oratory. The principal speakers are the Orators Crassus and Antonius, who are represented unfolding the principles of their art to Sulpicius and Cotta, young men just rising at the Bar. In the first book, the conversation turns on the subject-matter of Rhetoric, and the qualifications requisite for the perfect Orator. Here Crassus maintains the necessity of his being acquainted with the whole circle of the arts, while Antonius confines eloquence to the province of speaking well. The dispute, for the most part, seems verbal; for Cicero himself, though he here sides with Crassus, yet, elsewhere, as we have above noticed, pronounces eloquence, strictly speaking, to consist in beauty of diction. Scævola, the celebrated lawyer, takes part in this preliminary discussion; but in the ensuing meetings makes way for Catulus and Cæsar, the subject leading to such technical disquisitions as were hardly suitable to the dignity of the aged Augur.* The next morning Antonius enters upon the subject of *invention*, which Cæsar completes by subjoining some remarks on the use of humour in Oratory; and Antonius, relieving him, finishes the morning discussion with the principles of *arrangement* and *memory*. In the afternoon the rules for propriety and elegance of *diction* are explained by Crassus, who was celebrated in this department of the art; and the work concludes with his treating the subject of *delivery* and *action*. Such is the plan of the *De Oratore*, the most finished perhaps of Cicero's compositions. An air of grandeur and magnificence reigns throughout. The characters of the aged Senators are finely conceived, and the whole company is invested with an almost religious majesty, from the allusions interspersed to the miserable destinies for which its members were reserved.

De claris Oratoribus.

His Treatise *De claris Oratoribus*, was written after an interval of nine years, about the time of Cato's death, and is conveyed in a dialogue between Brutus, Atticus, and himself. He begins with Solon, and after briefly mentioning the Orators of Greece, proceeds to those of his own country, so as to take in the whole period from the time of Junius Brutus down to himself. About the same time he wrote his *Orator*; in which he directs his attention principally to diction and delivery, as in his *De Inventione* and *Topica* he considers the matter of an Oration.† This Treatise is of a less practical nature than the rest.‡ It adopts the principles of Plato, and delineates the perfect Orator according to the abstract conceptions of the intellect, rather than the deductions of observation and experience. Hence he sets out with a definition of the perfectly eloquent man, whose characteristic it is to express himself with propriety on all subjects, whether humble, grand, or of an intermediate character;§ and here he has an opportunity of paying some indirect compliments to himself. With this work he was so well satisfied, that he does not scruple to declare, in a letter to a friend, that he was ready to risk his reputation for judgment in Oratory on its merits.‖

Orator.

De partitione Oratoriâ.

The treatise *De partitione Oratoriâ*, or on the three parts of Rhetoric, is a kind of catechism between Cicero and his son, drawn up for the use of the latter at the same time with the two preceding. It is the most systematic and perspicuous of his Rhetorical works, but seems to be but the rough draught of what he originally intended.¶

Moral and Physical writings.

The connection which we have been able to preserve between the Rhetorical writings of Cicero, will be quite unattainable in his Moral and Physical Treatises; partly from the extent of the subject, partly from the

---

* *Orat.* 19.
† Vossius, *de Nat. Rhet.* c. 13. Fabricius, *Bibliothec. Latin.*
‡ *De Invent.* 1. 5. 6. *de clar. Orat.* 76.
§ *Ad Fam.* 7. 19. ‖ *De Div.* 2. 1.

* *Ad Atticum*, 4. 16. † *Orat.* 16.
‡ *Orat.* 14. 31. § Ibid. 21. 29.
‖ *Ad Fam.* 6. 18.
¶ See Middleton, vol. ii. p. 147. 4to.

losses occasioned by time, partly from the inconsistency which we have warned the reader to expect in his sentiments. In our enumeration, therefore, we shall observe no other order than that which the date of their composition furnishes.

De Republ.

The earliest now extant, is part of his Treatise *De Legibus*, in three books; being a sequel to his work on Politics. Both were written in imitation of Plato's Treatises on the same subjects.* The latter of these (*De Republicâ*) was composed a year after the *De Oratore*,† and seems to have vied with it in the majesty and interest of the dialogue. It consisted of a series of discussions in six books on the origin and principles of Government, Scipio being the principal speaker; but Lælius, Philus, Manilius, and other personages of like gravity taking part in the conversation. Till lately, but a fragment of the fifth book was understood to be in existence, in which Scipio, under the fiction of a dream, inculcates the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. But within the last two years, Signor Mai, librarian of the Vatican, has published considerable portions of the first and second books, from a palimpsest manuscript of St. Austin's *Commentary on the Psalms*. In the part now recovered, Scipio discourses on the different kinds of Constitutions and their respective advantages; with a particular reference to that of Rome. In the third, the subject of Justice was discussed by Lælius and Philus; in the fourth, Scipio treated of Morals and Education; while in the fifth and sixth, the duties of a Magistrate were explained, and the best means of preventing changes and revolutions in the Constitution itself. In the latter part of the Treatise, allusion was made to the actual posture of affairs in Rome, when the conversation was supposed to have occurred, and the commotions excited by the Gracchi.

Recent discovery of additional fragments of his Treatises.

De Legibus.

In his treatise *De Legibus*, which was written two years later than the former, and shortly after the murder of Clodius, he represents himself as explaining to his brother Quintus, and Atticus, in their walks through the woods of Arpinum, the nature and origin of the laws, and their actual state, both in other countries and in Rome. The first part only of the subject is contained in the books now extant; the introduction to which we have had occasion to notice, when speaking of his Stoical sentiments on questions connected with State policy. Law he pronounces to be the perfection of Reason, the eternal mind, the divine energy, which, while it pervades and unites in one the whole universe, associates Gods and men by the more intimate resemblance of Reason and Virtue, and still more closely men with men, by the participation of common faculties, affections, and situations. He then proves, at length, that Justice is not merely created by Civil institutions, from the power of conscience, the imperfections of human law, the moral sense, and the disinterestedness of virtue. He next proceeds to unfold the principles, first, of religious law, under the heads of divine worship; the observance of festivals and games; the office of Priests, Augurs, and Heralds; the punishment of sacrilege and perjury; the consecration of land, and the rights of sepulchres; and, secondly, of Civil law, which gives him an opportunity of noticing the respective duties of Magistrate and citizens. In these discussions, though professedly speaking of the abstract question, he does not hesitate to anticipate the subject of the lost books, by frequent allusions to the history and customs of his own country. It may be added, that in no part of his writings do more offensive specimens of his vanity occur than in this treatise, where they are rendered doubly odious by the affectation of putting them into the mouth of his brother and Atticus.*

Here a period of eight years intervenes, during which he composed little of importance besides his orations. He then published the *Brutus* and *Orator*; and the year after, his *Academicæ Quæstiones*, in the retirement from public business, to which he was driven by the Dictatorship of Cæsar. This work had originally consisted of two dialogues, which he entitled *Catulus and Lucullus*, from the names of the respective speakers in each. These he now remodelled and enlarged into four books, dedicating them to Varro, whom he introduced advocating, in the presence of Atticus, the tenets of Antiochus, while he himself defended those of Philo. Of this most valuable composition, only the second book (*Lucullus*) of the first edition, and part of the first of the second are now extant. In the former of the two, Lucullus argues against, and Cicero for, the Academic Sect, in the presence of Catulus and Hortensius; in the latter, Varro pursues the history of philosophy from Socrates to Arcesilas, and Cicero continues it down to the time of Carneades. In the second edition, the style was corrected, the matter condensed, and the whole polished with extraordinary care and diligence.†

Academicæ Quæstiones.

De Finibus.

The same year he published his treatise *De Finibus*, or the chief good, in five books, in which are explained the sentiments of the Epicureans, Stoics, and Peripatetics on the subject. This is the earliest of his works, in which the dialogue is of the *disputatious* kind. It is opened with a defence of the Epicurean tenets, concerning *pleasure*, by Torquatus; to which Cicero replies at length. The scene then shifts from the Cuman villa, to the library of young Lucullus, (his father being dead,) where the Stoic Cato expatiates on the sublimity of the system which maintains the existence of *one only* good, and is answered by Cicero in the character of a Peripatetic. Lastly, Piso, in a conversation held at Athens, enters into an explanation of the doctrine of Aristotle, that happiness is the *greatest* good. The general style of his Treatise is elegant and perspicuous; and the last book in particular has great variety and splendour of diction.

We have already, in our memoir of Cæsar, observed that Cicero was about this time particularly courted by the heads of the Dictator's party, of whom Hirtius and Dolabella went so far as to declaim daily at his house for the benefit of his instructions.‡ A visit of this nature to his Tusculan villa, soon after the publication of the *De Finibus*, gave rise to his work, entitled, *Tusculanæ Quæstiones*, which professes to be the substance of five Philosophical disputes between himself and friends, digested into as many books. He argues throughout on Academic principles, even with an affectation of inconsistency; sometimes making use of the Socratic dialogue, sometimes launching out

Tusculanæ Quæstiones.

* *De Legg.* 1. 5.
† Ang. Mai, *præf. in Remp.* Middleton, i. p. 486.

* Quint. *Inst.* 11. 1. † *Ad Atticum*, 13. 13. 16. 19.
‡ *Ad Fam.* 9. 16. 18.

Biography. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

into the diffuse expositions which characterise his other Treatises.* He first disputes against the fear of death; and in so doing he adopts the opinion of the Platonic School, as regards the nature of God and the soul. The succeeding discussions, on enduring pain, on alleviating grief, on the other emotions of the mind, and on Virtue, are conducted, for the most part, on Stoical principles.† This is a highly ornamental composition, and contains more quotations from the Poets than any other of Cicero's Treatises.

We have already had occasion to remark upon the singular activity of his mind, which becomes more and more conspicuous as we approach the period of his death. During the ensuing year, which is the last of his life, in the midst of the confusion and anxieties consequent on Cæsar's death, he found time to write the *De Naturâ Deorum*, *De Divinatione*, *De Fato*, *De Senectute*, *De Amicitiâ*, *De Officiis*, and *Paradoxa*, besides the treatise on Rhetorical Common Places above considered.

Of these the first three were intended as a full exposition of the opposite opinions entertained on their respective subjects; the *De Fato*, however, was not finished according to this plan.‡ His Treatise *De Naturâ Deorum*, in three books, may be reckoned the most magnificent of all his works, and shows that neither age nor disappointment had done injury to the richness and vigour of his mind. In the first book, Velleius, the Epicurean, sets forth the physical tenets of his sect, and is answered by Cotta, who is of the Academic School. In the second, Balbus, the disciple of the Porch, gives an account of his own system, and is, in turn, refuted by Cotta in the third. The eloquent extravagance of the Epicurean, the solemn enthusiasm of the Stoic, and the brilliant raillery of the Academic, are contrasted with inconceivable vivacity and humour. While the sublimity of the subject itself imparts to the whole composition a grander and more elevated character, and discovers in the author imaginative powers, which, celebrated as he justly is for playfulness of fancy, might yet appear more the talent of the Poet than the Orator.

De Naturâ Deorum.

De Divinatione

His treatise *De Divinatione* is conveyed in a discussion between his brother Quintus and himself, in two books. In the former, Quintus, after dividing Divination into the heads of natural and artificial, argues with the Stoics for its sacred nature, from the evidence of facts, the agreement of all nations, and the existence of Gods. In the latter Cicero questions its authority, with Carneades, from the uncertain nature of its rules, the absurdity and uselessness of the art, and the possibility of accounting from natural causes for the phenomena on which it was founded. This is a curious work, from the numerous cases adduced from the histories of Greece and Rome, to illustrate the subject in dispute.

De Fato.

His treatise *De Fato* is quite a fragment; it purports to be the substance of a dissertation in which he explained to Hirtius (soon after Consul,) the sentiments of Chrysippus, Diodorus, Epicurus, Carneades, and others, upon that abstruse subject. It is supposed to have consisted at least of two books, of which we have but the proem of the first, and a small portion of the second.

* *Tusc. Quæst.* 5. 4. 11. † Ibid. 3. 10. 5. 27.
‡ *De Nat. Deor.* 1. 6. *de Div.* 1. 4. *de Fat.* 1.

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

In his beautiful pieces *De Senectute*, and *De Amicitiâ*, Cato the Censor, and Lælius, are respectively introduced delivering their sentiments on those subjects. The conclusion of the former, in which Cato discourses on the immortality of the soul, has been always celebrated; and the opening of the latter, in which Fannius and Scævola come to console Lælius on the death of Scipio, is as exquisite an instance of delicacy and taste, as can be found in his works. In the latter he has borrowed largely from the eighth and ninth books of Aristotle's *Ethics*.

His Treatise *De Officiis*, was finished about the time he wrote his second Philippic, a circumstance which illustrates the great capaciousness and versatility of his mental powers. Of a work so extensively celebrated, it is enough to have mentioned the name. Here he lays aside the less authoritative form of dialogue, and, with the dignity of the Roman Consul, unfolds, in his own person, the principles of Morals, according to the views of the older Schools, particularly of the Stoics. It is written, in three books, with great perspicuity and elegance of style; the first book treats of the *honestum*, the second of the *utile*, and the third adjusts the claims of the two, when they happen to interfere with each other.

De Senectute et de Amicitiâ.

De Officiis

His *Paradoxa Stoicorum* might have been, more suitably perhaps, included in his Rhetorical works, being six short declamations in support of the positions of Zeno; in which that Philosopher's subtilities are adapted to the comprehension of the vulgar, and the events of the times. The second, fourth, and sixth, are respectively directed against Antony, Clodius, and Crassus. They seem to have suffered from time.* The sixth is the most eloquent, but the argument of the third is strikingly maintained.

Paradoxa Stoicorum.

Besides the works now enumerated, we have a considerable fragment of his translation of Plato's *Timæus*, which he seems to have finished about this time. His remaining Philosophical works, viz. the *Hortensius*, which was a defence of Philosophy; *De Gloriâ*, *De Consolatione*, written upon Platonic principles on his daughter's death; *De Jure Civili*, *De Virtutibus*, *De Auguriis*, *Chorographia*, translations of Plato's *Protagoras*, and Xenophon's *Œconomics*, works on Natural History, Panegyric on Cato, and some Miscellaneous Writings, are, except a few fragments, entirely lost.

His Epistles, about one thousand in all, are comprised in thirty-six books, sixteen of which are addressed to Atticus, three to his brother Quintus, one to Brutus, and sixteen to his different friends; and they form a history of his life from his fortieth year. Among those addressed to his friends, some occur from Brutus, Metellus, Plancius, Cælius and others. For the preservation of this most valuable department of Cicero's writings, we are indebted to Tyro, the author's freedman, though we possess, at the present day, but a part of those originally published. As his correspondence with his friends belongs to his character as a man and politician, rather than to his powers as an author, we have already noticed it in the first part of this memoir.

Epistles.

His Poetical and Historical works have suffered a heavier fate. The latter class, consisting of his Commentary on his Consulship, and his History of his own

Poetical and Historical works

* Sciopp. *in Olivet.*

Times, is altogether lost. Of the former, which consisted of the heroic poems Alcyones, Cimon, Marius, and his Consulate; the elegy of Tamelastes, translations of Homer and Aratus, Epigrams, &c. nothing remains, except some fragments of the *Phænomena* and *Diosemeia* of Aratus. It may, however, be questioned whether literature has suffered much by these losses. We are far, indeed, from speaking contemptuously of the poetical powers of one who possessed so much fancy, so much taste, and so fine an ear.* But his poems were principally composed in his youth; and afterwards, when his powers were more mature, his occupations did not allow even *his* active mind the time necessary for polishing a language still more rugged in metre than it was in prose. His contemporary history on the other hand, can hardly have conveyed more explicit, and certainly would have contained less faithful, information than his private correspondence; while, with all the penetration he assuredly possessed, it may be doubted if his diffuse and graceful style of thought and composition was adapted for the depth of reflection and condensation of meaning, which are the chief excellences of historical composition.

Orations.

The Orations he is known to have composed amount in all to about eighty, of which fifty-nine either entire or in part are preserved. Of these some are deliberative, others judicial, others descriptive, some delivered from the Rostrum, or in the Senate; others in the Forum, or before Cæsar; and, as might be anticipated from the character already given of his talents, he is much more successful in pleading or in panegyric than in debate or invective. In deliberative Oratory, indeed, great part of the effect depends on the confidence placed in the speaker; and, though Cicero takes considerable pains to interest the audience in his favour, yet his style is not simple and grave enough, he is too ingenious, too declamatory, discovers too much personal feeling to attain the highest degree of excellence in this department of the art. His invectives, again, however grand and imposing, yet, compared with his calmer and more familiar productions, have a forced and unnatural air. Splendid as is the eloquence of his Catilinarians and Philippics, it is often the language of abuse rather than of indignation; and even his attack on Piso, the most brilliant and imaginative of its kind, becomes wearisome from want of ease and relief. His laudatory orations, on the other hand, are among his happiest efforts. Nothing can exceed the taste and beauty of those for the Manilian law, for Marcellus, for Ligurius, for Archias, and the ninth Philippic, which is principally in praise of Servius Sulpicius. But it is, in judicial eloquence, particularly on subjects of a lively cast, as in his speeches for Cælius and Muræna, and against Cæcilius, that his talents are displayed to the best advantage. To both kinds his amiable and pleasant turn of mind imparts inexpressible grace and delicacy; Historical allusions, Philosophical sentiments, descriptions full of life and nature, and polite raillery, succeed each other in the most agreeable manner, without appearance of artifice or effort. Of this nature are his pictures of the confusion of the Catilinarian conspirators on detection;† of the death of Metellus;* of Sulpicius undertaking the embassy to Antonius;† the character he draws of Catiline;‡ and his fine sketch of old Appius, frowning on his degenerate descendant Clodia.§

These, however, are but incidental and occasional artifices to divert and refresh the mind, as his Orations are generally laid out according to the plan proposed in Rhetorical works; the introduction, containing the ethical proof; the body of the speech, the argument and the peroration addressing itself to the passions of the Judge. In opening his case, he commonly makes a profession of timidity and diffidence, with a view to conciliate the favour of his audience; the eloquence, for instance, of Hortensius, is so powerful,‖ or so much prejudice has been excited against his client,¶ or it is his first appearance in the Rostrum,** or he is unused to speak in an armed assembly,†† or to plead in a private apartment.‡‡ He proceeds to entreat the patience of his Judges; drops out some generous or popular sentiment, or contrives to excite prejudice against his opponent. He then states the circumstances of his case, and the intended plan of his oration; and here he is particularly clear. But it is when he comes actually to prove his point, that his Oratorical powers begin to have their full play. He accounts for every thing so naturally, makes trivial circumstances *tell* so happily, so adroitly converts apparent objections into confirmations of his argument, connects independent particulars with such ease and plausibility, that it becomes impossible to entertain a question on the truth of his statement. This is particularly observable in his defence of Cluentius, where prejudices, suspicions, and difficulties are encountered with the most triumphant ingenuity; in the antecedent probabilities of his *Pro Milone*;§§ in his apology for Muræna's public,‖‖ and Cælius's private life,¶¶ and his disparagement of Verres's military services in Sicily;*** it is observable in the address with which the Agrarian law of Rullus,††† and the accusation of Rabirius,‡‡‡ both popular measures, are represented to be hostile to public liberty; with which Milo's impolitic unconcern is made an affecting consideration;§§§ and Cato's attack upon the crowd of clients which accompanied the candidate for office, a tyrannical disregard for the feelings of the poor.‖‖‖ So great indeed is his talent, that (as we have before hinted,) he even hurts a good cause by an excess of plausibility.

General distribution.

But it is not enough to have barely proved his point; he proceeds, either immediately, or towards the conclusion of his speech, to heighten the effect by *exaggeration*.¶¶¶ Here he goes (as it were) round and round his object; surveys it in every light; examines it in all its parts, retires, and then advances; turns and returns it; compares and contrasts it;

* See Plutarch, *in Vitâ*.

† *In Catil.* 3. 3.

* *Pro Cæl.* 10.
‡ *Pro Cæl.* 3.
‖ *Pro Quinct.* and *pro Verr.* 5.
¶ *Pro Cluent.*
†† *Pro Milon.*
§§ *Pro Milon.* 8—10.
¶¶ *Pro Cæl.* 6.
††† *Contra Rull.* 2. 9
§§§ *Pro Milon. init. et alibi.*
‖‖‖ *Pro Muræn.* 14.
¶¶¶ *De Orat. partit.* c. 8. 16, 17.
† *Philipp.* 9. 3.
§ Ibid. 6.
** *Pro Leg. Manil.*
‡‡ *Pro Deiotar.*
‖‖ *Pro Muræn.* 4.
*** *In Verr.* 5. 2. &c.
‡‡‡ *Pro Rabir.* 3.

Biography. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

illustrates, confirms, enforces his view of the question, till at last the hearer feels ashamed of doubting a position which seems built on a foundation so strictly argumentative. Of this nature is his justification of Rabirius in taking up arms against Saturninus;* his account of the imprisonment of the Roman citizens by Verres, and of the crucifixion of Gavius;† his comparison of Antonius with Tarquin;‡ and his contrasting Verres with Fabius, Scipio, and Marius.§

And now, having established his case, he opens upon his opponent a discharge of raillery, so delicate and good natured, that it is impossible for the latter to maintain his ground against it. Or where the subject is too grave to admit this, he colours his exaggeration with all the bitterness of irony or vehemence of passion. Such are his frequent delineations of Gabinius, Piso, Clodius, and Antonius;|| particularly his vivid and almost humorous contrast of the two Consuls, who sanctioned his banishment, in his Oration for Sextius.¶ Such the celebrated account (already alluded to) of the crucifixion of Gavius, which it is difficult to read, even at the present day, without having our feelings roused against the merciless Prætor. But the appeal to the softer emotions of the soul is reserved (perhaps with somewhat of sameness) for the close of his oration; as in his defence of Cluentius, Muræna, Cælius, Milo, Sylla, Flaccus, and Rabirius Postumus; the most striking instances of which are the poetical burst of feeling with which he addresses his client Plancius,** and his picture of the desolate condition of the Vestal Fonteia, should her brother be condemned.†† At other times, his peroration contains more heroic and elevated sentiments; as in his invocation of the Alban groves and altars in the peroration of the *Pro Milone*, the panegyric on Patriotism, and the love of Glory in his defence of Sextius, and that on Liberty at the close of the third and tenth Philippics. But we cannot describe his Oratorical merits more accurately than by extracting his own delineation of a perfect Orator: *Sic igitur dicet ille, quem expetimus, ut verset sæpe multis modis eandem et unam rem; et hæreat in eadem, commoreturque sententia: sæpe etiam ut extenuet aliquid, sæpe ut irrideat: ut declinet à proposito deflectatque sententiam: ut proponat quid dicturus sit: ut, cùm transegerit jam aliquid, definiat: ut se ipse revocet: ut, quod dixit, iteret: ut argumentum ratione concludat;.... ut dividat in partes: ut aliquid relinquat ac negligat: ut ante præmuniat: ut in eo ipso, in quo reprehendatur, culpam in adversarium conferat: .... ut hominum sermones moresque describat: ut muta quædam loquentia inducat: ut ab eo, quod agitur, avertat animos; ut sæpe in hilaritatem risumve convertat: ut ante occupet quod videat opponi: ut comparet similitudines: ut utatur exemplis: .... ut liberius quod audeat: ut irascatur etiam: ut objurget aliquando: ut deprecetur, ut supplicet; ut medeatur; ut à proposito declinet aliquantulum: ut optet, ut execretur; ut fiat iis, apud quos dicet, familiaris. Orat.* 40.‡‡

Character of his style

But by the invention of a style, which adapts itself with singular felicity to every class of subjects, whether lofty or familiar, Philosophical or Forensic, Cicero answers even more exactly to his own definition of a perfect Orator,* than by his plausibility, pathos, and vivacity. It is not however here intended to enter upon the consideration of a subject so ample and so familiar to all scholars as Cicero's Oratorical diction, much less to take an extended view of it through the range of his Philosophical writings, and familiar correspondence. Among many excellences, the greatest is its suitableness to the genius of the Latin language; though the diffuseness thence necessarily resulting has exposed it, both in his own days and since his time, to the criticisms of those who have affected to condemn its Asiatic character, in comparison with the simplicity of Attic writers, and the strength of Demosthenes.† Greek, however, is celebrated for copiousness in its vocabulary and perspicuity in its phrases; and the consequent facility of expressing the most novel or abstruse ideas with precision and elegance. Hence the Attic style of eloquence was plain and simple, because simplicity and plainness were not incompatible with clearness, energy, and harmony. But it was a singular want of judgment, an ignorance of the very principles of composition, which induced Brutus, Calvus, Sallust, and others to imitate this terse and severe beauty in their own defective language, and even to pronounce the opposite kind of diction deficient in taste and purity. In Greek, indeed, the words fall, as it were, naturally, into a distinct and harmonious order; and from the exuberant richness of the materials, less is left to the ingenuity of the artist. But the Latin language is comparatively weak, scanty, and unmusical; and requires considerable skill and management to render it expressive and graceful. Simplicity in Latin is scarcely separable from baldness; and justly as Terence is celebrated for chaste and unadorned diction, yet, even he, compared with Attic writers, is flat and heavy.‡ Again, the perfection of strength is clearness united to brevity; but to this combination Latin is utterly unequal. From the vagueness and uncertainty of meaning which characterises its separate words, to be perspicuous it must be full. What Livy, and much more Tacitus have gained in energy, they have lost in perspicuity and elegance; the correspondence of Brutus with Cicero, is forcible indeed, but harsh and abrupt. Latin, in short, is not a Philosophical language, not a language in which a deep thinker is likely to express himself with purity or neatness. *Qui à Latinis exiget illam gratiam sermonis Attici*, says Quintilian, *det mihi in eloquendo eandem jucunditatem et parem copiam. Quod si negatum est, sententias aptabimus iis vocibus quas habemus, nec rerum nimiam tenuitatem, ut non dicam pinguioribus, fortioribus certè verbis miscebimus, ne virtus utraque pereat ipsâ confusione. Nam quo minus adjuvat sermo, rerum inventione pugnandum est. Sensus sublimes variique eruantur. Permovendi omnes affectus erunt, oratio translationum nitore illuminanda. Non possumus esse tam graciles? simus fortiores. Subtilitate vincimur? valeamus pondere. Proprietas penes illos est certior? copiâ vincamus.* This is the very plan on which Cicero has proceeded. He had to deal with a language

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711 — A. C. 107. to 43.

Difference between the Greek and Latin languages

* *Pro Rabir.* 5.
† *In Verr.* 5. 56, &c. and 64, &c.
‡ *Philipp.* 3, 4. § *In Verr.* 5. 10.
|| *Pro Redit. in Senat.—pro Dom.—pro Sext. Philipp.*
¶ *Pro Sext.* 8—10. ** *Pro Planc.*
†† *Pro Fonteio.* ‡‡ *De clar. Orat.* 93.

* *Orat.* 29.
† *Tusc. Quæst.* 1. 1. *de clar. Orat.* 82, &c. *de opt. gen. Dic.*
‡ *Quint.* 10. 1.

Biography. From U. C. 647: to 711. — A. C. 107: to 43.

barren and dissonant; his good sense enabled him to perceive what could be done, and what it was in vain to attempt; and happily his talents answered precisely to the purpose required. Terence and Lucretius had cultivated simplicity; Cotta, Brutus, and Calvus had attempted strength; but Cicero rather made a *language* than a *style*; yet not so much by the invention as by the combination of words. Some terms, indeed, his Philosophical subjects obliged him to coin;* but his great art lies in the application of existing materials, in converting the very disadvantages of the language into beauties,† in enriching it with circumlocutions and metaphors, in pruning it of harsh and uncouth expressions, in systematizing the structure of a sentence.‡ This is that *copia dicendi* which gained Cicero the high testimony of Cæsar to his inventive powers,§ and which, we may add, constitutes him the greatest master of composition the world has ever seen. If the comparison be not thought fanciful, he may be assimilated to a skilful landscape-gardener, who gives depth and richness to narrow and confined premises, by taste and variety in the disposition of his trees and walks.

Roman eloquence.

Such, then, are the principal characteristics of Cicero's Oratory; on a review of which we may, with some reason, conclude that Roman Eloquence stands scarcely less indebted to his compositions than Roman Philosophy. For though in his *De claris Oratoribus* he begins his review from the age of Junius Brutus, yet, soberly speaking, (and as he seems to allow in the opening of the *De Oratore*,) we cannot assign an earlier date to the rise of Eloquence among his countrymen, than that of the same Athenian embassy which introduced the study of Philosophy. To aim indeed at persuasion, by appeals to the reason or passions, is so natural, that no country, whether refined or barbarous, is without its orators. If however Eloquence be the mere power of persuading, it is but a relative term, limited to time and place, connected with a particular audience, and leaving to posterity no test of its merits, but the report of those whom it has been successful in influencing. *Vulgus interdum*, says Cicero, *non probandum oratorem probat, sed probat sine comparatione, cùm à mediocri aut etiam à malo delectatur; eo est contentus: esse melius sentit: illud quod est, qualecunque est, probat.* (*De clar. Orat.* 52.)

Orators before Cicero.

The eloquence of Carneades and his associates made (to use a familiar term,) a great *sensation* among the Roman Orators, who soon split into two parties; the one adhering to the rough unpolished manners of their forefathers, the other favouring the artificial graces which distinguished the Grecian style. In the former class were Cato and Lælius,‖ both men of cultivated minds, particularly Cato, whose opposition to Greek literature was founded solely on political considerations. But, as might be expected, the Athenian cause prevailed; and Carbo and the two Gracchi, who are the principal Orators of the next generation, are related to have been learned, majestic, and harmonious in the character of their speeches.* These were succeeded by Antonius, Crassus, Cotta, Sulpicius, and Hortensius; who, adopting greater liveliness and variety of manner, form a middle age in the history of Roman eloquence. But it was in that which immediately followed, that the art was adorned by an assemblage of orators, which even Greece will find it difficult to match. Of these Cæsar, Cicero, Curio, Brutus, Cælius, Calvus, and Callidius, are the most celebrated. The splendid talents, indeed, of Cæsar, were not more conspicuous in arms than in his Oratory, which was noted for force and purity.† Cælius, who has come before us in the history of the times, excelled in natural quickness, loftiness of sentiment, and politeness in attack;‡ Brutus in Philosophical gravity, though he sometimes indulged himself in a warmer and bolder style.§ Callidius was delicate and harmonious; Curio bold and flowing; Calvus, from studied opposition to Cicero's peculiarities, cold, cautious, and accurate.‖ Brutus and Calvus have been before noticed as the advocates of the dry sententious mode of speaking, which they dignified by the name of Attic; a kind of eloquence which seems to have been popular from the comparative facility with which it was attained.

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

Ciceronian age.

In the Ciceronian age the general character of the Oratory was dignified and graceful. The popular nature of the Government gave opportunities for effective appeals to the passions; and, Greek literature being as yet a novelty, philosophical sentiments were introduced with corresponding success. The Republican Orators were long in their introductions, diffuse in their statements, ample in their divisions, frequent in their digressions, gradual and sedate in their perorations.¶ Under the Emperors, however, the people were less consulted in State affairs; and the Judges, instead of possessing an almost independent authority, being but delegates of the Executive, from interested politicians became men of business; literature, too, was now familiar to all classes; and taste began sensibly to decline. The national appetite felt a craving for stronger and more stimulating compositions. Impatience was manifested at the tedious majesty and formal graces, the parade of arguments, grave sayings, and shreds of Philosophy,** which characterised their fathers; and a smarter and more sparkling kind of Oratory succeeded,†† just as in our own country, the minuet of the last century has been supplanted by the quadrille, and the stately movements of Giardini have given way to the brisker and more artificial melodies of

Decline of Roman Oratory under the Imperial Government.

---

* *De Fin.* 3. 1 and 4. *Lucull.* 6. Plutarch, *in Vitâ.*

† This, which is analogous to his address in pleading, is nowhere more observable than in his rendering the recurrence of the same word, to which he is forced by the barrenness or vagueness of the language, an elegance.

‡ It is remarkable that some authors attempted to account for the *invention* of the Asiatic style, on the same principle we have here adduced to account for Cicero's *adoption* of in Latin; viz. that the Asiatics had a defective knowledge of Greek, and devised phrases, &c. to make up for the imperfections of their scanty vocabulary. See *Quint.* 12. 10.

§ *De clar. Orat.* 72. ‖ Ibid.—*Quint.* 12. 10.

* *De clar. Orat.*—*pro Haruep. resp.* 19.

† *Quint.* 10. 1 and 2. *de clar. Orat.* 75.

‡ Ibid. § Ibid. *ad Atticum*, 14. 1.

‖ Ibid.

¶ *Dialog. de Orat.* 20 and 22. *Quint.* 10. 2.

** "It is not uncommon for those who have grown wise by the labour of others, to add a little of their own and overlook their master." JOHNSON. We have before compared Cicero to Addison as regards the purpose of inspiring their respective countrymen with literary taste. They resembled each other in the return they experienced.

†† *Dialog.* 18.

Biography. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

Rossini. Corvinus, even before the time of Augustus, had shown himself more elaborate and fastidious in his choice of expressions.* Cassius Severus, the first who openly deviated from the old style of Oratory, introduced an acrimonious and virulent mode of pleading.† It now became the fashion to decry Cicero as inflated, languid, tame, and even deficient in ornament;* Mecænas and Gallio followed in the career of degeneracy; till flippancy of attack, prettiness of expression, and glitter of decoration prevailed over the bold and manly eloquence of free Rome.

* *Dialog.* 18. † Ibid. 18.

* *Dialog.* 18 and 22. *Quint.* 12. 10.

Marcus Tullius Cicero. From U. C. 647. to 711. — A. C. 107. to 43.

CAIUS OCTAVIUS CÆSAR AUGUSTUS.

PART I.

CONTAINING A VIEW OF THE HISTORY OF ROME.

FROM U. C. 709 TO U. C. 722. A. C. 45 TO A. C. 32.

Biography — From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Parentage and early life of Augustus.

We have already spoken slightly of the family of Augustus Cæsar, and have mentioned his relationship to C. Julius Cæsar, as being the grandson of his sister Julia. Julia married M. Attius Balbus, a native of Aricia,* who rose to the rank of Prætor at Rome; and Attia, their daughter, married C. Octavius, a man of respectable family, who also obtained the same dignity, and died when he was on the point of offering himself as a candidate for the Consulship. He left behind him one son, C. Octavius, who was born at Rome on the twenty-third of September, U. C. 690, in the Consulship of M. Cicero and C. Antonius. The young Octavius lost his father when he was only four years old; and his mother soon after married L. Philippus, under whose care he was brought up, till his great uncle, Julius Cæsar, having no children, began to regard him as his heir,† and when he was between sixteen and seventeen years of age bestowed on him some military rewards at the celebration of his triumph for his victories in Africa.‡ In the following year he accompanied his uncle into Spain, where he is said to have given signs of talents and of activity; and in the winter of that same year he was sent, as we have seen, to Apollonia in Epirus, there to employ himself in completing his education till Cæsar should be ready to take him with him on his expedition against the Parthians. He was accordingly living quietly at Apollonia when the news of his uncle's death called him forward, when hardly more than eighteen years of age, to act a principal part in the contentions of the times.

State of affairs in Rome after Cæsar's death.

On the morning of the sixteenth of March, Brutus and Cassius with their associates were still in the Capitol, and Cicero and several other persons attached to the Aristocratical party,§ had joined them there. Antonius finding himself exposed to no danger, appeared again in public, as Consul; and Dolabella,‖ who had been appointed by Cæsar to succeed him in the Consulship, as soon as he should commence his expedition against the Parthians, now at once assumed the ensigns of that dignity; although with strange inconsistency he went up into the Capitol to visit the conspirators, and if Appian may be believed,¶ strongly inveighed against the late Dictator in a speech addressed to the multitude in the *Forum*. M. Lepidus, who as we have seen, was at this time invested with a military command, having been lately appointed to the government of the Nearer Spain, had some intentions, it is said, of availing himself of his actual power to establish himself in the place of Cæsar;** but Antonius, who had no wish to see his own views thus anticipated, easily prevailed upon him to lay aside such designs for the present; representing to him, we may suppose, the danger of such an attempt, and encouraging him with the prospect of obtaining hereafter all that he desired, if he would consent to temporize at the moment. But the real obstacle to the restoration of the Commonwealth, consisted in the numbers and dispositions of Cæsar's veteran soldiers, many of whom were waiting in Rome to receive their promised allotments of land; and others had come up from their new settlements to compliment their old General, by attending in his train when he should march out of the city to commence his eastern expedition.* These then naturally resented the death of their benefactor, and feared at the same time lest they should be deprived of their grants of land if he were declared a tyrant, and his Acts should be reversed. They were therefore a great encouragement to Antonius and Lepidus, and gave such alarm to the conspirators, that they remained in the Capitol, still trusting to the gladiators of Decimus Brutus for protection, and not venturing to expose their persons in the streets or in the Forum. Nor were the veterans the only set of men who were interested in upholding the legality of Cæsar's government. He had nominated as we have seen, the principal Magistrates of the Commonwealth for the next two years, under pretence of preventing any disorders during his absence in Asia: and the individuals, who, by virtue of these appointments, were either in the actual enjoyment or in the expectation of offices either honourable or lucrative, were little disposed to submit their pretensions to the chance of being confirmed or rejected by the free votes of the Roman people. Besides the late Civil war had so extended over every part of the Empire, and every Province contained so many persons who had risen to affluence or distinction in consequence of the offices or of the grants of forfeited estates conferred on them by Cæsar, that to repel all his measures, and to brand his government as an usurpation, would have at once unsettled the whole existing order of society. The foreigners who had been admitted to the rights of Roman citizens, and the many individuals who, in the course of the late commotions, had risen from humble stations to greatness, would have ill brooked the return of that exclusive and insulting system, which was upheld by the friends of the old Aristocracy.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. — From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Dispositions of the veterans.

Under these circumstances, the act of the assassins of Cæsar was likely to have no other effect than to expose their country to a fresh series of miseries, from which it would have no better prospect of relief, than a return at last to that very military despotism which they had so rashly attempted to overthrow. Cicero indeed had advised the only measure which could have given the conspirators any chance of maintaining their ground in Rome;† for he had

* Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 4.
† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 85.
‡ Suetonius, c. 8.
§ Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 35.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xliv. p. 250.
¶ *De Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 122.
** Dion Cassius, lib. xliv. p. 257.

* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. ii. c. 119.
† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. x.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

urged Brutus and Cassius to summon the Senate, by their authority as Prætors, to assemble in the Capitol immediately after Cæsar's death; before Antonius had recovered from his panic, or the veterans had had time to calculate their own strength or to look out for a new leader. But this counsel was not followed; and it was left for Antonius, in his character of Consul, to call the Senate together at the Temple of the Earth on the seventeenth of March,* when the doors of the assembly were beset with Cæsar's veterans in arms, and when they who hoped that they had restored the old Constitution of the Commonwealth dared not even to leave the shelter of the Capitol. Nor was it a slight circumstance, that Calpurnia, Cæsar's widow, had put into Antonius's hands the money and all the papers of her late husband;† a trust from which he intended to derive the most important benefits.

Meeting of the Senate on the seventeenth of March.

In the meeting of the Senate on the seventeenth of March, the reviving strength of Cæsar's party was already distinctly marked. Instead of declaring him a tyrant, it was ordered that the late Dictator should be honoured with the usual funeral rites paid to distinguished persons,‡ and that Antonius should deliver to the multitude an oration in his praise. All his acts were confirmed; his appointments of public officers for the next two years, were pronounced valid; and all the grants of lands made to the veterans, were to be preserved inviolable. In return for these concessions, the partisans of Cæsar acceded to Cicero's proposal,§ that the whole transaction of the Ides of March should be consigned to oblivion, and that all hostile designs should be relinquished on all sides. Antonius in particular expressed himself warmly in favour of a general and lasting peace; and this being the prevailing feeling of the assembly, the Act of oblivion was passed; Antonius sent his son to the Capitol as a hostage for his sincerity. The principal conspirators then descended from it; and we are told that Brutus that same evening supped with Lepidus, and Cassius with Antonius.‖

A general Act of Amnesty passes.

After this apparent termination of all dissensions, the conduct of Antonius was exceedingly artful. He frequently invited the most distinguished members of the Senate to his house, and consulted them as to the measures which it would be expedient to pursue. On the other hand, by coming forward to deliver Cæsar's funeral oration, he gave the veterans reason to understand that he was really attached to their late commander, and would not fail when an opportunity should offer, to act upon his real sentiments. In the meantime Cæsar's will was opened and read: and it appeared that C. Octavius was named the heir to the greatest part of the property,¶ and that he was adopted into the name and family of Cæsar. Several of the conspirators had been appointed guardians to Cæsar's son, if ever he should have one; and Decimus Brutus, as has been said before, was mentioned amongst those who were to inherit his fortune, in case of the failure of his regular heirs. To the Roman people Cæsar bequeathed his gardens on the right bank of the Tiber; and to each citizen a sum of money amounting to about £2. 8s. His funeral was prepared in a style of great magnificence;* the pile on which the body was to be consumed had been raised in the *Campus Martius*; and a small model of the Temple of *Venus Genitrix*, which he had built and dedicated, was placed in front of the *Rostra* in order to receive the bier, whilst the funeral oration was delivered. The bier was made of ivory, and covered with scarlet and gold, and at the head of it was displayed on a pole the very dress in which he had been assassinated. In the dramatic entertainments which were exhibited as a part of the solemnity, passages were selected from the plays of Pacuvius and Attius, which the audience might readily apply to the circumstances of Cæsar's fate; particularly one line from Pacuvius,

Cæsar's will opened.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709 to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Cæsar's Funeral.

> ——— Was I so merciful,
> But to provide assassins for myself?

When then Antonius came forward in the *Rostra* to speak the funeral oration, he ordered the crier to read aloud to the multitude all the decrees of the Senate, by which Cæsar had been invested with so many and such extraordinary honours, and the oath which all the Senators had taken to defend his person; after which he added only a few words of his own.† But his purpose was sufficiently answered, and enough had been done to excite the feelings of the multitude, disposed as they were of themselves to remember Cæsar's brilliant achievements with admiration, and his liberalities with gratitude and regret. Instead of carrying the body to the *Campus Martius*, some proposed to burn it in the Temple of Jupiter in the Capitol, and others in the Senate-house of Pompey, which had been the scene of his murder. But on a sudden two of the veteran soldiers who attended the funeral, stept forward armed with their swords, and each holding two javelins in his hand, and set fire to the bier with lighted torches in the place where it was standing in the front of the *Rostra*. The flames were fed by the zeal of the surrounding crowd with a quantity of dry brush-wood, and with the benches and seats which were usually left in the *Forum*:—those who had brought offerings of various kinds to present them at the funeral pile now threw them in to increase the conflagration; the musicians and actors in the funeral games stripped off their dresses, and cast them also into the fire, several matrons added their own ornaments, and those of their children, while the veteran soldiers crowned the whole with the offering of their own arms. Groups of foreigners of various nations were seen expressing their grief according to the fashion of their several countries: and amongst these the Jews were particularly remarkable; their hatred to Pompey for his violation of the sanctity of their Temple having, perhaps, disposed them to support the cause of his adversary. When the populace were satiated with feeding the fire, they dispersed in all directions, bent upon violence and bloodshed. They attacked the

His body burned in the Forum.

Riots of the populace on that occasion.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. xiv. and *Philippic*. ii. c. 35.
† Appian, lib. ii. c. 125.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. vi. ix. x. *Philippic*. i. c. 1. 7.
§ Ibid. *Philippic*. i. c. 1. 13. Ibid. ii. c. 36.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xliv. p. 257. Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 19.
¶ Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 83.

* Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 84.
† *Perpauca a se verba addidit*—Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 84. Dion Cassius makes him deliver a speech on this occasion which occupies nearly nine folio pages. He had just before filled six pages with a speech which he ascribes to Cicero, and which is about as genuine as the pretended funeral oration of Antonius.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

houses of those persons who were known to be adverse to Cæsar;* and especially those of the chief conspirators, Brutus and Cassius, whence they were driven off by force of arms, as in the old disorders and contests between Clodius and Milo. In the midst of their fury, they fell in with a man by name Helvius Cinna; and mistaking him for Cornelius Cinna, who had given great offence by a speech delivered the day before, full of invective against Cæsar, they instantly murdered him, and carried his head about with them on the end of a pike. This display of the temper of the populace served the purposes of Antonius by intimidating the conspirators; but as he designed to establish his power on a surer basis than the support of a riotous rabble, he appeared to give no countenance to their excesses. A mixed multitude consisting of slaves, and foreigners, and citizens of the lowest class, erected a marble pillar,† twenty feet high, in the Forum, with an inscription declaring it to be dedicated to Cæsar, under the title of "Father of his Country." Close by this pillar there was an altar raised, on which sacrifices continued for some time to be offered to Cæsar as a God; and parties at variance with one another would come to this spot, and decide their quarrels by an oath in Cæsar's name. The groupes that used to assemble round this column menaced the Capital daily with scenes of outrage similar to those which had been exhibited at Cæsar's funeral; till P. Dolabella proceeded to disperse them, and with the usual summary severity of a Roman magistrate, crucified a number of the slaves, and threw down from the Tarpeian rock those free citizens who were most forward in exciting these disturbances.‡ It is said that when Dolabella returned to his house after these executions, he was followed by a crowd of all ranks of persons, testifying their admiration of his conduct: that he received similar applauses shortly afterwards in the theatre; and that Cicero was warmly complimented by his friends on this earnest of patriotic intentions which his son-in-law had afforded.§

Dolabella disperses the rioters.

Antonius had also an opportunity about the same time of gaining the good opinion of the higher classes of citizens by acting in a similar manner. There was a man of very low origin, of the name of C. Amatius, who some months before, in the lifetime of Cæsar, had claimed to be the grandson of the famous Marius, and had applied to Cicero as a relation and townsman of Marius,‖ to support him in making good his pretensions. Cicero was not disposed to commit himself by maintaining such a cause; but the name of Marius was popular amongst a large proportion of the common people, and we are told that almost all the companies of the different trades in Rome,¶ together with some of the newly founded colonies of the veterans, and even some considerable free towns of Italy, believed the story of Amatius, and chose him to be their Patron. He was followed also by a considerable multitude when he appeared in the streets; till Cæsar impatient of such a rival in popularity, issued a decree to banish him from Italy. But after the Ides of March he returned again to Rome, and professed as the descendant of Marius to feel particular regret for the murder of his relation Cæsar; insomuch that he continually instigated the populace to take vengeance on the conspirators, and under this pretence had formed a design, as we are told,* to massacre the principal Senators of the Aristocratical party, and to rule in Rome as L. Saturninus and P. Sulpicius had done in former times. But the days were past in which ambition could hope to rise by the mere support of the turbulent rabble of the Capital. Antonius, glad perhaps to please and to blind his opponents so cheaply, employed a military force against Amatius, and having arrested him ordered him to be put to death in prison in pursuance of a decree of the Senate, and caused his body to be dragged by a hook through the streets, and to be thrown into the Tiber. This execution took place about the middle of April;† and up to this period Antonius had appeared desirous in several instances to maintain the old Constitution of the Commonwealth. To lessen the dissatisfaction that might be felt by many at the confirmation of all the Acts of Cæsar,‡ he assured the Senate that Cæsar's papers contained no grants of privileges or peculiar exemptions of any sort, and that they directed the recal of only one exile, Sex. Clodius; he agreed moreover to the motion of Ser. Sulpicius, that none of Cæsar's decrees or grants should be published, which had not already been announced by public advertisement before the Ides of March. Above all, he proposed that the office of Dictator should be for ever abolished; a proposal which was most joyfully acceded to by the Senate, and for which they bestowed on him their thanks in the warmest terms. His treatment of C. Amatius combining with his behaviour in all these instances, is said to have given satisfaction even to Brutus himself;§ and seemed to afford so fair a prospect of future tranquillity, that Cicero in a letter to Atticus expresses his belief, that Brutus might now go in safety through the *Forum*, with a cover of gold upon his head.‖

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

The office of Dictator is abolished by Antonius.

Story of C. Amatius, the pretended grandson of Marius.

But these hopes were chequered by fears even from the beginning, and it was not long before they were destroyed altogether. The tumults in the city, and the threatening language held by Cæsar's veterans, who were now assembled at Rome in great numbers, rendered the situation of the conspirators so unsafe, or at least so uncomfortable, that they judged it expedient to withdraw for the present out of the reach of danger. At first they had remained in their own houses at Rome, and had only avoided appearing in public;¶ but when the disorders continued, they thought it best to remove to a greater distance; and accordingly Brutus, apparently accompanied by Cassius, retired to his own villa at Lanuvium;** Trebonius set out in the most private manner to go to his Province of Asia; and Decimus Brutus hastened to Cisalpine Gaul,†† to secure the command of that

The conspirators retire from Rome.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 36. Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, c. 85.
† Suetonius, c. 85. Cicero, *Philippic.* i. c. 2.
‡ Cicero, *Philippic.* i. c. 2. 12. *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. xvi. *ad Familiares*, lib. ix. epist. xiv.
§ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxvi.
‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xii. epist. xlix.
¶ Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 15.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* i. c. 2. Valerius Maximus, *ubi supra* Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iii. c. 2, 3.
† Conf. Ciceron. *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. vii. viii.
‡ Ibid. *Philippic.* i. c. 1.
§ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. viii.
‖ Ibid. lib. xiv. epist. xvi.
¶ Ibid. lib. xiv. epist. v.
** Ibid. epist. vii. x. †† Ibid. epist. xiii.

Province, which Cæsar, as has been already noticed, had conferred on him before his death. This appears to have been a sudden resolution; for there is extant a letter from Decimus Brutus, to M. Brutus and Cassius,* dated in the month of April, in which he speaks in a very desponding manner of the state of his party, and says that they have no other resource but to withdraw into a voluntary exile; that they can do nothing at present, as they have no military force to support them; nor was there any quarter to which they could look for aid, except to the camp of Sex. Pompeius in Spain, and of Q. Cæcilius Bassus in Syria. Yet on the twenty-sixth of April Cicero had received intelligence from Atticus, that Decimus Brutus had already joined his legions in Cisalpine Gaul; and in that Province he remained during the whole summer, endeavouring to strengthen himself to the utmost against any attempts of his adversaries. In order to acquire some reputation for himself, and to obtain the means of attaching his soldiers to him by his liberality, he employed his time in attacking some of the Gaulish tribes who inhabited the Alps;† and having taken many of their strong-holds, and wasted their country, he received from his army the title of *Imperator*, and was enabled, as he hoped, to gratify it with a large share of plunder.

Decimus Brutus takes possession of Cisalpine Gaul.

Soon after the departure of the conspirators from Rome, Antonius proceeded to show the use which he intended to make of the confirmation of Cæsar's Acts by the Senate. In spite of the restriction to which he had himself assented, that no new grant should be published after the Ides of March, Antonius is accused of having commenced a system of audacious forgeries,‡ affixing notices in the *Forum* of all sorts of donations and immunities, both to States and private individuals, which he pretended to have discovered amongst Cæsar's papers; but which he is charged with having invented at his own discretion, and sold as an unfailing source of revenue to himself. Besides all this, he is taxed with having appropriated an immense treasure which Cæsar had acquired by his confiscations and plunderings, and had deposited in the Temple of Ops. With this money Antonius is said to have discharged the debts of his colleague Dolabella, and to have thus secured him to his own interests; at the same time he found his power of selling forged grants so profitable to himself, that, if we may believe Cicero, he paid all his own debts to the amount of above £300,000. in the short interval that elapsed between the Ides of March and the first of April.

Antonius forges grants in Cæsar's name, and sells them for his own benefit.

In order to obviate effectually all opposition to his views, he made a progress through several parts of Italy in the months of April and May,§ in which he took occasion to address himself to Cæsar's veterans in their different settlements, and to conjure them to bind themselves by oath, to maintain all Cæsar's Acts; and to procure the appointment of two Commissioners to inspect his papers every month, in order to decide whether all their provisions were duly carried into effect. He also spread a report, that the veterans would be most nearly concerned in the discussion which was to take place in the Senate on the first of June;* and this rumour induced them, as he intended, to assemble in crowds at Rome, so that it became unsafe for the conspirators or their friends to be present at the meeting. Yet, during all this time, Antonius preserved an appearance of respect and civility towards Brutus and Cassius. He had prevailed on them to dismiss their friends, who had assembled from several of the municipal towns of Italy to protect them, assuring them that it would be wise to avoid every appearance of suspicion or hostility; and he had also proposed to the Senate, that Brutus should be dispensed from the observation of the law,† which forbade a Prætor to be more than ten days absent from Rome. He wrote also to Cicero in very friendly language, requesting him to consent to the restoration of Sex. Clodius from exile; and telling him, that although he might be bound in duty to restore him, as his recal had been one of Cæsar's Acts, yet he would not press the point, unless Cicero was willing to agree to it. Cicero, in return, assured Antonius of his perfect readiness to comply with his request; and added, that both on public and private grounds there was no man for whom he entertained a higher regard.‡ Such was his language towards the end of the month of April; in the September following he delivered his first Philippic.

In the mean time the tidings of Cæsar's murder had reached his nephew C. Octavius at Apollonia; whither, as we have before-mentioned, he had been sent to complete his education, and to be in readiness also to attend his uncle when he should set out on his expedition into Parthia. As the probable heir of Cæsar's greatness, he already received many attentions from the officers of the army which was then quartered in Macedonia; and when Cæsar's death was known, M. Vipsanius, Agrippa, and Q. Sabidienus Rufus, who are here first spoken of as his friends,§ advised him to embrace the offers which many of the soldiers and Centurions made him, of assisting him to revenge his uncle's murder. But as he was not yet aware of the strength of that party which he would find opposed to him, he judged it expedient in the first instance to return to Italy in a private manner. On his arrival at Brundusium he learned the particulars of Cæsar's death, and was informed also of the contents of his will,‖ by which himself was declared his heir, and his adopted son. He did not hesitate instantly to accept this adoption, and to assume the name of Cæsar; and, it is said, numerous parties of his uncle's veterans, who had obtained settlements in the districts of Italy through which he passed, came from their homes to meet him, and to assure him of their support.¶ He arrived at Neapolis on the eighteenth of April,** and had an interview there with L. Balbus,

C. Octavius returns to Italy from Epirus.

He courts Cæsar's veteran soldiers.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. i.
† Ibid. lib. xi. epist. iv.
‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 86. Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 37, 38. *Philippic.* v. c. 4. *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. xii. xviii.
§ Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 39. *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. xxi.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. ii.
† Ibid. *Philippic.* ii. c. 13.
‡ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. xiii. B. *Nam quum te semper amavi, primum tuo studio, post etiam beneficio provocatus: tum his Temporibus Respublica te mihi ita commendavit, ut cariorem habeam neminem.*
§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 85.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 271. Velleius Paterculus, *ubi suprà.*
¶ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iii. c. 12.
** Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. x.

who had been so long the confidential friend of Cæsar, and who reported to Cicero, on the very same day, that Octavius was resolved to accept the inheritance bequeathed to him. From Neapolis he proceeded to see his mother, and his father-in-law, L. Philippus, at their villa near Puteoli. It happened that Cicero was at this time at his own villa, which was almost close to that of Philippus;* and not only L. Balbus, but A. Hirtius and C. Pansa were also staying in the same neighbourhood. Octavius, doubtless, consulted these old adherents of his uncle with some anxiety, as to the prospects which were opened to him at Rome; he expressed, however, great respect and regard for Cicero, as he was disposed at present to conciliate persons of every party; although Cicero, in conformity with the example of L. Philippus, did not address him by the name of Cæsar. It is said, indeed, that both his mother and his father-in-law earnestly dissuaded him from coming forward as his uncle's heir, and from availing himself of his adoption into the Julian family;† but his own resolution was taken, and he continued his journey to Rome without loss of time.

He is coolly received by Antonius.

On his arrival in the Capital, he requested an interview with M. Antonius, hoping, probably, to form at once a coalition with him, in order to take vengeance on the perpetrators of his uncle's murder; but Antonius was at this time in the height of his power, as the executor, in a manner, of Cæsar's grants and ordinances; nor was he disposed to admit such an associate as Octavius, who, as the relation and heir of Cæsar, would naturally take the highest place in any party that might be formed to avenge his death. Accordingly he treated him with great coolness, and declined any cooperation with him; upon which, Octavius, not at all discouraged, proceeded to exhibit some Games to the people in honour of Cæsar's victories,‡ the management of which was undertaken by two of Cæsar's old friends, Matius and Postumius. It was on this occasion that Octavius ventured to exhibit Cæsar's State chair, which the Senate had allowed him to use, whenever he appeared in public; but the Tribunes of the people ordered it to be removed; and it appears that the whole of the Equestrian order loudly applauded them for doing so. It is said, too, that Antonius, in this instance, supported the Tribunes;§ and that he also opposed the views which Octavius entertained of being elected Tribune himself,‖ in the place of one of that body who happened to die about this time. Irritated at this behaviour, Octavius began to turn his attention to the Aristocratical party,¶ to speak with apparent respect of Brutus and Cassius, and seem desirous of courting the friendship of Cicero. In the meantime he exerted himself more earnestly to secure to himself the attachment of the legions,** well knowing that if he could gain their support, he might make his own terms either with Antonius, or with the Aristocracy.

We may suppose that Antonius felt himself greatly strengthened by the favourable reception which Cæsar's colonies of veterans had given him, during his progress through different parts of Italy in the months of April and May. The expectations of the veterans were raised by the reports so industriously spread, that their interests would be nearly concerned in the measures to be proposed at Rome when the Senate should assemble on the first of June; and it was probably whispered among them, that the Aristocratical party would endeavour to recal or to diminish the grants of land which they were at present enjoying. Suspicions of a similar kind were, indeed, not confined to the soldiers and inferior officers, but were shared largely by those who had been most familiarly connected with Cæsar, by Balbus, Hirtius, Oppius, Matius, and by their friends in general. Assassination is a crime which when once practised or defended by a political party, must render it impossible for their opponents to trust them again; and while Cæsar's friends regarded the late Dictator as the victim of his own unsuspecting confidence, they naturally imagined that the conspirators and their friends assumed the language of moderation only whilst they were overawed by the populace and the veterans;* and that so soon as Decimus Brutus should have organized an army in Cisalpine Gaul, and Sex. Pompeius with his rapidly increasing force should have arrived from Spain to join him, the Aristocratical party would retract the concessions made in the Temple of the Earth on the seventeenth of March, and would annul all the acts of Cæsar's sovereignty, as they had formerly intended to do to those of his first Consulship. With regard to Brutus and Cassius themselves, although they were living in apparent privacy at Lanuvium, yet it was suspected that they were turning their views towards the eastern Provinces,† and were trusting to establish their ascendency over that portion of the Empire. Their associate Trebonius was already gone to take possession of the Province of Asia. Q. Cæcilius Bassus was still in arms against Cæsar's officers in Syria; Deiotarus, King of Galatia,‡

Cæsar's friends are suspicious of the designs of the Aristocratical party.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xi. epist. xii.

† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 86. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 8.

‡ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. xxviii. *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. iii.

§ Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 16. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iii. c. 30.

‖ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 10. Appian, lib. iii. c. 31. Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 272.

¶ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. xii.

** Ibid. lib. xv. epist. iv. dated the twenty-third of May. In this letter there occurs a passage which is given variously and corruptly in the MSS. but which Schütz in his edition has ventured to alter, on conjecture, into *De Legione probâ*. He supposes that Cicero alludes to a disposition manifested by one of the legions to take part against Antonius. That Octavius was intriguing with Cæsar's veterans is stated by Appian, lib. iii. c. 31; but none of them actually joined him in arms till a later period.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xiv. epist. xxii. *Τυθέως hanc habent, (scil. Cæsariani,) eamque præ se ferunt, virum clarissimum interfectum, totam Rempublicam illius interitu perturbatam; irrita fore quæ ille egisset, simul ac desistamus timere; clementiam illi malo fuisse, quâ si usus non esset, nihil ei tale accidere potuisse.*

† It is asserted by Appian, lib. iii. c. 2, and by Florus, lib. iv. c. 7. that Macedonia and Syria had been assigned by Cæsar to Brutus and Cassius before his death; and Appian adds, that this appointment was confirmed by the Senate on the seventeenth of March, but afterwards revoked by Antonius before the arrival of Octavius at Rome. But it is evident from Cicero, that this was not the case, and that Brutus and Cassius had not, like Trebonius and Decimus Brutus, any Provinces of which they could claim the command, till the Senate in the month of June or July, while appointing the Prætors as usual to their Provincial Governments, bestowed on them respectively, Crete, and, as it appears, Cyrenaica. These proofs of the inaccuracy of the later writers make us approach with regret to that period when we shall be obliged to follow them entirely, and when we shall lose the invaluable guidance of Cicero, whose letters are our only good authority for the transactions of these times.

‡ Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 37.

whom Cæsar had deprived of a part of his dominions for his adherence to the cause of Pompey, had immediately, upon receiving tidings of Cæsar's death, reinstated himself in the territories which he had lost; the name of Cassius was highly respected in Syria, from the ability which he had shown in preserving the wreck of Crassus's army after the Parthian expedition, and more recently in conducting the operations of the Syrian squadron in Pompey's fleet, during the late Civil wars; and there were in Greece and Macedonia many who had suffered severely from Cæsar's confiscations,* and who would therefore gladly contribute to aid the reviving cause of the Aristocracy. On all these accounts the better class of Cæsar's friends distrusted the fair professions of the conspirators, and dreaded the approach of a counter revolution; while Antonius and Dolabella, sharing these feelings perhaps themselves, and at any rate well aware of the policy of pretending to feel them, prepared to make these suspicions their own ground of justification for the violent cause which they were now going to pursue.

The presence of the veterans at Rome, and the hostile feelings which they were said to entertain towards the friends of the old Constitution, created an unwillingness on the part of the conspirators and their friends, to attend the approaching meeting of the Senate on the first of June. As the day drew nearer, the violent dispositions of the soldiers seemed likely to find a leader in Antonius; and the show of military force at his disposal was so menacing, that a considerable proportion of the Senators absented themselves from the Capital;† and their absence furnished Antonius with a pretext for neglecting the authority of the Senate from this time forward. Accordingly, on the second of June,‡ a law was passed in the Assembly of the People, intrusting to the Consuls the entire cognizance of all Cæsar's Acts and measures, and thus sanctioning that absolute controul which they already exercised, by having Cæsar's papers in their possession; and, it is added, his Secretary in their pay.§ Another law bestowed on Antonius the command of the Province of Cisalpine Gaul for six years,‖ together with the army which had been sent over into Greece by Cæsar, in preparation for his expedition against Parthia. This was in direct violation of Cæsar's law, which forbade the Consular Provinces to be given to any one for a longer period than two years; but, if we may believe Cicero,¶ the soldiers of Antonius occupied all the avenues to the *Forum*, and kept out all whom they thought likely to oppose the measure. At the same time Macedonia was given for two years, equally in defiance of Cæsar's law, to C. Antonius, the brother of Marcus, who was one of the Prætors for the year;** and P. Dolabella obtained the appointment to the Province of Syria.

Laws passed by Antonius and Dolabella.

On the fifth of June the Senate was again assembled,† and it was voted that Brutus should be sent into Asia, and Cassius into Sicily, to buy corn, and see that it was transported to Rome for the supply of the market of the Capital. Brutus and Cassius were at this time at Antium,‡ and Cicero met them there on the eighth, and consulted with them on the propriety of accepting or refusing such an appointment. The commission to buy corn they considered as degrading; and Servilia, the mother of Brutus, who, from her intimacy with Cæsar, enjoyed considerable influence amongst the members of his party, assured Cassius, who was particularly averse to it, that she would procure the repeal of that part of the Senate's decree which related to the corn. However, both Brutus and Cassius were invested with the character of public officers, and Provinces were voted to them in common with the other Prætors;§ but whether the vote was passed at this time, or a few weeks later, does not sufficiently appear. It was proposed, we are told, by Antonius, and was accompanied by a permission to them to appoint a greater number of Lieutenants than was usually allowed; for Antonius had not yet laid aside the appearance of friendship towards them. Yet his other acts as Consul seemed to declare that he was not really inclined to content himself with the condition of a citizen in a free Commonwealth. He brought forward at once an Agrarian law, a change in the constitution of the judicial power, and another in the manner of proceeding aginst persons charged with rioting, or with treasonable practices. So invariably did each new adventurer tread in the steps of his predecessors, and endeavour to reopen the door which they had successively hoped to shut against all future demagogues, so soon as they had themselves passed through it. By his Agrarian law, Antonius proposed to nominate a commission of seven persons,‖ who were to possess the usual exorbitant powers granted to such Commissioners in declaring what were national domains, and in distributing them at their pleasure. Their authority was so extensive, that Cicero hyperbolically describes them as empowered to divide the whole of Italy;¶ and it is mentioned, that Campania,** together with some of the most valuable lands possessed by the Commonwealth in Sicily, were amongst the districts to be subjected to their disposal. The Constitution of the judicial power had been, as we have seen, a frequent subject of dispute during the course of the last century; and one of Cæsar's late enactments had bestowed it, exclusively, on the Senatorian and Equestrian orders, and had repealed the more liberal provisions of the Aurelian law, by which it had been communicated also to some of the wealthiest class of the plebeians. Antonius, however, proposed not only to repeal Cæsar's restrictions, but to open the judicial power more indiscriminately than ever, by making any man eligible

Laws of Antonius.

---

* The people of Buthrotum in Epirus, for instance, are often spoken of in Cicero's letters as having had their lands confiscated by Cæsar for the benefit of his veterans. And the people of Dymè, in Achaia, being in the same predicament, had recourse to piracy about this very time, to afford them a maintenance. See Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. i.

† Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 42.

‡ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. xvi.

§ Ibid. lib. xiv. epist. xviii. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iii. c. 5.

‖ Ibid. *Philippic.* v. c. 3. Ibid. ii. c. 42. Ibid. i. c. 2. 8. Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 274.

¶ *Philippic.* i. c. 2. 10. Ibid. v. c. 4.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* v. c. 3. Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 274, 277.

† Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. ix.

‡ Ibid. epist. xi. § Ibid. *Philippic.* ii. c. 13.

‖ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. xix. *Philippic.* vi. c. 4.

¶ Ibid. *Philippic.* v. c. 3.

** Ibid. ii. c. 39.

who had ever held the rank of Centurion;* and, in fact, by so removing all the qualifications formerly required, that common soldiers and naturalized foreigners might now become Judges. His third and worst measure was, to allow an appeal to the People from all persons convicted before the ordinary tribunals, of any acts in violation of the public peace;† a law which was, in fact, a promise of impunity to all who should be guilty of riots or seditions. These acts were all carried, it is said, by violence,‡ and in contempt of all the religious impediments with which their opponents attempted to obstruct their course. Antonius was openly escorted by armed men in the *Forum*, and in the Senate; and the veterans, whose grants of land he had taken care to confirm by the authority of the people, were present in crowds in the Capital to support him against all opposition.

Growing animosity between Antonius and the conspirators.

While these proceedings were going on at Rome, Brutus and Cassius were chiefly at Antium, or in Campania; and both were preparing to pass over into Asia. Brutus was to exhibit some Games at Rome in the early part of July;§ but as he did not like to appear in the city himself, C. Antonius, as one of his colleagues in the Prætorship, undertook the management of them in his name. It was on this occasion that the people eagerly caught at some passages in one of the dramatic entertainments which seemed applicable to Brutus, and received them with enthusiastic applause. This, perhaps, irritated and alarmed Antonius; nor was he pleased that Brutus and Cassius, in one of their proclamations which they issued as Prætors, should have declared their intention still to absent themselves from Rome on account of the disordered state of the Capital,‖ and that they were evidently preparing to leave Italy and repair to the eastern Provinces. Antonius, in a counter proclamation, treated this language as a declaration of war, and threatened to have recourse to arms; his tone in his public speeches became more arrogant; and he was heard to say openly, that none could hope to save their lives, except their party should prove victorious;¶ which was, in other words, a denunciation of woe to the vanquished. L. Piso, Cæsar's father-in-law,** ventured to speak against Antonius in the Senate on the first of August, but no one supported him, and finding all resistance hopeless, he forbore to attend in the Senate again. Yet soon after this it appears that Brutus and Cassius entertained the hope of organizing a more successful opposition;†† for they sent letters to all the Senators of Consular and Prætorian rank, requesting them to be present in the Senate on the first of September; and on the seventeenth of August Brutus met Cicero at Velia; and finding that he had already renounced his design of leaving Italy, and was then returning to Rome, he expressed the greatest satisfaction at this change of purpose, and his hopes that Cicero was going to take an active part in the administration of the Commonwealth. It is probable that Brutus and Cassius, being now fully resolved to secure to themselves, if possible, the resources of the eastern Provinces, were anxious to acquire such a support in the Senate, as might free them from the charge of rebellion, and might ensure, for all their proceedings, the sanction of the Government at home. We cannot tell, however, by what means they hoped to deprive Antonius of his military superiority in Italy; and yet, while he retained it, they could not calculate on their party's obtaining the ascendency either in the Senate or in the *Forum*. Perhaps they trusted that many of Cæsar's old officers, and particularly Hirtius and Pansa, the two Consuls elect, were disgusted with the late conduct of Antonius, and would be able to counteract his influence over the minds of the soldiers.* But their plans and their cause were finally ruined by the interference of C. Octavius; who, taking to himself the part which Hirtius and Pansa might have performed sincerely and effectually, succeeded indeed in drawing away the army from Antonius, but only to attach it to himself; and coming forward as the heir and adopted son of Cæsar, rallied around him the whole strength of his uncle's adherents, and was thus enabled, eventually, to dictate terms to Antonius on the one hand, and on the other to crush for ever the reviving hopes of the Aristocracy.

Sex. Pompeius restored to his country by an agreement with Lepidus.

It was about this time that the Aristocratical party lost an army, which, if it had existed for a few months longer, might have altered the whole complexion of affairs. We have already stated that Sex. Pompeius was in arms against the officers of Cæsar in Spain, at the period of Cæsar's assassination. He had been gradually increasing his strength, had defeated C. Asinius Pollio, Cæsar's Lieutenant,† and had made himself master of New Carthage, and of most of the towns in what was called the Farther Spain. The tidings of Cæsar's death gave him great encouragement, and produced a general sensation in his favour; he had seven legions under his command, which constituted a formidable force, although they were probably composed chiefly of ill-disciplined troops, and might not perhaps have had their full compliment in point of numbers. Thus circumstanced, he addressed a letter to the Consuls at Rome, couched, according to Cicero, in firm but temperate language, in which he demanded his restoration to his country; and that all armies in every part of the Empire should be equally disbanded. At the same time he wrote to his father-in-law, L. Libo,‡ to say that he would conclude no peace, unless he could recover the property of his father which had been confiscated by Cæsar, and sold to different individuals by public auction. The validity of these sales, as well as of all the rest of Cæsar's Acts, had been recently confirmed by law; and besides, Antonius himself had been the purchaser of Pompey's house at Rome, and was now actually residing in it; so that it was not likely to be given up without some compensation. But at this time M. Lepidus commanded the Province of the Hither Spain;§ and thus found himself exposed to the first attacks of an enemy who had already overrun the

* Cicero, *Philippic.* i. c. 8. Ibid. v. c. 5, 6.
† Ibid. i. 9, 10.
‡ Ibid. i. c. 10. Ibid. ii. c. 42. Ibid. v. c. 4. 6, 7.
§ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. xxvi. lib. xvi. epist. i. ii. Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 338.
‖ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. iii.
¶ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. xxii. *Philippic.* v. c. 8. *nisi victorem, neminem victurum.*
** Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. vii. *Philippic.* i. c. 4. 6.
†† Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. vii.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. xxii. dated on the twenty-fifth of June.
† Ibid. lib. xvi. epist. iv. Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 274, 275.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. iv.
§ Ibid. *Philippic.* v. c. 14, 15. Ibid. xiii. c. 4, 5. Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 275.

whole of the Farther Spain, and had defeated one of Cæsar's Lieutenants in the field. Lepidus felt himself unequal to the contest, and was therefore warmly disposed to accede to all that Sex. Pompeius requested.* The Senate willingly confirmed what Lepidus had promised; and it was agreed that Sex. Pompeius should be restored to his country, and that a sum amounting to about £5,650,000. should be granted to him out of the Treasury, to enable him to redeem his father's property. Satisfied with these conditions, Pompeius gave up his army, quitted the Province in which he had so long maintained himself, and repaired to Massilia,† where he remained for some time in a state of suspense, not deeming it expedient or safe to return to Rome in the midst of those disorders which had now again begun to distract the Commonwealth.

Cicero commences his opposition to Antonius.

We have said that Cicero was met by Brutus at Velia on the seventeenth of August, and was requested by him to take an active part from henceforward in the management of public affairs,—in other words, to put himself at the head of the Aristocratical party, and make one vigorous attempt to recover for them their ancient ascendency. This, indeed, was now become Cicero's fixed resolution; he thought he saw a more favourable opportunity for acting with effect, than had occurred at any period of the late war between Cæsar and Pompey; and laying aside at last all hesitation, he went to Rome to commence his memorable career of opposition to Antonius, and to all the partisans of his revolutionary system. He arrived in the Capital on the thirty-first of August, and on the following day the Senate was to assemble, in order to vote a solemn thanksgiving to the Gods in honour of Cæsar's exploits. According to his own account,‡ Cicero feeling some fatigue from his journey, and not considering the business on which the Senate was summoned to be very important, forbore to attend the meeting. His absence greatly exasperated Antonius, who interpreted it probably into an insinuation that it was useless to appear in the Senate while the debates of that body were overawed by a military force. Accordingly, Antonius spoke with great violence, and threatened to come and pull down Cicero's house, if he persisted in absenting himself. It was usual, we must remember, for the Consuls to enforce the attendance of Senators either by a fine, or by seizing some article of their property as a security for their appearance; but the threat of Antonius far exceeded the authority which any former Consuls had been known to exercise in similar circumstances. On the following day, however, Cicero did attend the Senate, when Antonius in his turn was absent; and he then delivered the speech which is known by the name of the first Philippic Oration. It contains a strong condemnation of the measures which Antonius was pursuing, expressed however in temperate language, and unmixed with personalities; yet it gave Antonius the greatest offence. He summoned the Senate to meet again on the nineteenth of September, and on that day replied to Cicero's attack upon his measures by a violent invective,* in which, amongst other things, he charged him with being an accomplice in Cæsar's murder; intending, as Cicero asserted, to excite the resentment of the veterans against him, and hoping that they would make some attempts on his life, if he ventured to appear in the Senate-house. But Cicero having suspected, whether justly or no, that he could not attend without danger, was resolved not to risk the experiment; and similar fears, he tells us, kept away P. Servilius, who had expressed the same sentiments as he had done on the second of September; and L. Piso, who had set the first example of opposition to Antonius, by his speech on the first of August. The famous Oration, therefore, which is entitled the second Philippic, and which professes to have been spoken in the Senate on the nineteenth of September in reply to the invectives of Antonius, was in reality never delivered at all; but was written by Cicero about this time, and sent to Atticus in the month of October, with an express caution that he would not let it be seen by those friends of Antonius who were in the habit of visiting at his house.† In fact, Cicero retired into the country soon afterwards, and remained for some time at one or other of his villas, only going to Rome at intervals, and leaving it again immediately. He thought that nothing could be done in the Senate till the new Consuls entered upon their office; meantime an unexpected enemy suddenly came forward against Antonius, and attacked him with weapons more effectual than Cicero's eloquence.

C. Octavius comes forward against Antonius.

We have seen that C. Octavius had been coolly received by Antonius at his first arrival in Rome, after Cæsar's murder. It is said that not content with slighting him as a political associate, Antonius endeavoured to obstruct, or at least to delay, his adoption into the Julian family; as he could not claim the possession of his uncle's inheritance,‡ till he had gone through the forms by which he became Cæsar's adopted son. On this provocation, Octavius resolved to do himself justice by the most atrocious means, and although he was only nineteen years of age, he suborned some ruffians to assassinate Antonius,§ the Consul of the Republic, in his own house. The attempt was discovered in time, but it threw Antonius into the utmost perplexity and alarm. As it had not succeeded, a large portion of the people doubted its reality, and believed that the charge had been falsely brought forward against Octavius, in order to procure his ruin, that Antonius might enjoy his property without disturbance. So strong in fact was the public feeling, and so unpopular was Antonius at this period, that he did not think it advisable to bring his intended assassins to trial. But he trembled at the insecurity of his situation; and finding that Octavius was now leagued with his enemies, and being informed probably of the intrigues which he was carrying on with Cæsar's veterans, he thought that he should require the support of a stronger military force than the guard with which he had hitherto protected

---

* *Quum Lepido omnes Imperatores forent meliores*, is the remark of Velleius Paterculus on another occasion, lib. ii. c. 89, and it is equally applicable here.

† Cicero, *Philippic.* xiii. c. 6. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iv. c. 84.

‡ Cicero, *Philippic.* i. c. 5, *et seq.*

* Cicero, *Philippic.* v. c. 7. *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. ii.

† Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. xi. *Caleni interventum et Calvenæ cavebis.*

‡ Florus, lib. iv. c. 4. Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 272.

§ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xxiii. Seneca, *de Clementiâ*, lib. i. c. 9.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

his person, and by which he had overawed the Senate and the Forum. In justice to his memory we should remember, that the assassination of Cæsar might well have deterred him from exposing himself in a similar manner to the daggers of the conspirators or of their partisans; and that when Cicero so loudly complains of the introduction of a barbarian guard into the Senate-house, he should have reflected that the crime committed by his own friends, had rendered such a precaution natural, if not necessary. Be this as it may, Antonius thought his present force insufficient any longer to defend him; and accordingly he set out on the ninth of October for Brundusium,* in order to secure the four legions which were quartered in that neighbourhood, and which having formed part of the army assembled in Macedonia by Cæsar for his Parthian expedition, had lately returned to Italy, and remained still embodied, under no other authority than that of their own immediate officers. When he arrived at Brundusium,† he proceeded to address the soldiers, and offered to each man a gratuity of about £3. 4s. 7d. in order to win them to his interests; but far from receiving this offer with thankfulness, the troops murmured at it and ridiculed it, as utterly inadequate to their expectations; and many of the Centurions and soldiers appeared inclined to disown his authority altogether. Alarmed at these symptoms, he sent for several of those Centurions, whom he most suspected, to his own quarters, and there caused them to be instantly executed. But this severity failed to effect its object; the legions could not be prevailed upon to follow him; and at the same time the tidings which he received of the proceedings of Octavius, made him feel the necessity of returning to Rome without delay. In fact, no sooner had he set out for Brundusium, than Octavius hastened into Campania, and by giving to each man a donation of about £16.‡ he prevailed upon Cæsar's veterans, who had been settled at Casilinum and Calatia, to join his standard. He then applied to some other of the military colonies in that neighbourhood, and succeeded in raising a considerable force, which he began to organize at Capua with the greatest activity. The municipal towns,§ no less than the establishments of the veterans, testified the strongest attachment to his cause; and he wrote at the same time to Cicero, requesting a personal interview with him, asking his advice as to his subsequent movements, and wishing him to come forward as his avowed associate, and to exert his influence in the Senate in his behalf.

He persuades Cæsar's veterans to join him.

Cicero could not but entertain a natural distrust of so dangerous an assistant; and expressed, in a letter to Atticus,‖ his unavailing wishes that Brutus were at hand instead of Octavius to turn the impending crisis to the advantage of the Commonwealth. But Brutus and Cassius were already on the other side of the Ionian Gulf; and to wait for their return was impossible. In an evil hour, therefore for himself, did Cicero listen to the advances of Octavius, and encourage him to repair to Rome, and endeavour to strengthen his party by the favour of the popular assembly. Octavius adopted this plan, and was introduced into the *Forum*, and brought forward to speak, by the Tribune Tiberius Canutius,* one of the most violent enemies of Antonius. But his speech was ill calculated to please the Aristocratical party; for he attempted, we are told, to recommend himself to the popular favour as the heir and adopted son of Cæsar; he dwelt largely on the great services of the late Dictator; and when making some promises with regard to his own future conduct, he stretched out his hand towards a statue of Cæsar, which Antonius had lately placed in the *Rostra*,† and swore that he would be true to his word, "as he hoped to arrive at his father's greatness." But not feeling himself strong enough as yet to maintain the Capital against Antonius, and finding, if we may believe Appian, that the veterans were not well disposed to fight in such a quarrel, he withdrew into Tuscany with his forces, and endeavoured to get some assistance from that quarter.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

In the meantime Antonius was returning with all speed to Rome, attended by the legion of the Alaudæ,‡ a corps which had been raised by Cæsar in Transalpine Gaul, and had afterwards, as we have seen, been admitted by him to the rights of Roman citizens. Since his death this legion had been greatly favoured by Antonius, and its common soldiers had been rendered capable, by his law, of serving amongst the third order of Judges on criminal trials. He had therefore apparently taken it with him to Brundusium, and was now returning with it to Rome; for the four legions which he had gone to secure, had not received him so cordially as to induce him to rely on them in any critical service; and he was well satisfied that they should consent to march by themselves towards Gaul; there, as he hoped, to receive him as their Commander when he should arrive to take possession of that Province. The Alaudæ then formed his escort when he approached Rome, and were left by him at Tibur, while he entered the city with no other force apparently than that which he had been long in the habit of employing to support his authority or secure his person. He then, as Consul, issued a number of proclamations,§ charging Octavius with rebellion, and threatening the severest punishments against some other individuals whom he considered as his abettors. He summoned the Senate to meet on the twenty-fourth of November, and announced that if any member absented himself, he would be justly considered as a conspirator against the Consul's life, and a party to the treasonable counsels of Octavius. But he soon learned that one of the legions from Brundusium,‖ instead of pursuing its march towards Gaul, had suddenly turned off towards the Capital, and had actually stationed itself at Alba in a state of open disobedience to his authority. He then repaired to the troops whom he had left at Tibur, and tried, we may suppose, to assure himself of their fidelity, by promising to them abundant rewards out of the property of his antagonists.

Two of the legions desert Antonius and join Octavius.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xxiii.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 276. Cicero, *Philippic.* iii. c. 2. Ibid. v. c. 8.
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. viii. ix.
§ Ibid. lib. xvi. epist. xi.
‖ Ibid. lib. xvi. epist. viii. "*O Brute, ubi es? quantam exspectationem amittis!*"

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 276. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iii. c. 41.
† Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. iii. *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. xv. *Jurat*, "*ita sibi parentis honores consequi liceat;*" *et simul dextram intendit ad statuam.*
‡ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xvi. epist. viii.
§ Ibid. *Philippic.* iii. c. 7, 8. Ibid. iii. c. 3. Ibid. xiii. c. 9.

Again he returned to Rome, feeling it important, if possible, still to maintain possession of the Capital; and not choosing, whatever was his reason, to attend in the Senate on the twenty-fourth, he postponed the meeting of that body to the twenty-eighth,* and summoned the Senators then to assemble in the Capitol. He was extremely anxious to fortify himself by their authority, and to obtain a vote which should declare Octavius and his abettors public enemies. For this purpose he prohibited three individuals by name,† all of them his vehement opponents, from appearing in the Senate on this occasion; threatening one of them with death, according to Cicero, if he ventured to disobey his injunction. But just before the Senate assembled, he was informed that the fourth legion,‡ another of those which he had met at Brundusium, had not only stopped its march towards Gaul, but had actually joined the standard of Octavius in Tuscany. Under the impression produced on men's minds by this intelligence, he dared not submit to the Senate his intended motion on the state of the Commonwealth, lest the decision of the majority might rather favour his enemies than himself. His only hope lay in the success of his arms, and in stopping, by his presence, the growing spirit of disaffection among the soldiers. Accordingly, the Senate was only consulted on the question of voting the usual thanksgivings to the Gods in honour of M. Lepidus for his services in Spain; and as soon as the Senators separated, Antonius proceeded to the customary allotment of the Provinces to the different Magistrates of the year on the expiration of their term of office. His brother, C. Antonius, received his nomination to the Province of Macedonia, which had been already, as we have seen, conferred on him by the People; and he himself, in the same manner, entered upon his own appointment to the command of Cisalpine Gaul. He immediately assumed the military dress, and left the city with the utmost secresy to take the command of his troops at Tibur;§ whence he hastened, by cross roads, towards his Province, fearing lest Octavius might intercept his march.

Antonius retires from Rome to Cisalpine Gaul.

On his arrival at Ariminum he found there the two remaining legions from Brundusium, which acknowledged his authority without dispute; and with them a third, according to Appian,‖ which had returned from Macedonia after Antonius's departure from Brundusium, and, choosing to embrace his party, had followed the other two which still adhered to him into Gaul. These forces, together with the legion of the Alaudæ, and a considerable number of the veterans from Cæsar's colonies, who preferred his service to that of Octavius, formed all together an imposing army; and there was nothing in Cisalpine Gaul which could offer to them any resistance in the field. But Decimus Brutus, who, as we have seen, had held the command of that Province for some months, was resolved not lightly to abandon it; and accordingly threw himself into the town of Mutina,¶ to maintain that place against the invader. Antonius immediately advanced and began to lay siege to it; and thus the Commonwealth was again involved in a Civil war, when little more than a year had elapsed since the termination of hostilities in Spain, and the last triumphant return of Cæsar to Rome.

He is opposed by Dec. Brutus, whom he besieges in Mutina.

When Antonius left the Capital to take possession of Cisalpine Gaul, his colleague, P. Dolabella, seems to have been already on his way towards Syria. We find that he was at his villa, near Formiæ, in the latter end of October,* and that he then was making some arrangements for the payment of a debt due from him to Cicero, while he should be absent from Italy.

Hence he probably crossed over into Greece soon afterwards, accompanied by a small military force; so that Rome, in the beginning of December, was deserted by both the Consuls, while of the Tribunes, two at least, Tiberius Canutius and L. Cassius, were warmly devoted to the party of the Aristocracy. The Senate and people of Rome seem now, for the first time during many years, to have been left to express their sentiments freely; the terror of a military force was removed on the one hand, nor does the peace of the city seem to have been disturbed by any disorders of the populace on the other. The measures of the Government therefore, and the votes of individuals were likely now, if ever, to be independent, and wise, and pure; debased only by that inevitable alloy which the actions and principles of men will always contract from the original folly and selfishness of human nature. But the influence of eloquence is a less unworthy motive than the fear of the sword; and it was a fit reward for the general purity of Cicero's character, that his ascendency marked the last moments of his country's freedom; and that when Rome was left to herself, she followed his guidance with enthusiastic affection. Immediately on the departure of Antonius, he hastened to return to the Capital, where he arrived on the ninth of December.† The Tribunes had summoned the Senate to meet on the twentieth, that a vote might be passed empowering the Consuls elect, Hirtius and Pansa, to provide for the assembling the Senate in safety on the first of January. A very few days before the twentieth, there appeared a proclamation from Decimus Brutus, in which he engaged to maintain the Province of Cisalpine Gaul against the attempts of Antonius, and to preserve it in a state of obedience to the authority of the Senate and people. This declaration was likely to encourage the timid and the wavering; and that the impression produced by it might not be lost, Cicero went very early to the Senate on the morning of the twentieth, and having thus awakened an interest in men's minds, and procured a full attendance of Senators, he delivered the speech which is entitled the third Philippic. In this he proposed that the Senate should declare its approbation of the conduct of Decimus Brutus, and of the Province of Cisalpine Gaul, in upholding the Senate's authority; that it should also express its gratitude to Octavius, and to the two legions which had deserted Antonius; and that it should order Decimus Brutus, and all other officers who held commands in the Provinces by virtue of Cæsar's arrangements, to retain their governments till the Senate should think proper to supersede them.

Cicero returns to Rome.

---

* Cicero, *Philippic.* iii. c. 8.
† Ibid. iii. c. 9.
‡ Ibid. iii. c. 3. 9.
§ Ibid. iii. c. 10.
‖ *De Bell. Civil.* lib. iii. c. 43. 48.
¶ Cicero, *Philippic.* xiii. c. 9.

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. xiii.
† Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. v. vi. *Philippic.* iii. c. 4, 5.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32

The Senate agreed to all that Cicero wished;* and thus not only was M. Antonius adjudged to have no pretensions to the Province of Gaul, but the claims of his brother upon Macedonia, and of P. Dolabella upon Syria, were condemned on the same ground. Meanwhile the siege of Mutina was carried on with vigour by Antonius, and Octavius having intercepted some cavalry, archers, and elephants,† which were on their way to join the besieging army, was proceeding to attempt the relief of the town, as soon as he should be strengthened by the arrival of the Consuls with fresh troops from Rome. Such was the state of things when the first of January arrived, and the new Consuls, A. Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa, U. C. 710. entered upon their office. They assembled the Senators on the very first day of their Consulship; first to consult them generally on the Commonwealth, and then to determine on the honours which were to be paid to C. Octavius and to his followers, according to the resolution passed before at the meeting of the twentieth of December.

Q. Fufius Calenus defends Antonius in the Senate.

It was not to be expected, composed as the Senate was in a considerable proportion of the partisans of Cæsar, that Antonius should be left altogether without an advocate. The person who first came forward in his behalf was Q. Fufius Calenus, who had been made Consul by Cæsar during the last three or four months of the year 706, and had before commanded a separate division of his army in the campaign of the preceding year in Greece. At an earlier period, in the year 698, he had been one of the Tribunes; and it was owing to a law proposed by him,‡ and directing that the Judges should be chosen by lot, instead of selected by the Prætor, that P. Clodius obtained an acquittal, when tried for his infamous profanation of the Mysteries of the *Bona Dea* in Cæsar's house. He now moved that a deputation from the Senate should be sent to Antonius, to demand of him that he should raise the siege of Mutina;§ that he should abstain from all acts of hostility against Decimus Brutus and the Province of Cisalpine Gaul; and that he should submit himself to the authority of the Senate and People. If he refused to comply with these demands, he was to be declared a public enemy, and the whole population of the State was to assume the military dress, as in a war of the last importance to the general safety. It was not supposed that Antonius would accede to the terms offered him; and as he would gain time to prosecute the siege of Mutina, and to strengthen his party whilst the deputation should be going to his camp from Rome and returning with his answer, Cicero, well aware of the necessity of decisive measures, was anxious, on this very account, that he should be declared a public enemy immediately, and that the people should be summoned at once to take up arms against him. After a vehement debate, however, which was protracted by successive adjournments during three days, the proposal of Q. Calenus prevailed, and it was resolved that a deputation should be sent to Antonius.‖ On other points, the opinion of Cicero was followed, settlements of land were promised to the veterans and to the two legions which had joined Octavius;* and an exemption from military service was granted to them and to their children, except in the case of a war breaking out in Gaul or in Italy. L. Egnatuleius, the Quæstor who had led the fourth legion over to Octavius, was allowed to be a candidate for and to hold any public office three years before he should have attained the age prescribed by law. To Octavius still higher honours were paid. He was constituted an officer of the Commonwealth, with the title and authority of Proprætor; he was admitted into the Senate among the Senators of Prætorian rank; he was allowed to be a candidate for all public offices several years earlier than the law permitted; and on the motion of his step-father, L. Philippus,† an equestrian statue was erected to his honour in the *Rostra*.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45 to 32.

A deputation sent from the Senate to Antonius with proposals of peace.

Immediately after this debate, the deputation, which was to carry the commands of the Senate to Antonius, set out on its journey. It consisted of three members; Servius Sulpicius, the celebrated lawyer, whom Cæsar had appointed Proconsul of Achaia in the year 707; L. Philippus, the step-father of Octavius; and L. Calpurnius Piso, the father-in-law of Cæsar, who had formerly when Consul countenanced the attacks of Clodius upon Cicero, in order to win the favour of the Triumvirate. About the same time, A. Hirtius took the field and marched to the relief of Mutina;‡ while his colleague C. Pansa remained at Rome to superintend the levies of troops which were carrying on with the greatest activity. Cicero meanwhile was exerting himself to the utmost to strengthen the cause of the Commonwealth by securing the fidelity of the different commanders in the western Provinces. If Antonius were obliged to retreat from before Mutina, it was a question of the last importance to him, to ascertain whether he could hope to find an asylum and support in the armies of Spain and of Transalpine Gaul. There were three officers who held commands at this time in those countries; M. Æmilius Lepidus, the Proconsul of Gallia Narbonensis, and of the Hither or Nearer Spain; L. Munatius Plancus, who enjoyed the government of all the other parts of Transalpine Gaul added by Cæsar's conquests to the Roman Empire; and C. Asinius Pollio, who had been employed in the Farther Spain against Sex. Pompeius with the title of Cæsar's Lieutenant, and still possessed the chief authority in that Province. Of these three men Lepidus was likely to join that party which could most work upon his hopes of personal advantage; but his inclinations would lead him to oppose the cause of the Commonwealth, inasmuch as the forms of the old Constitution would confine within moderate bounds his irregular ambition. L. Munatius Plancus is mentioned as one of those persons who received large presents from Cæsar, at the time when he was employing the plunder of Gaul in purchasing partisans among the needy and the prodigal at Rome.§ When the Civil war began, we find that L. Plancus was in

Account of the officers commanding in Gaul and Spain.

M. Æmilius Lepidus.

L. Munatius Plancus

* Cicero, *Philippic.* iv. c. 1, *et seq.* Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 277.
† Cicero, *Philippic.* v. c. 17. Dion Cassius, lib. xlv. p. 276.
‡ Ibid. *ad Atticum*, lib. i. epist. xvi.
§ Ibid. *Philippic.* vi. c. 2, 3. Ibid. vi. c. 1.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* v. c. 17. 19.
† Ibid. *ad Brutum*, lib. i. epist. xv. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 87.
‡ Cicero, *Philippic.* vii. c. 4.
§ Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. viii. epist. i.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Cæsar's service, and held a command in his army in Spain during the campaign against Afranius and Petreius.* At a later period he was one of his Lieutenants in Africa;† and on the whole his conduct throughout the war obtained for him from Cæsar the appointment to the Province of Transalpine Gaul, and the nomination to the Consulship for the year 711, together with Decimus Brutus, so that he was at this time Consul elect. His reputation however had not kept pace with his fortune. Cicero tells him plainly in one of his letters,‡ that he had been generally regarded as a time-server; and Paterculus speaks of him as "behaving with that wavering honour, which was characteristic of him."§ But as he was at the head of an important Province and a considerable army, Cicero tried to attach him to the cause of the Commonwealth; and wrote to him a number of letters to this effect, which he answered with the fairest professions of his zeal in behalf of his country, but without declaring his sentiments with regard to Antonius. C. Asinius Pollio, whose name reminds us that we are arrived at the age of Virgil and Horace, was early distinguished as an orator,‖ and at the beginning of the civil war espoused the party of Cæsar; because, according to his own account,¶ the power of some one of his personal enemies in the camp of Pompey made him afraid to join the standard of the Commonwealth. He served Cæsar faithfully, and was left by him, as we have seen, in the command of the Province of Farther Spain, after the defeat of Cnæus Pompeius at Munda. He had since been opposed to Sex. Pompeius, and had been defeated by him, as we have already mentioned. Yet he professed a great zeal for the liberties of his country, and a determination to resist any person whatsoever who should again attempt to gain absolute sovereignty.** He was at the head of an army of three legions;†† and Antonius had endeavoured already to seduce one of these to his own service, nor had Pollio been able to retain it in its duty without difficulty. In fact the dispositions of the soldiers in general were so adverse to the establishment of the old Constitution, that when they understood the quarrel to be between Antonius and the cause of the Senate and the People, they could not be prevailed upon to support the latter; and it was this circumstance that ensured the success of Octavius, when a few months afterwards he revealed his own treasonable intentions, and enslaved the Senate whose authority he was now affecting to uphold.

C. Asinius Pollio.

Antonius rejects the proposals of the Senate.

Meantime the deputation from the Senate had proceeded to the camp of M. Antonius. Ere its members had reached the end of their journey,‡‡ Ser. Sulpicius, the most distinguished of their number, died of an indisposition which had attacked him before he left Rome, and which had been aggravated by the fatigue of travelling, and by the anxiety which he felt for the success of his mission. His surviving colleagues, L. Philippus and L. Piso, were too nearly connected with the family of Cæsar to be very zealous in the cause of the Commonwealth. They presented the commands of the Senate to Antonius, and consented to carry back to Rome a counter proposal on his part;* in which far from complying with the orders which he had received, he agreed to give up Cisalpine Gaul only on condition of receiving in exchange the Province of Transalpine Gaul for five years,† with an army of six legions, and that his brother should retain Macedonia as long as Brutus and Cassius should enjoy the command of any Provinces as Consuls or Proconsuls. Besides these concessions he demanded grants of lands for the soldiers who had followed him, a confirmation of all grants already made by himself and Dolabella, and of all the decrees issued by them on the pretended authority of Cæsar's papers; and that his law relating to the judicial power should be maintained inviolate. When these proposals were reported to the Senate, L. Cæsar,‡ the uncle of Antonius, moved that the country should be declared in a state of disturbance; and the whole people assumed the military dress, in token of the imminent danger which threatened the Commonwealth. The spirit of all ranks, if we may believe Cicero,§ was keenly alive to the necessity of putting down the rebellion of Antonius: with the exception only of those citizens who were of Consular dignity, whom age or the honours and emoluments which they had gained in the last revolution, made unwilling to risk the chances of another. Besides, many of these persons had been so connected with the party of Cæsar, that the revival of the old Aristocratical interest, supported by the eloquence and integrity of Cicero, was to them a prospect full of apprehension. They served the cause of Antonius at present, by professing an extreme anxiety for peace; but they hoped to espouse it more effectually, and to introduce divisions amongst the opposite party, so soon as they could find a handle to insinuate that whilst Cæsar's friends were quarrelling with one another, the partisans of Pompey were watching for the moment in which they might once more establish their own ascendency.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Nor was the opportunity which they sought for backward in presenting itself. Brutus and Cassius had left Italy in the preceding autumn, with the intention, we may suppose, of strengthening themselves against the enmity of Antonius by the resources of the Eastern Provinces. The opposition begun by Cicero in the Senate on the second of September, and

Proceedings of

* Cæsar, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. and *Auctor de Bell. Africano.*
† Ibid.
‡ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. iii.
§ Lib. ii. c. 89. *Plancus dubiâ, id est, suâ Fide.*
‖ Quintilian, lib. xii. c. 6.
¶ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. xxxi.
** *Si id agitur ut rursus in Potestate omnia unius sint, quicunque is est, ei me profiteor Inimicum.*—Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. xxxi.
†† Ibid. lib. x. epist. xxxii.
‡‡ Ibid. *Philippic.* ix. c. 7.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. iv.
† Ibid. *Philippic.* viii. c. 9. The text towards the latter end of the ninth chapter of the eighth Philippic is evidently defective. One sentence relative to C. Antonius is marked by Schütz as inserted in this place by mistake; but it seems to us that some words have rather been omitted in the preceding sentence, and that the clause, *tamdiuque ut obtineat, quamdiu M. Brutus, C. Cassius, Consules, prove Coss. Provincias obtinebunt*, refers to C. Antonius, and not, as Schütz imagines, to Marcus. M. Antonius throughout speaks of himself in the first person, and immediately after the stipulation in behalf of his brother, which we have just quoted, he adds, *Ipse autem ut quinquennium obtineam.*
‡ Cicero, *Philippic.* viii. c. 1.
§ Compare, besides his assertions in his *Philippics*, *Epist. ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. iv. v. lib. xi. epist. viii. lib. x. epist. v.

the subsequent state of terror under which the Senate was said to be kept by the military force of Antonius, induced them, or furnished them with a pretext to act in a more decisive manner. Brutus at first had repaired to Athens,* and had remained there for some time apparently engrossed with the philosophical studies of the place; but during this interval his emissaries had been at work in Macedonia, endeavouring to conciliate to his interest the soldiers that were still quartered there; and he was himself gaining partisans among that numerous body of young men of family or talent who were in the habit of resorting to Athens as the University of the ancient world. He was however principally enabled to declare himself openly in consequence of an important service rendered him by M. Apuleius,† who had for some time past filled the office of Quæstor in the Province of Asia. Apuleius happened to be returning to Rome with a fleet on board of which was a large sum of money belonging to the Government, collected by him in his Province for the benefit of the revenue of the Commonwealth. Brutus met him on the coast of Eubœa, and prevailed upon him to make over the whole of this treasure. He was thus in a condition immediately to raise an army, partly by inviting to his standard those soldiers who had formerly served under Pompey,‡ and who it seems were still numerous in Thessaly; and partly by tampering with the troops belonging to P. Dolabella, which were at this time passing through Greece on their way towards Syria. It is particularly mentioned, that two divisions of Dolabella's cavalry were thus persuaded to desert their officers and join Brutus;§ and the same means were probably used with effect towards a legion commanded by one of the Lieutenants of C. Antonius, which submitted itself to M. Cicero, Cicero's son, one of those young men whom Brutus had won to his interests during his residence at Athens. Soon afterwards, Q. Hortensius, the son of the famous orator of that name, who was at this time Proconsul of Macedonia, put the whole resources of his Province at the disposal of Brutus; and he was thus become so formidable, that P. Vatinius, Proconsul of Illyricum, and one of Cæsar's oldest and most zealous partisans, finding himself unable to depend upon his soldiers, surrendered to him the important town of Dyrrhachium, and saw his troops immediately enter into the service of his enemy. In this manner Brutus made himself master of the Provinces of Achaia, Macedonia, and Illyricum, and was become the General of an army of seven legions;‖ while C. Antonius, who had set out from Italy in the hope of entering upon the government of Macedonia, found that Province now armed against him, and the troops which he expected to command adding themselves to the forces of his enemy. Thus disappointed, he threw himself into Apollonia with seven cohorts which still remained faithful to him;¶ and being master of that city, and of one or two other places in the neighbourhood, he prepared to resist the attacks of Brutus.

Brutus obtains possession of the Provinces of Achaia, Macedonia, and Illyricum.

It is difficult, while relying upon Cicero's authority for almost the whole of our accounts of these times, not to forget that this authority is not equally to be followed in its judgments of men and actions as in its reports of matters of fact. We catch insensibly the opinions of a writer whom we are continually consulting; and we do not remember that during all the transactions which we are now relating, he was the active leader of a party, and could not therefore represent with impartiality the motives or the merits of the conduct of his opponents. This remark must apply particularly to those proceedings of Dolabella which we are now called to notice. He found that the assassins of Cæsar were resolved to consider as illegal all the acts of his colleague M. Antonius and of himself in their late Consulship. Decimus Brutus was maintaining Cisalpine Gaul against M. Antonius, in defiance of the decree of the people; M. Brutus was occupying Macedonia, which had been equally given by the people to C. Antonius; and C. Cassius was proceeding towards Syria to take away that Province in a similar manner from Dolabella himself. Already, as we have seen, Dolabella's cavalry had been seduced from his service, and had joined the army of Brutus; so that under these circumstances, whilst his enemies by their own sole authority were converting to their own use the resources of the Empire, he might think himself justified in following their example, and in depriving their officers of their Provinces, as he himself and his friends had been deprived of those held by themselves. With this view he formed the design of securing the Province of Asia, which was now held by C. Trebonius. But in the execution of this purpose he is charged with acts of the greatest perfidy and cruelty; he is said to have entered the Province of C. Trebonius as if he were merely passing through it on his way to Syria:* he had an interview with Trebonius, in which he professed the most friendly dispositions towards him; and having thus lulled him into a fatal security, he made a sudden assault by night upon the city of Smyrna, in which Trebonius then was, and thus obtained possession of his person. Trebonius thus treacherously seized, was immediately put to the torture to draw from him some information as to the treasure of the Province; and after he had suffered these cruelties for two days, he was beheaded with circumstances of additional barbarity; his head was carried about on the point of a spear, and his body was exposed to the insults of Dolabella's soldiers, and finally cast into the sea. After this murder, Dolabella enriched himself by seizing some of the public money in the Province, and by the plunder of a great number of individuals;† but not having a sufficient force to enable him at once to maintain Asia, and to prosecute his march towards Syria, he abandoned the prize which he had gained, and continued his progress towards the east. But receiving alarming accounts of the force under C. Cassius, and thinking it probable that Syria would be effectually barred against him, he prepared a large fleet of transports in the ports of Lycia, on board of which he intended in case of need to embark his

Dolabella surprises and plunders the Province of Asia, and murders C. Trebonius.

* Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 24.

† Cicero, *Philippic.* x. c. 11. Ibid. xiii. c. 16. Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 24. Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iv. c. 75. Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xiii. epist. xlv.

‡ Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 25.

§ Cicero, *Philippic.* x. c. 6. Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 25.

‖ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 94.

¶ Cicero, *Philippic.* x. c. 6. Ibid. xi. c. 11.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* xi. c. 2, 3. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxix.

† Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xv.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

troops and his treasures, and return to join Antonius in Italy. This scheme was defeated by the activity of P. Lentulus Spinther, the son of that Lentulus who had been Consul in the year 696, and to whom Cicero was largely indebted for his recal from banishment. The younger P. Lentulus had been Quæstor under Trebonius in Asia, and had first retired into Macedonia after the murder of the Proconsul;* but finding that Dolabella did not retain possession of Asia, he returned thither, and having reorganized the administration of that Province, he hastened to Rhodes with the fleet under his command, in order to procure assistance from the government of that island to enable him to attack the fleet of Dolabella in Lycia. The Rhodians however had suffered too severely under the dominion of the old Aristocracy at Rome to be inclined to support its defenders. They had refused to receive Pompey himself within their walls, when he was a fugitive after the battle of Pharsalia; and a squadron of their ships had joined Cæsar at that period, and had distinguished itself most nighly in his service during the contest in which he was involved in Egypt. But P. Lentulus even without their aid was strong enough to effect his purpose; the ships of war belonging to Dolabella fled from Lycia; and either dispersed and abandoned his cause, or retreated to Cyprus and Syria; while the transports thus left to themselves were immediately secured by Lentulus. Dolabella arriving in Syria with a force which was probably not very considerable, found the gates of Antioch closed against him,† and having in vain endeavoured to force an entrance, he fled in disorder to Laodicea. In this distressed state of his fortunes, his soldiers began to desert him, and he soon found himself besieged by C. Cassius, who had gained full possession of the Province of Syria, and now commanded an army of ten legions. Laodicea was blockaded by land and sea, till Dolabella hopeless of relief, and dreading the fate which he had inflicted on Trebonius, ended his life by suicide.‡ This event took place in the summer of 710, and the tidings of it reached the Capital, and cheered the Aristocratical party with a moment's exultation immediately before their complete and final overthrow.

Dolabella is shut out from Syria by Cassius.

He is besieged in Laodicea, and kills himself.

Account of the proceedings of Cassius in Syria.

The army with which Cassius had obtained this great success, had been collected by him from various quarters, since his first departure from Italy in the autumn of the preceding year. He had first visited Trebonius in the Province of Asia;§ and was liberally supplied with money by his Quæstor P. Lentulus; who also claimed the merit of winning over to his interest a large body of cavalry forming part of Dolabella's army, and which had been sent on by him from Macedonia, to precede his march into Syria. Some forces were also raised in the Province itself; and Cassius, thus provided with men and money, did not hesitate to proceed to Syria without delay, while Dolabella was still lingering in Europe. He reached Syria in the depth of the winter, perhaps about the end of January or beginning of February, when the ascendency of the Aristocratical party in Rome, and the measures taken against Antonius, were already known in the east. There was at this time in Syria an army, according to Appian, of six legions;* under the command of L. Statius Murcus, and Q. Marcius Crispus; which had been committed to them by Cæsar for the purpose of reducing Q. Cæcilius Bassus, and the legion with which he maintained himself in Apamea. Both of these officers had served under Cæsar in the Civil war, but they were then of little ambition, and were disposed to obey any authority which might seem entitled to command them. Accordingly they gave up their legions to Cassius without hesitation,† believing that by so doing they should most consult the wishes of the Government at Rome; and this example was presently followed by the legion under Q. Bassus; for although that officer himself was sufficiently desirous of retaining his command, yet his soldiers looked upon Cassius as so much more respectable a leader, that he was unable to prevent them from making him an offer of their services. Soon afterwards, A. Allienus, who had been employed by Dolabella to lead from Egypt four legions which had been mostly left there by Cæsar to secure the throne of Cleopatra, meeting Cassius in Syria, and being neither willing nor able to resist him, surrendered to him the whole force which he commanded. With regard to foreign States, it may be mentioned that the inhabitants of Syria in general,‡ and particularly the people of Tyre, as also Cæsar's old enemy, Deiotarus, King of Galatia, were inclined to support Cassius; while on the other hand, Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt, the Rhodians, the Lycians, the people of Tarsus,§ and the Jews, were the enemies of the old Aristocracy, and devoted to any one who should profess himself the representative of the party of Cæsar. The Jews, however, being placed in the midst of the forces of Cassius, were soon obliged to submit to him; and he proceeded soon afterwards to attack the Rhodians, whose eminence as a naval power made their opposition more formidable.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

We have thus carried on our narrative of the state of affairs in the east to a period some months later than that at which we had arrived, in describing the course of events at Rome and in Italy. When M. Brutus had made himself master of Macedonia and Achaia, he sent despatches to the Senate containing an account of his successes.|| After they had been read, Q. Fufius Calenus proposed that they should be acknowledged by an answer of mere compliment, and that Brutus at the same time should be ordered to give up the legions the command of which he had gained so irregularly. But Cicero, rejoicing to see a powerful army in the hands of a General on whom he could so fully rely, moved on the contrary "that the Senate highly approved of the conduct of Brutus, and that it confirmed to him in the fullest manner the possession of the armies and Provinces which he had acquired, requesting him at the same time to remain with his forces as much as possible in the neighbourhood of Italy, that he might be ready to lend his assistance to the Commonwealth if necessary." This

Vote of the Senate in favour of Brutus.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xiv. xv.
† Ibid. lib. xii. epist. xiii. xiv. xv.
‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 94. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. i. 121.
§ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xiv. Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 342.

* *De Bell. Civil.* lib. iv. c. 58.
† Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xi. xii.
‡ Ibid. *Philippic.* xi. c. 13, 14.
§ Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xiii. Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 343.
|| Cicero, *Philippic.* x. *passim.*

motion, it appears, was carried; and excited probably no small jealousy amongst the partisans of Cæsar. Soon afterwards tidings arrived of the murder of Trebonius, and the seizure of the Province of Asia by Dolabella. The cruelty which had accompanied this action excited a general feeling of indignation. Q. Calenus,* with a frankness highly creditable to him, being first asked his opinion by his son-in-law, C. Pansa, moved that Dolabella should be declared a public enemy, and that his property should be confiscated; adding, that if any Senator should propose a decree of greater severity, he would gladly assent to it. But the unanimity which had been thus happily produced by the cruelty of Dolabella, was soon disturbed. It was next to be considered, to whom the Commonwealth should intrust the duty of revenging the death of Trebonius, and prosecuting the war against Dolabella. L. Cæsar,† who had been Consul twenty-one years before, in the year preceding the conspiracy of Catiline; the uncle of M. Antonius, but who had always firmly and honestly opposed his ambitious and violent measures, proposed that P. Servilius Isauricus should be the person selected. Servilius had been Cæsar's colleague in the Consulship in the year 705; but even then he had supported the Aristocratical interest with vigour against the mischievous laws of M. Cælius. He had since been himself Proconsul of Asia, and had borne the character of a moderate and humane Magistrate;‡ so that his appointment seems to have been most unexceptionable, and was likely to have answered Cicero's purposes sufficiently in putting down Dolabella, without giving offence to the partisans of Cæsar. Another proposal advised that the war should be committed to the two Consuls, Hirtius and Pansa, who were to be appointed to the command of the two Provinces of Asia and Syria. By this method it was artfully intended to allure the two Consuls from Italy by the prospect of an honourable command in the most lucrative stations in the Empire; to leave Octavius by their departure at the head of the troops opposed to Antonius, and, above all, to stop the progress of Cassius, who was suspected of seizing Syria by his own authority. Nothing seemed so likely to disappoint this scheme, as the proposal of L. Cæsar, which, if supported by the Aristocratical party, would probably have been carried. But Cicero, most injudiciously, opposed the nomination of Servilius, as well as that of the Consuls; and moved "that the war with Dolabella, together with the Province of Syria and all the troops in that part of the Empire, should be intrusted to C. Cassius; that for the prosecution of the war, he should be invested with an absolute controul over the fleets and revenues of the East; that his command should extend to the Provinces of Asia, Pontus, and Bithynia, as well as to Syria; and that into whatsoever Province he should enter in the course of his hostilities against Dolabella, his authority in that Province should immediately supersede that of the regular officers of the Commonwealth." Even the very mother and brother of Cassius,§ who were at that time in Rome, remonstrated with Cicero upon the gross impolicy of such a proposal. When Brutus had so lately been confirmed in the command of three Provinces, and an army of seven legions, how was it to be expected that even moderate men, and much less that the partisans of Cæsar should consent to invest another of the conspirators with powers and resources still more ample? The only effect of Cicero's motion, was to render him an object of increased suspicion to all the friends of Cæsar's Government, and to procure the triumph of that party who wished to give the command of the war with Dolabella to the Consuls Hirtius and Pansa. It is true that they did not live long enough to avail themselves of the vote of the Senate in their favour; and Cassius, as we have seen, soon afterwards destroyed Dolabella by his own authority. But Cicero, by thus showing himself so intemperate a partisan of the assassins of Cæsar, and of those two in particular, who had even during the Civil war been among the adherents of Pompey, gave a general disgust to that numerous portion of the Commonwealth, who wished to see Cæsar's system and measures preserved under certain limitations; and who dreaded and abhorred the exclusive dominion of the high Aristocratical party.

Dolabella declared a public enemy by the Senate.

The war against Dolabella intrusted to the two Consuls.

The proceedings of Antonius, however, during his Consulship, had been so violent, that the majority of the Senate were disposed to pass the strongest decrees against him individually, however unwilling they might be to concur in the excessive powers and honours proposed by Cicero for the assassins of Cæsar. It was resolved that the laws passed by Antonius were not binding;* that he had forged decrees of the Senate; and that he had corruptly appropriated to himself above five millions sterling of the public money. By these resolutions the Senate seemed to declare that their quarrel with him was perpetual; and although they were so far moved by L. Piso and Q. Calenus as to vote that another deputation should be sent to him, in the expectation that he would submit implicitly to their orders; yet when they found that this expectation was not likely to be realized, the measure was dropped altogether. Nay, when letters were received from M. Lepidus,† urging them to put an end to the Civil war, they voted according to the sentiments of P. Servilius, who moved, that peace with Antonius was prejudicial to the Commonwealth. It was about this time also, that is the beginning of April, that M. Varisidius arrived at Rome,‡ being the bearer of a letter addressed by L. Plancus to the Senate. In this letter Plancus asserted that he had an army of five legions under his command; and that both himself, his soldiers, and the people of his Province of Gaul, were entirely devoted to the interests of his country; and ready to undertake any service to which the Commonwealth might think proper to call them. There was an ambiguity in the terms "Country" and "Commonwealth," of which Plancus possibly designed hereafter to avail himself; yet the tone of his letter was so promising, and his language in a private letter to Cicero was so strongly in favour of his attachment to the course now pursued by the Senate, that Cicero thought proper to move for a grant of extraordinary

Vote of the Senate against Antonius.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* xi. c. 6.
† Ibid. c. 8. *Epist. ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. v
‡ Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. xiii. epist. lxvi. lxviii.
§ Ibid. lib. xii. epist. vii.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* xii. c. 5.
† Ibid. xiii. c. 4, *et seq.*
‡ Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. viii. xii.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45 to 32.

honours to him, in recompense of his fidelity. This motion was opposed by P. Servilius; and when the majority of the Senate agreed to it, P. Titius, one of the Tribunes, interposed his negative at the request of Servilius, and thus stopped the decree. The debate was adjourned to the following day, the ninth of April, when Cicero spoke with great vehemence against Servilius and Titius; and at last, partly from the effect of his own eloquence, and partly owing to the impression produced by the arrival of despatches from P. Lentulus in Asia,* containing an account of the progress of Cassius in Syria; the opinion of Cicero triumphed, the Tribune withdrew his negative, and the vote of honours to L. Plancus was carried. But the subsequent conduct of Plancus seems to indicate that with regard to him, as well as to Octavius, Cicero either believed or pretended to believe their professions much too readily; and by his lavish votes in their favour injured, in fact, the dignity of the Commonwealth, and gave to the contest the appearance of a personal quarrel with Antonius, rather than of a general opposition to the principle of usurped and illegal power, and military tyranny.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

While the Aristocratical party was thus triumphing in the fancied support of Plancus, Antonius was endeavouring to seduce the officers who were employed against him, A. Hirtius and C. Octavius. He addressed to them a letter,* in which he represented the impolicy of their conduct in serving the purposes of the Pompeian party, and fighting against their old comrades and natural associates, in behalf of men by whom they were hated in reality as bitterly as he himself. And he spoke of Lepidus and Plancus as being united with him in all his designs, and approving his proceedings. This letter was transmitted by Hirtius to Cicero, and was by him read aloud in the Senate. To Octavius, doubtless, it suggested nothing which he had not himself clearly perceived before. It was not, and could not be his real intention to exalt the cause of Pompey, or to see the assassins of his uncle in possession of the greatest power and dignity in the Commonwealth. Nor ought the enemies of Antonius to have neglected that part of his letter, in which he boasted of the entire cooperation of Lepidus and Plancus. With regard to Lepidus, the whole course of his former life, as well as his recent interference to procure peace for Antonius, rendered the assertion extremely probable; and if Lepidus deserted the cause of the Commonwealth, the fidelity of Plancus would be exposed to a very severe temptation. On the other hand, the Consuls Hirtius and Pansa, the latter of whom had now taken the field with the army which he had been levying and organizing at Rome, possessed and deserved the entire confidence of the Senate; and whilst the greatest part of the forces employed against Antonius was in their hands, Octavius must, of necessity, remain faithful, and the contest might be decided before Lepidus or Plancus should venture to throw aside the mask which they now thought it prudent to wear.

Letter of Antonius to Hirtius and Octavius.

Meantime the events of the campaign were becoming of the highest importance. In the month of February, Antonius, while closely besieging Decimus Brutus in Mutina, was in possession of the important places of Parma, Regium Lepidi or Reggio, and Bononia or Bologna. These three towns were all situated on the Æmilian way, at that time probably the only good line of communication by which it was possible to reach Mutina; and lying two to the westward, and one to the eastward of the place that was besieged, the occupation of them by the besieging army rendered it difficult for Hirtius and Octavius to advance to its relief. The season, besides, was unfavourable, and C. Pansa was still busied in levying

* Cicero, *ad Brutum*, lib. ii. epist. ii. We are aware that the genuineness of the two books of "Epistles to Brutus," has been often questioned; and Schütz has classed them, together with five Orations commonly ascribed to Cicero, among the works which he believes to be forgeries; and has published them in a separate volume. But judging from the arguments which he brings to prove their spuriousness, the genuineness of a work was never more unreasonably suspected. He says that the letter which we have just quoted (lib. ii. epist. ii.) must be a forgery, because it speaks of the arrival of tidings concerning Cassius on the ninth of April; whereas in another letter to Brutus, dated on the fifth of May, the writer says that nothing was known of the forces of Cassius. But on attending to the whole passages in both letters, the inconsistency vanishes. Despatches had reached Rome, on the ninth of April, from P. Lentulus, who had been Quæstor to Trebonius, and who appears to have written them from the Province of Asia. They contained a report of the information which he had received from Syria, of the occupation of that Province by Cassius, and of the surrender of the legions under L. Murcus and Q. Crispus. It is not said that the despatches of Lentulus entered into any particulars; but they probably stated in general terms, as was natural, what he had heard of events which had occurred in a distant Province. Nearly a month afterwards, Cicero informs Brutus that the Senate had given him a discretionary power to act against Dolabella or not, as he should judge most expedient; and adds, as the reason why so much was thus left to his own judgment, that nothing was known about the army of Cassius; nothing, that is, as to its position, its operations, or even its means of taking the field. It was known that Cassius had an army and a Province; but this knowledge was of no use towards deciding the question, whether he might require the aid of Brutus in destroying Dolabella, or no; and therefore, as far as that point was concerned, it was equivalent to a "total ignorance about the army of Cassius."

We have quoted the "Epistles to Brutus" without hesitation; for we think that all the positive arguments of inconsistency with themselves or with other authorities, which Schütz has repeated from Tunstall, are founded on mistakes and misinterpretations of the passages attacked. Another class of arguments, if they deserve to be called so, is built on the pretended occurrence of unclassical or inelegant expressions in these letters; and sometimes a letter is condemned because *tota ejus compositio prorsus a Ciceronis elegantiâ abhorret.* Schütz, *Præfat.* in tom. viii. p. 3. *Ciceron. Oper.* It must be a very strong case, indeed, that could warrant us in pronouncing a work to be a forgery, on account of fancied inelegancies in its style, or even of dissimilarity from the usual language of the writer. But in the present instance we see no such dissimilarity; and as for the inelegance of particular expressions, we do think that it is quite absurd to pretend to decide, in a dead language, what expressions might, or might not have been used in the familiarity of a private letter.

The evidence in favour of the "Epistles to Brutus," is the same on which we believe the genuineness of any ancient writing; namely, that they have been transmitted down to us amongst the other works of Cicero, and profess to be his composition. If the arguments brought against them be of no weight, if there be, as we think there is not, no evidence to render them suspected, we may receive them as genuine on the external evidence of their having been always ascribed to Cicero, without inquiring whether they afford any positive internal evidence in their own favour. But we think that they possess also this mark of genuineness, and that they are such letters as no man was likely to have forged, from the brevity and uninteresting nature of many of the numbers; and from their real, but neither apparent nor designed, agreement with what we know from other really respectable authorities concerning the facts to which they allude.

* Cicero, *Philippic.* xiii. c. 10, *et seq.*

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

troops at Rome; so that Hirtius and Octavius remained quiet for some time; the former at Claterna,* and the latter at Forum Cornelii, or Imola; both of which towns were situated on the Æmilian way, between Bononia and Ariminum. But as the spring came on, and Decimus Brutus began to suffer severely from the strictness of the blockade, Hirtius and Octavius deemed it necessary to act more vigorously. They advanced towards Mutina, and Antonius thought proper to abandon Bononia to them; so that they were enabled to approach very near to the lines of the besiegers; and in this situation they were endeavouring to open a communication with Decimus Brutus, and were waiting at the same time for the arrival of Pansa with his newly-raised legions from Rome. It was about the middle of April,† when Hirtius was informed that Pansa was approaching at the head of four legions of newly raised troops; and in order to favour his safe arrival, which Antonius would naturally endeavour to prevent, he despatched the Prætorian cohorts of himself and Octavius, together with one of his legions by night to join him, and strengthen him on his march. It happened that this was the Martian legion, which had first set the example of desertion from Antonius, and which was animated by the fiercest animosity against him. Antonius not aware of the reinforcement which Pansa had thus received, marched with two of his veteran legions, and some of Cæsar's disbanded soldiers, whom he had assembled under his standard at the beginning of the campaign, to intercept him on his way. But on the first appearance of his light troops and cavalry, the Martian legion, unable to restrain its impetuosity, advanced hastily forward, and followed by the two Prætorian cohorts, engaged with the enemy before it could be supported by the newly raised legions which were at some distance in the rear. It was in consequence overpowered and defeated with severe loss;‡ Pansa, who had taken the command of it in person, after having vainly endeavoured to check its imprudent advance, was dangerously wounded, and carried off to Bononia; and Antonius following up his advantage, attempted to take the camp of the enemy. Here, however, he was repulsed by two of Pansa's newly raised legions; and finding that he could do nothing further on that side, he commenced his retreat towards his own camp before Mutina. But Hirtius, who had received intelligence of Pansa's danger, had set out with two legions to his rescue, leaving Octavius to defend their camp; and although he could not arrive in time to prevent the defeat of the Martian legion, yet he fell in with Antonius when retreating towards Mutina after his victory, and assaulting his soldiers, fatigued as they were by their preceding exertions, he totally routed and dispersed them. Antonius reached his lines in safety at the head of his cavalry, a kind of force with which Hirtius was unprovided, and found that the troops whom he had left there in the morning, had made an attack upon the enemy's camp during the absence of Hirtius, but had been repulsed with loss by the forces left with Octavius to guard it.

Battle of Mutina. U. C. 711.

By this action the army of Antonius was greatly weakened, but as it yet retained its lines around Mutina; the relief of Decimus Brutus had not been effected by the success of his associates. Hirtius and Octavius, therefore, were anxious to bring Antonius to a second action; and this they accomplished by threatening to force their way into Mutina at a distant and ill-guarded quarter of his lines. Antonius was forced to fight in order to oppose this attempt; but he was again defeated with great loss; and Decimus Brutus making a sally at the same time with the garrison of Mutina, he had no other resource, but to abandon all his positions, and fly with the wreck of his infantry, covered by his still unbroken cavalry, in the direction of the Alps.* Unfortunately for the cause of the Aristocracy, Hirtius, while pursuing the enemy into their lines, had fallen; and the command of his army devolved thus suddenly upon Octavius. This circumstance deprived Decimus Brutus for the moment of any cooperation. Octavius drew back his troops into his own camp, and Brutus, not aware of the death of Hirtius,† waited in expectation of receiving some communication from him. When he learned that Octavius was now the sole General of the army of the Commonwealth, he wished to ascertain his sentiments, before he ventured freely to act with him; and having requested and obtained an interview with him, although Octavius removed all suspicion by the language which he held, yet it was too late in the day, after this meeting, to take any active steps in pursuing Antonius. On the following morning Decimus Brutus was summoned to Bononia to see Pansa, who was lying there ill of his wounds; but on his way thither he received intelligence of the Consul's death, and returned immediately to Mutina, having lost irreparably another day. Meantime, Antonius was retreating with the utmost rapidity, marching in no regular order, and swelling his numbers by opening all the workhouses, and enlisting the slaves who were kept there under their task-masters.‡ His object was to enter Gaul as soon as possible by way of the Maritime Alps; and accordingly he allowed himself no respite till he had crossed the Apennines and arrived at Vada,§ a spot which still retains the name of Vado, and is situated on the road from Genoa to Nice, a little to the westward of Savona. Here he received a most seasonable support in the junction of P. Ventidius with three legions. This officer was a native of Asculum, and when that town had been taken by Cn. Pompeius Strabo in the Italian war, Ventidius, then quite a boy, had walked amongst the other prisoners in the triumphal procession of the conqueror. Since that time he had risen to considerable eminence, and had probably become acquainted with Antonius while they both served under Cæsar. When the Civil war was again begun by the siege of Mutina, and Italy seemed likely to be the scene of a bloody contest, as in the times of Marius

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Defeat of Antonius, death of the two Consuls.

Antonius retreats towards Gaul, and is joined by Ventidius.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. v.
† Ibid. lib. x. epist. xxx.
‡ Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. xxx. *Philippic.* xiv. c. 9, 10. 14.

* Cicero, *ad Brutum*, lib. i. epist. iv.
† Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. xiii.
‡ Ibid. lib. xi. epist. x. xiii.
§ Strabo, lib. iv. p. 221. edit. Xyland.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722 — A. C. 45. to 32.

and Sylla, Ventidius repaired to his native country, Picenum, and there began to raise soldiers, partly from among Cæsar's veterans, and partly from the inhabitants. He had collected a force of three legions, and was apparently still in Picenum, or its neighbourhood,* when he received intelligence of the defeat of Antonius. Without loss of time he set out to join him, and as Octavius took no pains to intercept him, he crossed the Apennines by roads scarcely practicable, and succeeded in his attempt. Their cavalry was exceedingly formidable,† and L. Antonius was sent forwards with it to occupy the passes of the Alps, on the coast road from Vada to Forum Julii, or Frejus. Antonius himself arrived at Forum Julii on the fifteenth of May,‡ with the first divisions of his infantry; Ventidius following at the distance of two days march in the rear. They found that M. Lepidus had arrived with his army at Forum Vocontii, a place distant little more than twenty miles from them; and whatever private reasons Antonius might have had for depending on his assistance, yet his avowed object was to prevent the fugitive army from entering his Province, and he had called upon L. Plancus to cooperate with him for that end. Plancus, as we have seen, had been rewarded with thanks and honours by the Senate, on the motion of Cicero, in return for the assurances of patriotism which he had sent to Rome from his Province in the month of March. He crossed the Rhone, near Lyons and Vienne, on the twenty-sixth of April,§ with the intention, as he declared, of marching into Italy, to the relief of Decimus Brutus; but receiving intelligence of the battles of Mutina a few days afterwards, he halted between the Rhone and the Isere, and began to communicate with Lepidus on the best means of serving the Commonwealth.

Lepidus pretends to oppose his passage.

The chief agent in this correspondence was M. Juventius Laterensis, who was at this time one of the Lieutenants of Lepidus; but, unlike his General, had been through life, and still continued to be, a fearless and sincere supporter of the old Constitution.‖ Laterensis, believing what he wished, assured Plancus of the good intentions of Lepidus, and earnestly entreated him to move to his assistance against Antonius. It was on the twelfth of May that Plancus had thrown a bridge over the Isere, and had crossed the river; but he had remained on the left bank for nine days; being inclined, he said, to wait there for the arrival of Decimus Brutus; on whose cooperation he could more safely rely than on that of Lepidus. But being urged by the repeated entreaties and assurances of Lepidus and Laterensis, he moved forwards from the Isere with four legions on the twenty-first of May,* having built and garrisoned two towers at the two extremities of his bridge, in order to secure the passage for Decimus Brutus, if he should arrive from Italy to join him. Three days only after he left the Isere, Decimus Brutus was at Eporedia, or Ivrea,† in the direct road from the plains of the Po to the passage over the Alps by the Little St. Bernard, by which, retracing Hannibal's footsteps, he would have descended into the plains of Dauphinè by Montmeillan, and the road to Vienne. Brutus had under his command an army of seven legions,‡ consisting of the legions raised by Pansa, those which he had levied himself, and one legion of veterans; but having been delayed at first in pursuing Antonius after the battle of Mutina, having lost the cooperation of Octavius, and being unprovided with the means of adequately supplying his army, he was probably an unequal match for the united forces of Antonius and Ventidius; and therefore was obliged to rest his dependence on the assistance of Plancus. But when he had reached Eporedia, he was induced to suspend his march by the alarming reports which he received of the dispositions of Octavius and his veterans,§ reports which made him unwilling to leave Italy, and to abandon the seat of Government to the ambition of one who was far more dangerous than Antonius. Meanwhile Plancus moved forwards from the Isere to join the army of Lepidus;‖ but by this time the soldiers of Antonius were in communication with those of Lepidus, and these last had openly told their General that they were determined to have peace, and would fight with none of their fellow-soldiers. M. Laterensis, perceiving that Lepidus took no steps to check these feelings in his soldiers, wrote to Plancus to warn him that he should advance no further; and Plancus according halted within forty miles of Forum Julii to wait the event.

Movements of Plancus and Decimus Brutus

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus — From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

On the twenty-ninth of May, Lepidus united his forces with those of Antonius; and the two Generals instantly began to march in pursuit of Plancus. He fell back upon the Isere as they advanced, recrossed the river without suffering any annoyance, and having broken down his bridge, resolved again, according to his own account, to look forward to the arrival of Decimus Brutus. But it may be suspected that Antonius and Lepidus would have pursued him more vigorously, had they apprehended any serious effects from his hostility; and the indecision of Plancus may have joined with the treachery of Lepidus in provoking Laterensis to that act of despair, by which, when he saw the junction with Antonius consummated, he fell upon his own sword.

Union between Antonius and Lepidus.

Suicide of Laterensis.

It is now time to return to Rome, and to notice the effect produced in the Capital by the tidings of the battle of Mutina. When it was known that the siege of Mutina was raised, and that Antonius was flying in disorder with the wreck of his army, the expressions, and, probably the feelings of public joy, were great and general.¶ The people, as if all danger were at

* Cicero, *Philippic.* xii. c. 9.
† Ibid. *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. xv. xxxiii. xxxiv.
‡ Ibid. epist. xvii.
§ Ibid. epist. ix.
‖ Laterensis had abandoned his canvass for the Tribuneship in the year 694, because all candidates for any Magistracy were required to take an oath, that they would never propose to the people any alteration in Cæsar's Agrarian law, relative to a division of lands in Campania. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. ii. epist. xviii. And he had afterwards loudly taxed Cicero with a disgraceful tergiversation, when he allowed himself to court the friendship of Pompey and Cæsar in opposition to the Senate after his return from exile. Cicero, *pro Plancio*, c. 38, 39.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. xviii.
† Ibid. lib. xi. epist. xx.
‡ Ibid. lib. x. epist. xxiv. lib. xi. epist. x.
§ Ibid. lib. xi. epist. xx.
‖ Ibid. lib. x. epist. xxi. xxiii.
¶ Ibid. *ad Brutum*, lib. i. epist. iii. There is a story told

an end, laid aside the military dress; a triumph was voted to Decimus Brutus,* an oration to Octavius, and a public funeral in the *Campus Martius* to the two Consuls Hirtius and Pansa. Antonius, and all his followers were declared public enemies; and as the death of the Consuls left vacant the charge of conducting the war against Dolabella, P. Servilius moved that it should be now conferred on Cassius; and it was added, on the suggestion of Cicero, that M. Brutus might take part in it or not, as he should judge most expedient for the Commonwealth. The first check which his exultation sustained, was from the tidings of the unmolested retreat of Antonius, and of his junction with P. Ventidius; and the Public complained loudly of the neglect of Decimus Brutus and Octavius in suffering their defeated enemy to escape. Decimus Brutus, however, had so deep an interest in the success of the Aristocracy, that he cannot be suspected of any want of vigour in their cause; and his own justification, which he sent to Cicero in one of his letters, appears entirely satisfactory.† We have already mentioned the circumstances which detained him two days from the pursuit of Antonius immediately after the battle; and it became then impossible for him to overtake the fugitives, who were making their way with the utmost expedition by tracts which were probably impracticable for a regular army, whose order was unbroken. But Decimus Brutus requested Octavius to cross the Apennines and intercept the division of Ventidius;‡ for the troops of Antonius, if left to themselves, would naturally dwindle away by desertion; whereas if they were reinforced immediately by a fresh army, their spirits would gradually recover, and their fidelity to their chief would be confirmed.

Proceedings at Rome.

Conduct of Octavius.

And here we want a more detailed account of events, and a more careful specification of dates than it is now possible to gain. All the veteran legions, which had been commanded by the late Consuls, were now, with one exception, under the orders of Octavius; but it seems that neither they nor their General were inclined to obey the Senate any longer. What excuses he made to Decimus Brutus for not attempting to intercept Ventidius, we cannot tell; but no such attempt was made, and it was impossible for him, so soon after the battle, to have received intelligence of those decrees of the Senate, which his partisans represent as so injurious to him. The fact appears to be, that the death of both the Consuls instantly opened to Octavius a new prospect; and that his thoughts were henceforward bent far more on forwarding his own schemes of ambition at Rome, than on lending any effectual assistance to Decimus Brutus. He conceived the design of procuring his own election to the Consulship for the remaining months of the year; and possibly he showed some symptoms of his intentions immediately after the battle of Mutina; for Decimus Brutus gives some intimations of this kind in a letter to Cicero, dated on the fifth of May.* If this were at all suspected, it was just and reasonable that the Senate should endeavour to transfer the chief command of the armies in Italy to an officer on whom more reliance could be placed; and accordingly it was proposed by L. Livius Drusus,† the father of the future wife of Octavius, and by L. Æmilius Paulus, that the fourth legion and the Martian should be given up to Decimus Brutus. This was never done, for the soldiers would not be commanded by one of Cæsar's assassins,‡ and Octavius was not at all unwilling to avail himself of their inclinations, and to plead his inability to comply with the Senate's order.

Yet although his conduct in this matter, combined with his designs upon the Consulship, and his negligence in acting against Antonius and Ventidius, must have given just offence, nothing was decreed by the Senate against him; but a deputation of Senators was sent to the legions to try whether they could not be prevailed upon to remain firm in their duty, and to pacify them with regard to some claims for pay and military rewards which they had been lately advancing.§ In times of Civil war, which are necessarily accompanied by great public and private distress, the Government naturally finds it difficult to pay the armies by which it is supported; and this inability is commonly made a handle by the soldiers and their Generals to colour their own usurpations. The poverty of the Roman treasury was very great; and it seemed impossible to supply it, without having recourse to direct taxation,‖ from which the Romans had been exempted ever since the conquest of Macedonia by L. Æmilius Paulus. A property-tax of one per cent. appears accordingly to have been levied;¶ but the money thus procured was no more than sufficient to discharge the promises formerly made by the Senate to the fourth legion and the Martian for their early desertion of the cause of Antonius. A vote passed besides, that lands should be distributed among the soldiers of four legions;** but which they were, is not mentioned. And as a Commission of ten Senators had lately been appointed,†† for the purpose of examining the Acts of Antonius during his Consulship, and amongst the

by Valerius Maximus, lib. v. c. 2. which seems to confirm the statement of Cicero, that the war with Antonius was regarded by the people in general as a struggle for their liberty. When M. Cornutus, the Prætor, was proceeding to contract for the funeral solemnities of Hirtius and Pansa, the principal undertakers in Rome begged that they might be allowed to furnish every thing that was required, even to the labour of their slaves, without receiving any sort of payment; because they considered the two Consuls to have fallen in the service of their country.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 62. edit. Oxon. 1693. Cicero, *ad Brutum*, lib. i. epist. v. xv.

† *Ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. xiii.

‡ Ibid. epist. x.

* *Ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. x. *Primum omnium, quantam perturbationem rerum urbanarum afferat obitus Consulum, quantamque cupiditatem hominibus injiciat vacuitas, non te fugit. Satis me multa scripsisse, quæ literis commendari possint, arbitror. Scio enim, cui scribam.*

† Ibid. epist. xix.

‡ Ibid. epist. xiv.

§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 62. Appian, lib. iii. c. 86.

‖ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xii. epist. xxx. *Pecunia conquiritur undique, ut optimè meritis militibus promissa solvantur; quod quidem fieri sine tributo posse non arbitror.*

¶ Cicero, *ad Brutum*, lib. i. epist. xviii. *Obdurescunt magis quotidie boni viri ad vocem tributi; quod ex centesimâ collatum impudenti censu locupletum in duarum legionum præmiis omne consumitur.*

** *Ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. xx.

†† Ibid. epist. xiv. xx. xxi. Appian, lib. iii. c. 82.

rest his grants of lands to Cæsar's veteran soldiers; it appears that some of the members of this Commission, were anxious to have the management of the grants now proposed to be made to the four legions, which they would have connected with the reversal of those made by Antonius. All the Commissioners were warm partisans of the Aristocracy; and Cicero was amongst the most distinguished of the number; but on account of the jealousy which was felt towards every military man who might possess a dangerous influence over the soldiery, neither Decimus Brutus nor Octavius were included amongst them.

The army is irritated against the Senate.

In these measures there was a spirit manifested which alarmed and irritated all the partisans of Cæsar, and which made the army fear that they should soon be deprived of the fruits of their victories. The veterans expressed their indignation that while their own Generals were slighted, all the acts of Government were directed by Cicero;* and all the bounties which they were to receive were to be given them by men of whom they had no knowledge, and from whose gratitude or ambition they had nothing to expect.

Such language repeated by every person around him served, perhaps, to excuse to Octavius himself the guilt of the conduct which he meditated. He threw himself into the hands of his soldiers, with the mutual understanding that he should defend their interests while they served the ends of his ambition. His own grounds of offence against the Senate were utterly trifling. It is a mere mockery of all Government, when a military officer thinks himself justified in committing treason, because his services have not been rewarded according to his estimate of their merits; and Decimus Brutus had as much right as Octavius to complain of the omission of his name among the ten Commissioners. But Decimus Brutus, instead of turning the irritation of the soldiers to his own purposes, wrote to Cicero to acquaint him with it, and to advise him to take some steps to pacify it. He recommended that no one legion should be favoured above the rest; that the lands, which had belonged to the soldiers of Antonius, should be divided amongst the veterans who had fought under the late Consuls and Octavius; and that Octavius and himself should be intrusted with the distribution of them. Cicero, in answer, expressed his entire approbation of these proposals;† assured Decimus Brutus that he had already prevented his colleagues in the Commission from having the management of the division of lands, and that it was not his fault that neither Decimus nor Octavius had been included amongst the Commissioners. Under these circumstances it was the army, and not Octavius personally, whom it seemed expedient to the Senate to conciliate. Their demands of pay and of rewards in land, were to be satisfied or moderated; their jealousy of the Senate and of the civil authorities, was to be lessened; and they were to be persuaded to show their obedience and their respect to the usual practice of the Commonwealth, by submitting to the command of Decimus Brutus, who was Consul elect, rather than to that of a youth of nineteen, who had been only qualified to exercise any military authority at all, by the extraordinary favour of the Senate in dispensing with the strict observance of the laws in his behalf. But when the deputation of the Senate reached the camp of Octavius, the soldiers professed to be indignant that they were addressed distinctly from their General;* and Octavius, who had probably determined already on the part which he was to act, affected to be deeply injured, and while he professed his readiness to obey the Senate, only inflamed the veterans still more by his pretended meekness, and determined them to persist in their refusal to listen to any communication which they did not receive through him.

They refuse to listen to a deputation sent to them by the Senate.

The defection of Lepidus, which took place, as we have seen, on the twenty-ninth of May, made Octavius more anxious than ever to terminate his opposition to Antonius. It seems that in the beginning of June, Plancus had carried his forces across the Alps, and had formed a junction with those of Decimus Brutus, in the neighbourhood of Eporedia or Ivrea. Their united army consisted of four veteran legions, of one of two years standing, and of nine newly levied;† so that although some of these were probably incomplete, yet the numerical strength of the whole must have been very considerable. But hardly any superiority of numbers could enable the newly-raised troops to meet veterans in the field; so that in opposing the united armies of Lepidus, Antonius, and Ventidius, the four veteran legions were the only part of their force on which Plancus and Brutus could safely calculate. Plancus therefore sent repeated letters to Octavius, requesting him to march to their assistance; and Octavius answered them by assurances that he was coming without delay, although, in fact, he was bent on moving in the very opposite direction, and on employing his troops, not against Antonius, but against the Senate and People of Rome. Meantime the Senate, on the thirtieth of June, declared M. Lepidus a public enemy, together with all his adherents;‡ and it seems to have been a question whether or no the veteran legions in the Province of Africa, and M. Brutus, with his victorious army in Greece, should be recalled for the defence of Italy. It seems probable that Cæsar's friends, as long as the intentions of Octavius were any way doubtful, represented that it could not fail to disgust and alienate him entirely, if the Senate appeared to mistrust his fidelity; and, above all, if M. Brutus were called in to overawe him in the centre of Italy, whilst the command of the war in the north had been just transferred from him to Decimus. Accordingly the fear of offending Octavius seems to have had such influence that M. Brutus, although privately urged by Cicero to cross over into Italy, was never officially summoned home by the Senate; but two legions from the army in Africa were sent for, and were despatched accordingly by Q. Cornificius, the Commander of the Province; they did not, however, arrive in Rome till the month of August, and their arrival, after all, as we shall see, produced no benefit. It was in the month of July that Octavius sent to the Capital a deputation from his army, headed by one of his Centurions, to

The Senate declares Lepidus a public enemy.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. xi. epist. xx.
† Ibid. epist. xxi.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 62.
† Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. xxiv.
‡ Ibid. lib. xii. epist. x.

Military deputation sent by Octavius to Rome, to demand the Consulship.

request, or rather to demand, that he should be elected Consul.* Wishing, as we may suppose, to avoid the infamy of such an outrage, he had before endeavoured to find some friend amongst the Magistrates or members of the Senate, who would propose his request in a less obnoxious manner; but Cicero affirms,† as a splendid proof of the unanimous good spirit by which the people were actuated, that not a single individual could be prevailed upon to countenance his ambition. His soldiers, however, were less scrupulous; and it is mentioned that when the deputation was admitted into the Senate, and had declared the wishes of the army, the Centurion who headed it, finding that the Senators hesitated in complying, threw back his military cloak, and, pointing to the hilt of his sword, exclaimed, "If you refuse our request, this shall grant it." When such treasonable language could be uttered with impunity, a military despotism was, in fact, already established. The Senate could not, at once, be induced to surrender up that liberty which so lately seemed to have been securely recovered; but Octavius determined now to throw off the mask altogether, put his army in motion from Cisalpine Gaul, entered Italy, as we are told, by the very road which his uncle had taken at the beginning of his rebellion,‡ advanced without opposition to the very gates of the Capital, occupied the *Campus Martius* with his troops; and thus, under the imminent terror of a military usurpation, he was admitted into the city, and was elected Consul, together with Q. Pedius, an old officer of his uncle, in the month of August, 710.§ From this moment the liberty of the Commonwealth was lost for ever; the Senate, now the helpless instrument of military violence, was obliged to repeal its former decrees, by which Antonius and Lepidus had been declared public enemies; and the famous Pedian law was proposed and carried by Q. Pedius; which enacted that all the assassins of Cæsar, and all who had approved of the murder, should be brought to trial for that crime; and, on condemnation, should be forbidden the use of fire and water, according to the usual style of attainder. It is said that M. Agrippa came forward as the accuser of C. Cassius under this law;‖ and as neither he nor any of the other conspirators were in Rome to answer to the charge, sentence of condemnation was passed against them all. In the midst of these disturbances, the two legions from Africa arrived in Italy;¶ but the soldiers were soon corrupted by the general example of their comrades, and put themselves under the command of Octavius.

Octavius marches to Rome, and is elected Consul, together with Q. Pedius.

The assassins of Cæsar are condemned by a law brought forward by Q. Pedius.

We have now reached the period at which we can no longer avail ourselves of the inestimable guidance of Cicero and his correspondents; and we are left at the very moment when our curiosity and interest are most intensely excited, without any means of gratifying them. We might, indeed, still present our readers with a very detailed narrative of the course of events, if we could prevail on ourselves to rely on Dion Cassius and Appian. But as we have found how little they are to be trusted when we have been able to try them by a reference to good authorities, so when we have no opportunity of doing so, we cannot follow them with confidence, nor will we injure the truth of history by the indiscriminate admission of evidence so worthless.

It seems that Octavius, soon after his usurpation of the Consulship, took the field to watch the movements of Antonius, who, since his junction with Lepidus, appears to have remained for some time quietly in Gaul, and not to have made any attempts against the army of Plancus and Brutus. But it is likely that he was prepared for the change in the conduct of Octavius; and rightly augured that he should draw from his Consulship the same advantages which he must otherwise have risked a battle to gain. Asinius Pollio,* finding that Cæsar's officers were all uniting in one common cause, and that his heir was on the point of taking his natural station amongst them, surrendered his legions to Antonius; and L. Plancus did not hesitate to separate his troops from those of Decimus Brutus, and to follow the example of Pollio. Of the four veteran legions which Plancus and Brutus had commanded, three had belonged to Plancus;† and when these submitted to Antonius, it is likely that the single one which had been commanded by Brutus, was easily induced to follow the example of its comrades. It is said also, that Plancus endeavoured to make his defection still more acceptable to Antonius,‡ by treacherously getting the person of his late associate into his power. In this he failed, but Decimus Brutus soon found that he could not depend upon the newly-raised legions which alone continued to acknowledge his authority. They gradually dropped away from him, and Brutus saw that his only resource was to escape, if possible, from Italy, and reach the camp of M. Brutus in Greece. His troops at last deserting him altogether, he assumed the disguise of a Gaul, and hoped, by avoiding all the ordinary roads, to make his way to Aquileia and Illyricum, through the territories of the Gaulish chiefs, which bordered upon the Alps. He was discovered, however, by one of the Chiefs, who instantly detained him, and sent word to Antonius of his capture. Antonius sent a party of soldiers to put him to death, and to bring his head away with them, and his commands were speedily executed. If, as it is reported, the Gaulish Chief who betrayed him had formerly received great kindnesses at his hands,§ Decimus Brutus met with a treatment more exactly corresponding to the peculiar perfidy and ingratitude which he had himself shown in the assassination of Cæsar. It is true that in the last part of his life he had well and honourably supported the cause of the Commonwealth; but if Antonius had never been guilty of a worse crime than the putting him to death, his conduct would have had some plea of retaliation to urge; and amidst the low morality of the times, the illegality of the action might seem excused by the former illegal violence of him who was now the victim.

Asinius Pollio and L. Plancus join Antonius.

Decimus Brutus is deserted by his soldiers, and endeavours to escape into Greece.

He is taken and put to death by order of Antonius.

* Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. xxiv. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 26.
† *Ad Brutum*, lib. i. epist. x.
‡ Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. iii. c. 88, *et seq.*
§ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 31. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 65. 69.
‖ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 69.
¶ Appian, lib. iii. c. 92.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 63. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxx.
† Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. x. epist. xxiv.
‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 64. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxx Appian, lib. iii. c. 97, 98. Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 13
§ Appian, lib. iii. c. 98.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Octavius, or Augustus as we shall for the future call him,* now invested with the title of Consul, and commanding a numerous army, marched back again towards Cisalpine Gaul, and found that Antonius and Lepidus had by this time recrossed the Alps, and were arrived in the neighbourhood of Mutina. A friendly correspondence had been carried on between the Chiefs of the two armies before they were advanced very near to one another; and it was determined that all differences should finally be settled, and the future measures which they were to take in common, should be arranged at a personal interview. Accordingly the meeting took place in one of the islands,† if so they may be called, which were formed in the low fenny district between the Apennines and the Po, by the numerous streams which descended from the mountains, and which for want of a proper drainage spread themselves to a vast extent over the low country, encircling various tracts of marshy ground in their irregular courses. On one of these spots which the subsequent alterations in the nature of the country would soon make it almost impossible to identify, amidst a scenery, the dull and loathsome character of which well befitted the actors and the acts which they meditated, Antonius, Lepidus, and Augustus held their conference. It was pretended afterwards by the writers, who flourished under the Imperial Government,‡ that Augustus for a long time remonstrated against the bloody executions which Antonius and Lepidus were eager to perpetrate; but his language at a private meeting could not be so well ascertained as his subsequent conduct; and this, it is confessed, was more remorseless than that of either of his associates; for whilst Antonius and Lepidus listened in several instances to the influence of entreaties or of favour, and spared those whom they had condemned to death, it is mentioned, that Augustus did not pardon a single victim.§ But whatever discussions may have taken place between the three leaders, the result sufficiently proved that all principles and all feelings of good were overpowered in their minds by revenge and ambition. They constituted themselves into a Triumvirate, or High Commission of Three,‖ for settling the affairs of the Commonwealth during five years; they divided among themselves those Provinces of the Empire which were subject to their power; and nominated the persons who were to hold the usual annual Magistracies during the term of the Triumvirate; they made such liberal promises to their armies, that it is said that eighteen of the finest cities in Italy, together with the territories adjacent to them, were to be given up to the soldiers as military colonies; and they agreed to draw up a list of proscription, including the names of all those individuals whom they proposed to murder. To cement the personal union of the Triumvirs, it was resolved that Clodia,* the daughter-in-law of Antonius, being the daughter of his wife Fulvia by her first husband P Clodius, should be given in marriage to Augustus; but she was as yet too young to become a wife, and in a short time afterwards, the nominal connection, which policy had formed, was, by a change of political circumstances, as readily dissolved.

Meeting between Antonius Lepidus, and Augustus.

The second Triumvirate. U. C. 711.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Immediately after the conclusion of this agreement, and while its purport was unknown at Rome, orders were despatched to the Capital for the murder of twelve or sixteen individuals whom the Triumvirs wished to destroy before any general alarm was given.† Some of these victims were suddenly assassinated in the streets, or at social entertainments; and although the armies of the Triumvirs were yet at a distance, the Consul Q. Pedius, who had been left by Octavius at Rome, sanctioned these crimes by his authority, and at once showed to the people the hopelessness of the evil under which they had fallen. He attempted, indeed, to allay the panic which these first murders occasioned, by publishing the names of the individuals whom he had been ordered to destroy, and by assurances that no others should be molested. But it is said that Pedius died suddenly, in consequence of his excessive personal exertions to preserve tranquillity in the city; and the Triumvirs were thus freed from the difficulty in which his official limitation of the number of the proscribed might otherwise have involved them. A few days afterwards they entered Rome with their troops; the *Comitia* were assembled in mockery; the appointment of the Triumvirate was proposed by P. Titius, (one of the Tribunes, who had before distinguished himself by his opposition to Cicero's measures,) and was of course agreed to without a murmur. Then the lists of proscription began to be published; but gradually, as had been done before by Sylla, as if to protract the misery of the sufferers by this horrible state of suspense. The lists were accompanied by a proclamation which Appian professes to have faithfully translated into Greek from its Latin original, and to which probably no other parallels can be found in history than that which defended the massacre of St. Bartholomew; and that which encouraged the populace of Paris to the murders committed in the prisons in September 1792. It is remarkable too that in the latter of these two cases, the very same excuse was assigned for the massacres as was now alleged by the Triumvirs. "Whilst we are hastening to attack our enemies abroad," said Lepidus, Antonius, and Augustus, "we cannot with safety leave so many other enemies behind us in Rome; nor again can we linger to take precautions against our domestic adversaries, lest the dangers with which

The great Proscription.

* We have resolved to call Octavius henceforward by the name of Augustus, in order that the cruelties of the Triumvirate, and the splendour of the Imperial Government may be distinctly associated in the reader's mind with one and the same person; for otherwise the Emperor seems to have derived a real benefit from his change of name, and Octavius, with all his atrocities is forgotten, while we think only of Augustus, the peaceful Sovereign of the civilized world, the patron of literature, and the idol of the favourite writers of our youth.

† Appian, lib. iv. c. 2. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 19. Such a spot as that described in the text, was the Isle of Athelney, in Somersetshire, to which Alfred is said to have retired when the Danes had overrun his kingdom. And the Isle of Ely still retains the name of an island; which it obtained originally from similarity of situation. The progress of agricultural improvement so alters the appearance of such districts, that Athelney now can scarcely, if at all, be recognised; and the country between the Apennines and the Po, which was in the days of the Triumvirate little better than a great fen, is now described to be one of the richest and most delightful parts in Italy.

‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 66.

§ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 27.

‖ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxx. Appian, lib. iv. c. 3.

* Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 62.

† Appian, lib. iv. c. 6, *et seq.*

we are threatened from abroad become too formidable to be overcome." "Whilst the patriots are hastening to the defence of their country in the plains of Champagne," said the Municipality of Paris, "they cannot leave their wives and children exposed to the machinations of those numerous Aristocrats who will be let loose from their prisons on the first successes obtained by the enemy, to fill our streets and our houses with bloodshed."

Under pretence of thus providing for their security, the Triumvirs inscribed on the proscription list the names of one hundred and thirty Senators,* at the lowest computation, and of a far greater number of the Equestrian order. All persons were forbidden to harbour or to promote the escape of any of the proscribed, under pain of being sentenced to the same fate themselves;† while rewards were offered to any who should put them to death, and bring their heads to the Triumvirs; and it was added, that no record should be kept of the payment of this blood-money; that he who received it might not hereafter be exposed to the public detestation. That no aggravation of wickedness might be wanting, each of the three associates stained themselves with the blood of some near relation or former friend. M. Lepidus insisted that his brother, L. Æmilius Paulus, should be proscribed;‡ Antonius inserted on the list the name of his uncle, L. Cæsar; and Augustus added that of his guardian, C. Toranius. In emulation of the Chiefs, L. Plancus requested that his brother, Plotius Plancus, might be amongst the victims; and, if Appian may be credited, Asinius Pollio, in like manner, procured the murder of his father-in-law. The rewards offered to the murderers, added the instigations of avarice to those of revenge or fear, and produced instances of the most horrible domestic treachery; freedmen betraying their patrons, slaves their masters, and children their parents. It is the remark of Paterculus,§ that the proscription was marked by the heroic fidelity of wives towards their husbands, whilst the conduct of sons towards their fathers was peculiarly undutiful and perfidious; and he imputes this to the eagerness which men feel to anticipate their hopes of future advantage; for the son hoped by the merit of his parricide to save his father's property from confiscation, and to obtain an earlier possession of his inheritance. Anecdotes of these fearful times were greedily collected, and volumes, as we are told, were filled with them;|| some recording the most tragical deaths, and others the most extraordinary escapes, of those who were destined to destruction. But of all the victims of the proscription we must select the most illustrious, and follow as carefully as we can the circumstances of the fate of M. Cicero.

Extent of the Proscription.

Murder of M. Cicero.

From the moment that we can no longer derive any information concerning him from his own writings, our knowledge of his conduct becomes much less accurate. The latest of his own letters, which has been preserved to us, is one written to M. Brutus on the twenty-seventh of July,¶ in which he expresses great fears lest Augustus should disappoint all his hopes, and should falsify by some act of treason all the praises which he had bestowed upon him. But two letters from Brutus are extant,* apparently of a still later date, written one to Cicero and the other to T. Atticus, in both of which Cicero is taxed with an excessive complaisance towards Augustus, and is accused particularly of having interceded with him in too humble a manner in behalf of the conspirators against Cæsar; and even of having endeavoured to conciliate him by condemning their conduct, and by attacking P. Casca, who was one of the Tribunes for the year, and who, on the motion of P. Titius, had been degraded from his office by the votes of the Tribes, since Augustus had usurped the Consulship. It is very likely that Cicero was somewhat too credulous in trusting to the fair professions which Augustus constantly made to him; he believed, besides, that in spite of the pernicious counsels of his military friends, so young a man could not yet be thoroughly corrupted; and might still be led to choose the better part, if his suspicions of the Aristocracy could be lessened. With this view he thought it politic to praise him, and to move that extraordinary honours should be granted him; he may also have felt that if Augustus could be taught to respect the Constitution of his country, much might be indulged to his natural resentment towards the assassins of his uncle; and that in speaking to him of them and of their conduct, the language of deprecation and censure was more fitting than any higher tone. It is true that Cicero's personal enmity against Antonius made him over-estimate the services which Augustus had rendered in first taking up arms against him; nor did he rightly appreciate the real danger which threatened the Commonwealth; and which arose not from the ambition of any one man however unprincipled, but from the power and insolence of the army at large, who were now conscious of their strength, and were determined to exert it. We are told that Cicero at one time was desirous of becoming the colleague of Augustus in the Consulship;† and if he could have effected this, the evil designs of his colleague would have been in great measure neutralized; the declarations of the Senate against Antonius and Lepidus would not have been so easily repealed; the law condemning the assassins of Cæsar might not have passed, nor the nominal authority of Government have been so speedily transferred to that party which had hitherto been considered as in a state of rebellion. But Augustus having the power of the sword in his hands, determined to avail himself of it to the utmost; he chose therefore for his colleague, not Cicero but Q. Pedius, and the first measures of his Consulship must have almost prepared Cicero for that consummation of treachery which was soon afterwards displayed in establishing the Triumvirate.

It is said that the name of Cicero was included in that first list of victims whom Q. Pedius received orders to destroy before the arrival of the Triumvirs at Rome. But be this as it may, Cicero could not doubt of his own danger, from the moment that he heard of the conferences and engagements between the three Generals. He instantly therefore quitted the Capital,‡

* Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxx.
† Appian, lib. iv. c. 11.
‡ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxx. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 27
§ Lib. ii. c. 67.
|| Appian, lib. iv. c. 16.
¶ *Epist. ad Brutum*, lib. i. epist. xviii.

* *Epist. ad Brutum*, lib. i. epist. xvi. xvii.
† Plutarch, *in Cicerone*, c. 45, 46.
‡ Livy, *Fragm. apud Senecam, inter Fragmenta T. Livii editum.*

and retired to his villa near Tusculum, whence, by cross roads, he escaped to another of his villas near Formiæ, intending to embark on board of a vessel at Caieta, and make the best of his way by sea to Macedonia. A vessel was provided for him, and he commenced his voyage; but the wind was contrary, and the delay thus occasioned, together with the sickness which he always felt severely at sea, induced him to return and to take no further steps to avoid the fate which awaited him. "I will die," he said, "in that country which I have so often saved." He was now sixty-three years of age, so that death seemed to him preferable to the miseries and anxieties of a doubtful flight. He landed therefore once more, and returned to his Formian villa near Caieta. Here he was disposed to remain and to meet his death, but his slaves,* who were warmly attached to him, could not bear to see him thus sacrificed; and when the party of soldiers sent to murder him was advancing towards the villa, they almost forced him to put himself into his litter, and to allow them to carry him once more on board of the vessel which was still lying at Caieta. But as they were bearing the litter towards the sea, they were overtaken in the walks of his own grounds by the soldiers who were in search of him, and who were headed by one Herennius, a Centurion, and by C. Popilius Lænas. Popilius was a native of Picenum,† and had, on a former occasion, been successfully defended by Cicero, when brought to trial for some offence before the Courts at Rome. As the assistance of advocates was given gratuitously, the connection between them and their clients was esteemed very differently from what it is amongst us; and it was therefore an instance of peculiar atrocity that Popilius offered his services to Antonius to murder his Patron, from no other motive than the hope of gaining his favour by showing such readiness to destroy his greatest enemy. The slaves of Cicero,‡ undismayed at the appearance of the soldiers, prepared to defend their master; but he refused to allow any blood to be shed on his account, and commanded them to set down the litter, and to await the issue in silence. He was obeyed, and when the soldiers came up, he stretched out his head with perfect calmness, and submitted his neck to the sword of Popilius. When the murder was accomplished, the soldiers cut off his two hands also, as the instruments with which he had written his Philippic Orations; and the head and hands were both carried to Rome and exposed together at the *Rostra*, at that very place where he had been so lately heard with an universal feeling of admiration, "such," says Livy, "as no human tongue had ever excited before." Men crowded to see his mangled remains, and testified by their tears, the compassion and affection which his unworthy death, and his pure and amiable character had so justly deserved.

U. C. 711.

Political character of Cicero.

In reviewing the political life of Cicero, it cannot, we think, be doubted, that none of his contemporaries surpassed him in the liberality of his views, or the integrity of his motives. He has been usually charged with vacillation and timidity throughout the period which elapsed between his return from banishment in 696, and the close of the Civil war between Pompey and Cæsar. It seems, indeed, that in all great political convulsions, candour and acuteness are apt to lead to indecision;* it is certain, at least, that they will incur the reproach of it from all the more violent partisans of either side. At Rome, immediately before the commencement of Cæsar's rebellion, neither of the two parties, by which the State was divided was worthy of the cordial support of an honest and well judging citizen. The heads of the high Aristocracy were selfish and violent; the popular Tribunes and the military leaders, whose interests they served, were turbulent and unprincipled. A few years earlier, while Pompey and Cæsar were as yet acting in union with one another, the Aristocratical leaders were not such as to encourage confidence; and their jealousy of Cicero, because he was not by birth or inclination exclusively connected with themselves, was a public as well as a personal reason for his regarding them with suspicion and dislike. At the same time Cicero must be allowed to have been biassed at this particular period by private feelings; by the flattering language of Pompey and Cæsar on the one side, which affected the placability of his nature even more than its vanity; and by the countenance which the Aristocracy at this time gave to his enemy Clodius, because they wished to employ his services in annoying the Triumvirate. The greatest error into which these feelings led him, was the speech which he made in the Senate "on the disposal of the Consular Provinces;" in which he pronounced a high panegyric upon Cæsar, and urged that he should be continued in his command in Gaul, while at the same time he advised the recal of Piso from Macedonia, and of Gabinius from Syria. But six years before the commencement of Cæsar's rebellion, it was hardly to be suspected that he intended to use his Province as a means of enabling him to make war upon his country; or that he had no thoughts of resigning his command in Gaul till it should be exchanged for the sovereignty of the Empire.

When the Civil war at last broke out, Cicero disapproved of the system on which Pompey intended to conduct it, and particularly of his purpose of leaving Italy. Yet he was only prevented at first from following him into Greece by the rapid advance of Cæsar's army into Apulia, by which he was precluded from joining Pompey at Brundusium; and afterwards, having tried in vain, yet without the least compromise of his own character, to persuade Cæsar to conclude a peace on equitable terms, he escaped from Italy on the first opportunity, and joined the standard of the Commonwealth in Macedonia. There a nearer view of the avowed sentiments and designs of the Aristocratical leaders, made him, indeed, a lukewarm follower of their cause. To say nothing of the immediate confiscations and proscriptions which they announced as the first fruits of their victory, Cicero might justly dread that their triumph would be followed by the re-enactment of Sylla's most tyrannical measures, the

* Plutarch, *in Cicerone*, c. 47, 48.
† Valerius Maximus, lib. v. c. 3.
‡ *Fragment. Livii, ubi suprà.*

* Τὸ πρὸς ἅπαν ξυνετὸν, ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀργόν.—Τὸ δὲ σῶφρον, τοῦ ἀνάνδρου πρόσχημα. Such was the manner in which Thucydides tells us that the violent and unprincipled members of the Aristocratical and Democratical factions in Greece represented the characters of those few moderate and upright men who regarded both the contending parties with equal disapprobation. lib. iii. c. 82.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

destruction of the Tribunitian magistracy, and the appropriation of the whole Judicial power to the Senatorian Order. Seeing thus so much to excite his fears in the success of either party, the miseries of Civil war would naturally strike upon his mind with proportionate force; and he wished to escape at any rate, from any personal share in a struggle which he abhorred, as soon as he could with honour. Accordingly, after the battle of Pharsalia, he took no further part in the war, but returned to Italy, and received the conqueror's permission to live in the quiet enjoyment of his own property. When Cæsar's power was finally established, Cicero kept up his former acquaintance with him on the terms of mutual civility; but he received from him no favours, unless we consider it in that light, that his family was one amongst many which Cæsar raised to the dignity of Patricians, when he wished to fill up the losses sustained by that Order in the late wars. At last, after Cæsar's death, when a fair prospect opened of restoring the old Constitution, Cicero acted with a degree of firmness and decision, which we think adds probability to the representation which we have given of his motives and feelings in the earlier part of his career.

His main error, as it seems to us, in the latter part of his life, was his excessive partiality to the assassins of Cæsar, and his throwing so great a military force into their hands. The murder of Cæsar was an action, at the best, to be buried in oblivion. Except the single pretence of revenging his death, the new enemies of the Constitution had not another excuse for their treason; while the cause which Cicero upheld was perfectly pure, if it did not needlessly encumber itself by upholding an act of assassination, and rewarding the murderers. The more respectable part of Cæsar's old officers, such as Hirtius, and Pansa, and Cornificius; and of those moderate men who had submitted to his power without having shared in the guilt of his first rebellion, such as P. Servilius, Ser. Sulpicius, L. Philippus, and others, were the very men to whom the Commonwealth might most safely have trusted the defence of its liberties against Antonius; for not only would Cæsar's veterans have obeyed them without reluctance, but all that numerous party who had been gainers by the late revolution, looked upon these men as their security against the excesses of a complete reaction, and would have willingly supported the Commonwealth so long as they conducted the administration of it. And with them Cicero might safely have taken his place as their associate, or even as their leader; for his eloquence and his integrity had made him long and generally popular: and the only ground of the offence which Cæsar's veterans entertained against him, was his so closely connecting himself with the assassins of their General. Even Augustus himself might not so soon have proved a traitor, had he not seen that while Cicero was on the one hand courting his support, he was on the other conferring exorbitant powers on Brutus and Cassius, and investing them with the whole military command of the East. The restoration of the Commonwealth might have been practicable; but to reinstate the old Aristocracy, or the friends of Pompey, in their former supremacy was clearly not so. But perhaps after all the preservation of any form of Civil Government was become impossible, since the army was grown so formidable as to form a distinct interest of its own; and since its favour or displeasure were held up even in the debates of the Senate as objects of hope or fear. Be this as it may, Cicero died as he had lived, with a reputation of patriotism and integrity; nor is his life, as a citizen, stained with any thing worse than some mixture of vanity and erroneous judgment amid many splendid instances of liberality and moderation, and wisdom and vigour

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Amongst the other distinguished persons who were murdered in the same proscription, may be noticed Q. Cicero and his son, C. Toranius, a man of Prætorian dignity,* and who had been guardian to Augustus; L. Villius Annalis,† one of the Prætors for the present year; C. Plotius Plancus, the brother of L. Plancus; and, according to Appian, Salvius,‡ one of the Tribunes, and Minucius, also one of the Prætors. L. Cæsar,§ the uncle of Antonius, was saved by the influence of his sister; and L. Paulus, the brother of Lepidus, was allowed to escape by the soldiers sent to murder him, who respected, it is said, the brother of their General; or perhaps were shocked at the unnatural wickedness of that General, in commanding the murder of so near a relation. M. Varro,‖ formerly one of Pompey's Lieutenants in Spain, but much more known as a man of letters, was saved by the intercession of Q. Calenus. Apulius,¶ perhaps the same person who was Tribune in this very year, and who was warmly attached to Cicero, escaped to the army of M. Brutus in Macedonia. Some of the expedients by which individuals who had been proscribed preserved their lives, are worthy of mention, as serving to illustrate the circumstances of the times. Sentius Saturninus Vetulio** assumed the dress and ensigns of a Prætor, disguised his slaves as lictors, and proceeded from Rome towards Naples, with all the state of a public officer; impressing carriages for his use, taking possession of the inns on the road, and obliging all travellers whom he met to move out of the way till he had passed. Having thus reached Puteoli in safety, he there pretended to be employed on the service of the State, and demanded some vessels for the conveyance of himself and his attendants, which being granted, he effected his passage in safety to Sicily, where Sex. Pompeius was holding the chief command. Antius Restio had been proscribed,†† and escaped from his house secretly by night, while his slaves having heard of their master's sentence, were busily engaged in plundering his property. One slave alone had watched him, and followed him in his flight; a man who had been branded in the face by his master for some offence, and had been confined in chains in his workhouse, from whence he had only been released by some of his fellow-servants at the time of the general ruin of their master's fortunes. This man overtook Antius, assured him that he entertained no resentment against him for the punishment which he had received, but rather felt grateful to him for many former kindnesses; and having concealed him out of the way of the soldiers who were in search of him, he began to construct a funeral pile, and then having,

Some account of other persons included in the Proscription.

Anecdotes relating to the Proscription.

* Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 11. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 27.
† Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 11. Appian, lib. iv. c. 18.
‡ Appian, lib. iv. c. 17. § Ibid. c. 37.
‖ Ibid. c. 47. ¶ Ibid. c. 46.
** Valerius Maximus, lib. vii. c. 3. Appian, lib. iv. c. 45.
†† Valerius Maximus, lib. vi. c. 8. Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, lib. i. c. 11. Appian, lib. iv. c. 43.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

without any scruple, murdered an old man who happened to be passing by on the road, he placed his body upon it. The soldiers coming up while he was thus employed, he hastened to tell them that he had himself killed the object of their search, in revenge for the former ill treatment which he had received from him; and as his story seemed probable, they contented themselves with taking the head of the murdered man as that of Antius, in order to obtain the usual reward from the Triumvirs on producing it; and suspicion being thus laid asleep, Antius himself was conducted from his hiding place by his slave, and escaped with him into Sicily. M. Volusius,* one of the Ædiles, procured from a friend the dress of one of the Ministers of Isis, and disguising himself in the long linen gown, and wearing the mask made like a dog's face, which were the distinguishing marks of that order of persons, he went about through the streets dancing and begging money of the passengers; and in this manner he made his way through a considerable part of the country, till he at last escaped out of Italy. Some of the proscribed assumed the disguise of Centurions, and arming their slaves as soldiers went about as if they were themselves employed in the pursuit of others; and once, it is mentioned, two of these parties fell in with one another;† and each mistaking the other for the real emissaries of the Triumvirs, they fought for some time without discovering their mutual mistake. One man of the name of Vitulinus,‡ formed a considerable force in the neighbourhood of Rhegium, partly out of those who were proscribed, and had, like himself, escaped the murderers, and partly out of the inhabitants of those eighteen cities of Italy which the Triumvirs had given up to their soldiers as settlements. Thus supported, he cut off several parties that were going about in pursuit of the proscribed; till at last, when a strong detachment was sent against him, he maintained several obstinate contests, and before he was killed had the satisfaction of knowing that his son, and several others who had been proscribed, had effected their escape to Sicily in safety. Amidst the horrors of the times, we are told that several orphans,§ of tender age, who were heirs to large properties, were included in the proscription, that their wealth might become the prey of the Triumvirs. One of these, of the name of Atilius, had just gone through the ceremony of putting on the manly gown, and was going, as was the custom, attended by a numerous company of his friends, to offer sacrifice at the Temples. It was suddenly announced that his name was among the number of the proscribed; the procession instantly dispersed, and Atilius, deserted by all his relations, fled to his mother's house for shelter. But even she refused to receive him, dreading to incur the penalty denounced against all who should harbour the proscribed. Thus cast off, and despairing of protection from any one else, when his own mother had abandoned him, he fled to an unfrequented part of the country and took refuge amongst the mountains; but being obliged to descend into the vallies to get food, he was seized by a kidnapper, who was in the habit of carrying off travellers, and confining them as slaves in his workhouse. Unable to bear the cruelties to which he was here exposed, he made his escape to the high road, and, in utter despair, gave himself up to the first military party that passed by, and was by them, accordingly, put to death.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

If any thing could be wanting to complete the general misery, it was added by the utter insolence with which the Triumvirs mocked the victims of their tyranny. Rufus Cæsetius, a Senator,* had been proscribed, because he was the owner of a house and property adjoining to those of Fulvia, the wife of Antonius, and had often refused to sell them to her. He was murdered, and his head, as usual, was brought to Antonius, who happened to be at table with a party of his associates. After carefully examining the features of the face, Antonius said to the soldiers, "This is no acquaintance of mine,"† and desired them to take it to Fulvia; and she ordered it to be exposed, not as usual at the *Rostra*, but in front of the house which had been the occasion of his murder. M. Lepidus and L. Plancus,‡ in the very midst of the proscription, determined to enjoy the honours of a Triumph for some victories which they had gained while commanding respectively the Provinces of *Gallia Narbonnensis*, and *Gallia Transalpina*. An order was issued, commanding that the usual marks of general rejoicing should not be omitted; that the people should attend the Triumphal procession, and should offer sacrifices of thanksgiving at the Temples. It must be remembered that Lepidus and Plancus had each caused the name of his own brother to be inserted in the lists of the proscribed; and in allusion to this, their own soldiers, availing themselves of the customary license of the occasion, shouted aloud, as they followed their chariots, *De Germanis, non de Gallis, duo Triumphant Consules.*§

Behaviour of the Triumvirs.

Their rapacity.

One object of all these dreadful atrocities, had been the money which the Triumvirs hoped to gain from the sale of the property of their victims.‖ But in this hope they were greatly disappointed. The plate and most articles of valuable furniture were generally plundered by the slaves of the owner, as soon as his name was seen on the fatal list; and the houses and landed estates could only be sold at low prices; because the people in general considered it infamous to become purchasers; and A. Cascellius,¶ a lawyer of high reputation, steadily refused to make any instrument of conveyance for property granted by the Triumvirs, or possibly sold at their auctions, considering such means of acquiring it to be no better than robbery. Accordingly the Triumvirs finding themselves still in want of money, drew out a list of fourteen hundred ladies,** who were ordered to make exact returns of their property, that a proportionate tax might be levied upon them. This excited great indignation, and the persons aggrieved having first applied in vain for the intercession of the female relations of

* Valerius Maximus, lib. vii. c. 3. Appian, lib. iv. c. 47.
† Appian, c. 46. ‡ Ibid. c. 25.
§ Ibid. c. 30.

* Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 5. Appian, c. 29.
† "*Hunc ego notum non habui.*" Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 5.
‡ Appian, c. 31. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 67.
§ "The Consuls are triumphing, not over the Gauls, but '*de Germanis*,' which signifies, either 'over the Germans,' or, 'over their brothers.'"
‖ Appian, c. 31.
¶ Valerius Maximus, lib. vi. c. 2.
** Appian, lib. iv. c. 32, *et seq.* Valerius Maximus, lib. viii. c. 3.

the Triumvirs, assembled themselves in the *Forum*, and trusting to the protection of their sex, addressed the Triumvirs in very forcible language, and succeeded in obtaining from them an abatement of the greatest part of the tax which it had been intended to raise. But as the men could not utter their complaints with equal safety, they were condemned to make up for this deficiency. Every person, of what rank or condition soever, who was possessed of property to the amount of more than 400,000 H. S. or about £3200.* was required to furnish a loan of two per cent upon all that he was worth, and at the same time to pay the value of a year's income as a tax for the immediate expenses of the war.

Crimes of the soldiers and others.

But the cruelty and rapacity of the Triumvirs themselves, great as they were, might yet have been satisfied by so many murders and confiscations as we have already recorded. A wider and almost boundless scene of misery was opened by the infinite vexations, robberies, and violences of every kind which were committed by the army at large;† when every soldier gratified his passions without scruple, and the Triumvirs dared not refuse to their instruments that same license of wickedness which they were themselves so largely enjoying. The example of the soldiers was followed by numerous bands of slaves and other low persons, who took advantage of the general confusion to plunder and murder in their turn, and often assumed the disguise of soldiers to ensure to themselves impunity. But as their resentment was not dreaded, their disorders were more speedily repressed; orders were given by the Triumvirs to punish those who committed unauthorized acts of violence; and as the soldiers were too formidable to be restrained, the inferior malefactors were the only sufferers; and of these last several were seized and crucified.

Reflections on the Proscription.

Although no previous provocation, nor any prospect of future benefits to the Commonwealth, could justify in any degree so atrocious a massacre, yet its wickedness becomes still more heightened when we consider the only pleas which its perpetrators could urge in their defence, and the utter selfishness of the motives by which they were actuated. Their great pretence was to revenge the murder of Cæsar; an act the guilt of which was confined to about sixty individuals, scarcely any of whom were among the victims of the present proscription. Thousands, who had no share in his death, might very justly have rejoiced in the effects of it, in the dissolution of a tyrannical power, and the restoration of the lawful Constitution; and after the murder had been perpetrated, the best course which could be followed was that which the Senate actually adopted on the motion of Cicero, to decree a general amnesty for the past; and to resume the usual form of the Government, as if Cæsar's usurpation had never interrupted it. And on this principle the more respectable of Cæsar's friends, such as Hirtius and Pansa, acted; who, while openly lamenting and condemning his murder, thought that it ill became them to renew the Civil war for the purpose of revenging it; but that it was the duty of all good citizens to uphold that old Constitution of their country which was now by whatever means restored; especially as all the beneficial effects of the late revolution were still maintained, in the extension of the privileges of citizenship to a great number of foreigners, and the elevation of many individuals of humble birth to the enjoyment of wealth and honours. But Antonius and Lepidus wishing to continue the system of military usurpation, and having been deservedly declared public enemies, were anxious to exterminate all those who were zealously attached to the Constitution of their country; while Augustus hoping to inherit his uncle's sovereignty as well as his name and private fortune, and animated besides with that inveteracy which men naturally feel against a cause which they have deserted and betrayed, longed to destroy, if possible, the whole of the Aristocratical party, that his way to the Throne might be cleared from all impediments. His conduct, accordingly, was marked by peculiar traits of malignity and hard-heartedness. We have already mentioned that he himself was not known to spare a single victim of those whom he had marked out for death; and he opposed every inclination to clemency in his associates. When the proscription was ended,* Lepidus, in a speech to the Senate, made something of an apology for what was past; and said that henceforth such instances of severity would not be repeated, as enough of the guilty had been already punished; but Augustus arose and added, that he had only closed the proscription as long as he thought proper, but without meaning to impose the least restriction on himself with regard to his future measures. When he thus spoke and acted, he was scarcely one-and-twenty years old. Had his whole after life been marked by nothing but benefits to his country, no human judgment would be warranted in attributing his altered conduct to any better motive than the absence of temptation; for he who had once plunged so deeply in wickedness, must ever be suspected of being ready to do the same again if his interests required it, unless he could give positive proof that he regarded his former crimes with remorse and abhorrence.

The proscribed are sheltered in Greece, Africa, and Sicily.

Whilst Italy was overwhelmed by these calamities,† three neighbouring countries afforded a secure refuge to all those of the proscribed who were happy enough to reach them. Many accordingly escaped to M. Brutus in Macedonia, and to Q. Cornificius in Africa; but a still greater number fled to Sicily, where Sex. Pompeius, in a manner worthy of his name, was exercising the most unwearied benevolence towards all of his persecuted countrymen, to whom he had the means of extending it. We have already mentioned, that after he had been recalled from banishment, and the Senate had resolved to pay him out of the Treasury the value of his father's property, he remained for some time at Massilia, waiting to see the issue of the campaign at Mutina; and unable to take the active part in it which he wished, because Cæsar's veterans, who were serving under Hirtius, Pansa, and Augustus, were unwilling to receive amongst them the son of Pompey. After the battle of Mutina however, when the treason of Lepidus, and the suspected fidelity of Augustus, made it necessary for the Senate to avail themselves of some more trust-worthy aid, Sex. Pompeius was appointed

Sex. Pompeius receives an extensive naval command from the Senate, and occupies Sicily.

* Appian, c. 34. † Ibid. c. 35.

* Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 27.
† Appian, lib. iv. c. 36.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

to the general command of the naval forces of the Commonwealth,* with an authority on every part of the coast, which, like that granted to his father in the war with the Cilician Pirates, extended over the whole country within a certain distance from the sea. He had retained at Massilia part of the fleet which had belonged to him in Spain; and having speedily increased it after he had received his commission from the Senate, he sailed to Sicily, deeming that island a favourable situation for his head-quarters; and the whole of it, according to the tenour of his appointment, being properly included within the limits of his authority. Sicily was at that time held by A. Pompeius Bithynicus, who had received the government of it from Cæsar; but it was occupied, after some resistance, by Sex. Pompeius, and when the proscription began, he was in complete possession of it.

His active benevolence to the proscribed.

He instantly ordered his ships and smaller vessels to cruise along the coasts of Italy,† to intimate their presence by every possible signal, and to receive on board every one who applied to them for protection. To tempt the avarice of the soldiers employed in the massacres, he offered to each individual who should preserve any proscribed person, double the sum which the Triumvirs gave for his murder. To those who reached Sicily, he offered every consolation and relief in his power, supplying them with clothing and other articles of which they stood in need, and conferring on those of higher rank amongst them some command in his army or navy. Nor did he ever afterwards, from any selfish consideration, abandon them; but when he concluded his treaty with Antonius and Augustus, he expressly stipulated that all who had fled to him at the time of the proscription, should be allowed to return to their homes in perfect safety. It is delightful to refresh ourselves for a moment with a picture of power actively exerted for objects of benevolence: and to those who revere the memory of Pompey the Great, it is pleasing to think that as his conduct in the war against the Pirates, was a single instance of wisdom and humanity, amidst the cruelties of other Roman Generals; so the virtues of his son afford the principal relief to that dismal scene of wickedness and misery which the party of his enemies were now exhibiting.

In the midst of the horrors of the proscription the year 711 expired; and although the whole actual power of the State was in the hands of the Triumvirs, they resolved, nevertheless, to preserve nominally the usual offices of the Commonwealth; and accordingly, M. Lepidus and L. Plancus were named as Consuls for the new year. Lepidus was to remain at Rome,‡ and superintend the Government of Italy; whilst his two associates, Antonius and Augustus were to undertake the management of the war against Brutus and Cassius in the East, and against Sex. Pompeius and Q. Cornificius, in Sicily and Africa.

The Triumvirs obtain possession of Africa.

In Africa, indeed, the contest was speedily terminated in favour of the Triumvirs by T. Sextius, one of their officers,§ assisted by the power of Arabio, one of the native Princes of Mauritania. Arabio's father had taken part with Scipio and Juba in the former African war; and had, on that account, been deprived of his dominions by Cæsar, and had seen them divided between Bogud, a Mauritanian Prince in Cæsar's interest, and P. Sitius, the Roman exile, whose services to the cause of Cæsar, under very critical circumstances, have already been noticed. But about the time of Cæsar's death Arabio returned home from Spain, whither he had fled to join the sons of Pompey; and by the aid of some African soldiers, who had been disciplined in their service, he expelled Bogud from his share of his father's territories, and procured the assassination of Sitius. The Aristocratical party at Rome began to conceive hopes from this conduct of Arabio,* and, perhaps, expected that he would support their cause with the same zeal which they had formerly found in Juba. But the repeated victories of Cæsar had impressed Arabio with a deep sense of the utter hopelessness of the cause of the Commonwealth; and he chose rather to purchase a pardon for his treatment of Bogud and Sitius, by proving to the Triumvirs that he was disposed to exert in their favour the power which he had seized from the hands of their partisans. Accordingly, he so effectually assisted T. Sextius, when the war broke out, that Q. Cornificius was defeated and killed, the wreck of his party dispersed, and the Province of Africa became subject to Augustus without dispute, according to the terms of the agreement originally concluded between the Triumvirs.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

The contest in Sicily was not terminated so easily. Augustus was eager to gain the island, because the usual supplies of corn which it sent to the Roman market were now interrupted; and the horrors of a scarcity were thus added to the accumulated miseries under which Italy was suffering. But Q. Salvidienus, one of Augustus's principal officers,† was repulsed by the fleet of Sex. Pompeius, when attempting to cover the passage of troops from Rhegium to the opposite shore: and the naval and military forces of the Triumvirs were all required immediately after in another quarter, to stop the progress of Brutus and Cassius in the East.

They attack Sicily without success.

Since the defeat and death of Dolabella at Laodicea, which seems to have taken place about the end of June, in the summer of the year 711, Cassius had been engaged in an obstinate, but at last successful, contest with those cities and countries of Asia Minor, which had manifested their attachment to the cause of his enemy. After the fall of Laodicea, he had hoped to make himself master of Egypt, in return for the succours which Cleopatra had sent to Dolabella; but being pressed, it is said, by messages from Brutus,‡ he abandoned his enterprise, and began to return towards the Province of Asia. On his way he levied a severe contribution upon the inhabitants of Tarsus,§ and having enriched himself considerably, by this and many similar exactions, he met Brutus at Smyrna, as far as appears, about the middle of the winter.‖ Brutus had lately crossed over with his army from Macedonia, having constantly refused to

Progress of Brutus and Cassius in the East.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 72, 73. edit. Oxon. 1693. Appian, lib. iv. c. 84. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxiii.
† Appian, lib. iv. c. 36. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 77.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 338.
§ Appian, lib. iv. c. 53, *et seq.*

* Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. xv. epist. xvii. *Arabioni de Sitio nihil irascor.*
† Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxiii. Appian, lib. iv. c. 85.
‡ Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 28. Appian, lib. iv. c. 63.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 345.
‖ Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 28. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxii.

listen to the pressing exhortations of Cicero and Decimus Brutus, who had urged him to come to the assistance of the Commonwealth in Italy, before the treason of Augustus had openly manifested itself. We cannot now decide whether he acted wisely or timidly in adopting a different line of conduct; but it seems impossible not to condemn the result of his subsequent meeting with Cassius at Smyrna, if the writers, whom we are now reduced to follow, have put us at all in possession of the real circumstances of the case, or of the grounds of the resolution which was adopted. Cassius,* it is said, insisted on the difficulties with which the Triumvirs were actually surrounded at Rome; on their want of money, and on the delay which Sex. Pompeius must necessarily occasion them by his occupation of Sicily; and therefore he urged the policy of employing the present moments in the reduction of Rhodes and Lycia, which were warmly attached to the party of the Triumvirs, and might effect a formidable diversion in the rear if left unsubdued, while Brutus and himself were advancing into Greece. No reasoning could be more opposite to the soundest principles of policy and military conduct; and if Cassius really argued in such a manner, he was a very unequal antagonist to Generals who had been trained like Antonius in the school of Cæsar. The event was a memorable lesson on the folly of wasting time in war upon inferior objects, and of pecking at the extremities of an enemy's power, instead of striking at the heart. Rhodes and Lycia indeed were successively conquered;† but the power of the Triumvirs was in the meantime consolidated, their armies were in a condition to take the field; and they themselves, acting in the true spirit of Cæsar's system, were prepared to anticipate attack, and had already despatched a force into Macedonia, to fix the seat of war in the territories of their adversaries instead of in their own.

The Triumvirs sent a force to occupy Macedonia against them.

This first division of the army of the Triumvirs was commanded by C. Norbanus and Decidius Saxa.‡ Of the former we can find nothing recorded; but if he were of the family of that C. Norbanus who was proscribed by Sylla, and who killed himself at Rhodes, that he might not fall into the hands of his enemies, his connection with the party of the Triumvirs was natural. Decidius Saxa was a Spaniard,§ on whom Cæsar had conferred the rights of Roman citizenship, and had afterwards caused him to be named one of the Tribunes. He was with Antonius during the siege of Mutina, and is frequently mentioned by Cicero in his Philippics as one of his principal adherents. At the time when Saxa and Norbanus crossed over into Greece, there was no enemy to obstruct their progress either by land or sea; for both the fleets and armies of Brutus and Cassius were still employed in Asia. They advanced therefore through Macedonia, till they approached Philippi, a place favourably situated for intercepting the march of an army from the Hellespont towards Greece. The great plain of the Strymon is bounded on the east by a branch of the mountains known by the name of Pangæus,‖ and which running to the southward, nearly at right angles with the general course of the chain, is only separated from the sea by a tract of low and marshy ground, over which there was, at this time, no practicable road. The road, therefore, from the Hellespont to Macedonia, crossed this projecting branch of Pangæus by two mountain-passes, before it descended into the plain of the Strymon; and a little to the westward of the passes it came to the city of Philippi, which was itself situated on one of the lower points of the mountain range, near the head of a small stream which flowed to the westward, through the plain, to join the Strymon. The two passes to the eastward of Philippi were occupied by Norbanus and Saxa; and in this position they hoped to check the march of the enemy, if he should return from Asia to attack them, until they could be supported by Antonius himself, who was to join them as soon as possible with the rest of his army from Italy.

Brutus and Cassius advance to Philippi.

Brutus and Cassius having effected the conquest of Rhodes and of Lycia, met again at Sardis,* and thence resolved to carry their united forces into Europe. They were aware that a part of the army of the Triumvirs had already arrived in Macedonia, but they trusted, by the superiority of their naval force, to prevent the passage of the remainder; and for this purpose, L. Statius Murcus was sent with a considerable squadron to cruise off Brundusium,† exactly as Pompey's naval officers had done before in the war with Cæsar. Meanwhile they themselves crossed the Hellespont, and advanced towards Philippi. And here again the impossibility of defending a mountain line of considerable length, against a superior enemy, was fully proved.

The positions of Norbanus and Saxa were impregnable in front; but one of the Thracian Chiefs pointed out a way over the mountains to the northward of the passes,‡ by which the army of Brutus and Cassius crossed without opposition, after a laborious march of three days through the woods, and appearing suddenly on the flank of Saxa and Norbanus, obliged them to retreat with great expedition, and to fall back across the plain of the Strymon, as far as Amphipolis. Brutus and Cassius then formed their respective camps on two hills, distant somewhat less than a mile from one another, and about a mile and half to the westward of Philippi. Immediately to the south, or left of their position, the marsh began, and extended from thence to the sea. On their right were the mountains, the regular passes being probably covered by their own position; while they were likely to keep a watchful eye upon the more difficult track by which they had themselves effected their passage.

The space between their two camps was secured by fortifications connecting the two hills with each other; their fleet was stationed in the neighbouring harbour of Neapolis to cooperate with them; and their magazines of every kind were placed in perfect safety in the island of Thasos, which lay just opposite to that part of the coast at an inconsiderable distance from the main land. Thus situated, and having all the resources of Asia in their rear, while their enemy's communications with Italy and the western Provinces would be, as they hoped, constantly intercepted by

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 346. Appian, lib. iv. c. 65.
† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 95.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 347.
§ Cicero, *Philippic.* xi. c. 5. and xiii. c. 13.
‖ Dion Cassius, p. 348. Appian, lib. iv. c. 105.

* Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 34.
† Dion Cassius, p. 348. Appian, c. 82.
‡ Appian, lib. iv. c. 103, 104.

the fleets of Sex. Pompeius and L. Murcus, they trusted to follow successfully the system which Pompey, under similar circumstances, had been unwisely induced to abandon, and to bring the war to a triumphant end, without exposing themselves to the hazard of a battle.

But Antonius effected his passage from Brundusium with the same success which had attended him before in the very same place, and under the same circumstances, when he commanded the rear division of Cæsar's army, and joined his General on the coast of Epirus in spite of all the fleets of Pompey. After he had been blockaded for some time by L. Murcus, he sent to Augustus, who was then at Rhegium, requesting him to suspend his preparations against Sicily, and to employ his naval force in driving off the blockading squadron from Brundusium.* It does not appear, however, that the fleet which Augustus could spare for this service, was at all able to meet that of L. Murcus in battle. But the apprehension of being hemmed-in in the narrow space between Brundusium and the little island which lay off the harbour's mouth, induced L. Murcus to draw off his ships, and to allow Augustus to join Antonius without opposition. The legions were then embarked on board of vessels, such as were usually employed in commerce; and which were worked only by sails; while an escort of ships of war accompanied them, to be sacrificed, if needful, to the superior force of the enemy, in the hope that their resistance might at least allow the transports time to escape. But the wind, for some days, happened to blow so freshly, that the transports were carried across with full sails, at a rate which rendered it impossible for the enemy's ships of war, worked only with oars, to overtake them; and in this manner, we are told, Antonius and Augustus landed the main body of their army on the coast of Epirus without loss. Antonius instantly hastened to the support of Saxa and Norbanus, with an activity which rivalled that of his old Commander, and which far exceeded, as we are told, all the calculations of his opponents.† We might wonder, indeed, why Brutus and Cassius had not followed upon Saxa and Norbanus in their retreat from Philippi, instead of allowing them quietly to strengthen themselves on the Strymon; but it is idle to attempt to give the military history of a campaign, when the writers, whom we are obliged to follow, have not recorded the date of any one operation or movement on either side. It only appears, that as soon as Antonius arrived at Amphipolis,‡ he instantly moved forwards with his whole army, and encamped near Philippi, within a short distance from the enemy; and that here he was in a short time joined by Augustus, who on his first landing had remained at Dyrrhachium on account of illness; but not choosing to be absent from the scene of action at so critical a moment, he hastened to follow his troops, as soon as he heard of the position of the two armies, and arrived in the camp while he was still too weak to discharge the most active duties of a General.

Antonius and Augustus arrive in Macedonia to oppose them.

In the present contest, as in that between Pompey and Cæsar, the army of the Constitutional party was the more numerous, their naval superiority was undoubted, and their resources were so ample, that they could easily afford to protract the war. But on the side of the Triumvirs there were Generals and officers trained in the school of Cæsar; these were the remains of his invincible veterans; and even the newly-raised soldiers, disciplined by the same commanders, and having before their eyes in their more experienced comrades such a perfect pattern of military excellence, were likely to emulate the good conduct of the veterans themselves. Antonius, therefore, was eager to bring on a general action, and finding that the enemy remained immovable within his lines, he endeavoured to make opportunities of fighting, by carrying a road through the marsh on the left of Cassius's camp, as if he designed to turn his position.* It appears that an irregular engagement was at last the consequence of these operations; for the details of which we can best rely on the narrative of Plutarch, as he appears to have copied from the Memoirs of M. Messala, an officer of the highest rank in the Constitutional army, next to Brutus and Cassius. According, then, to the statement of Messala, the left of the Triumvirs' army, which was the part commanded by Augustus, was drawn out in order of battle in front of its camp, to effect a diversion in favour of Antonius. But the troops of Brutus making a sudden and unexpected sally, Messala himself, with a part of the army, turned the left flank of the enemy, pushed forwards at once to their camp, and carried it with little opposition; while Brutus assailing them at the same time in front, broke them with great slaughter, and chased them back to their camp, which was already in Messala's possession. Meanwhile the centre of the Triumvirs' army, observing that the troops of Cassius had taken no part in the action, passed by the left flank of the victorious legions of Brutus, and attacked the left wing of the Constitutional army, commanded by Cassius. Antonius himself, on the extreme right of his own army, was at the same time engaged in the marsh, in an attempt to take the cross wall which Cassius had carried out from his own camp, in order to intercept the projected road of the enemy. It appears that the veteran legions were all in that part of the army commanded by Brutus, and that the troops of Cassius were probably very unfit to maintain a contest with the disciplined soldiers of the Triumvirs. In spite, therefore, of all the efforts of their General, they were easily routed; their cavalry, instead of covering the infantry, fled in disorder towards the sea; and the enemy pursuing his advantage, not only carried the cross wall in the marsh, but attacked and took the camp of Cassius. The prospect over the field was so obscured, it is said, by clouds of dust, that the parts of both armies, which were victorious, were not aware of the fortune of their friends in the other wing; and when they were informed of it, both Brutus and Antonius returned to their own respective camps, and both parties, on the following morning, remained in the same positions which they had occupied before the action. But the hasty despair of Cassius gave to a battle, which was otherwise of doubtful success, all the appearances, and some of the consequences, of a total defeat of the Constitutional army. When he saw his own legions routed,† he supposed that all

First action at Philippi, autumn of 712.

* Appian, c. 86.
† Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 38.
‡ Appian, lib. iv. c. 107. Dion Cassius, p. 349.

* Appian, c. 109, *et seq.*
† Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 43. Appian, c. 113. Dion Cassius, p. 364.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

was lost, and could scarcely be prevailed on to despatch an officer to the other part of the field to learn what was the fate of Brutus. The officer, however, was sent, and Cassius, it is said, attended by one of his freedmen, watched his progress for a time from a hill on which he had taken refuge. He soon saw him met by a party of cavalry; then he heard a loud shout of triumph, and presently observed that the cavalry continued to advance towards the spot where he was, and that his officer was forming one of their company. Concluding from this that the horsemen belonged to the enemy, that his officer was their prisoner, or was, perhaps, now guiding them to the place where they might find his General, Cassius conjured his freedman to save him from falling into their hands, and instantly to kill him. The freedman obeyed, and fled; and presently after, the officer arrived on the hill, followed by the horsemen whom Brutus had sent to announce his success to his colleague; and who, on meeting the messenger despatched by Cassius, had shouted aloud to announce their victory, and turned him back with them, to acquaint his General with the happy tidings. It is added, that when he saw the body of Cassius lying on the ground, he immediately stabbed himself, and fell dead beside it.

Death of Cassius.

The body of the deceased General was sent by Brutus to be buried privately at Thasos, least the performance of the funeral solemnities, in sight of the army, should communicate some discouragement to the soldiers. Brutus himself resolved still, as before, to act on the defensive,* and hoped that the enemy would soon be obliged to retreat from want of provisions. But a system which even Pompey could not steadily persevere in, was found much more impracticable now. The soldiers, and even the superior officers, grew impatient of the taunts which the enemy continually threw out against them; while the enemy were more eager than ever to fight, as their situation was greatly compromised by a heavy disaster recently sustained in the Ionian Gulf. Since Antonius and Augustus had effected their passage, L. Murcus had been reinforced by a numerous squadron under the command of Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the son of that Domitius who had been one of the most violent enemies of Cæsar, and who was himself charged, whether truly or not, with having been one of Cæsar's assassins. With his fleet thus strengthened, Murcus soon after fell in with a large force of soldiers which Cn. Domitius Calvinus was carrying over in transports, escorted only by a few ships of war, to reinforce the army of the Triumvirs.† The weather was now as favourable to Murcus as it had been before adverse; for the wind suddenly dropped, and the transports were left becalmed and perfectly helpless, while the enemy's ships of war could use their oars with increased facility in the smooth water. After an obstinate resistance the whole of the transports were taken, burnt, or dispersed; and a force which had consisted of two legions, and a Prætorian cohort of two thousand men, besides a numerous body of cavalry, was thus almost entirely destroyed. But these successes could not decide the general issue of the war. Brutus was at last induced, as Pompey had been before him, to yield to the wishes of his army; for latterly several desertions to the enemy had taken place,* and he feared that his troops, the best of which had formerly served under Cæsar, might be persuaded, if longer suffered to remain inactive, to join the standard of the friend and adopted son of their old General. Accordingly he drew out his legions in order of battle, and was cheerfully met by the enemy; who already began to suffer serious inconvenience from want of provisions. The battle of Philippi was marked, according to our accounts, by no display of Generalship on either side; but after some hours of close combat, the superior discipline of the Triumvirs' army prevailed, and the soldiers of Brutus first began slowly to give ground, and then were totally routed. Brutus himself,† being cut off from his camp, fled to a small glen or deep dell, at no great distance from the field of battle, through which a stream flowed between deep banks, occasionally covered with wood, and sometimes consisting of bare cliffs. He was accompanied by several of his friends, and amongst the rest by P. Volumnius, who, from his love of literature, had long lived on terms of familiarity with Brutus, and whose account of the close of his friend's life Plutarch appears to have followed as his principal authority. We may venture then to give the following particulars, as resting on the testimony of one who was present at the scene which he describes.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Second battle of Philippi.

It was already dark when Brutus seated himself on a large piece of rock in the narrow valley, and looking up to the sky, which was bright with stars, he repeated two lines from Greek poets, one of which, from the *Medea* of Euripides, Volumnius still remembered, when he wrote his narrative, and has recorded it. It was an imprecation, "that Jove would not forget to punish the author of all this misery."‡ He was full of the thought of the many friends who had already fallen in the battle; and he particularly lamented the loss of Labeo, who had been one of his Lieutenants, and of C. Flavius, his Master of the Works, who had been long one of his intimate friends.§ Shortly afterwards he began to express his hopes that the number of his soldiers who had fallen could not be great; upon which Statyllius, one of his companions, engaged to make his way to the camp, to send up a fire signal from thence, if he found it still in the possession of their own troops, and then to return to Brutus. He went accordingly, and after a certain interval, the fire signal was observed to be made, but Statyllius did not return, so that Brutus rightly conjectured that he had fallen in with some of the enemy on his way back, and had perished by their hands. This circumstance showed that it would not be easy to regain the camp, or to rally any part of the army that might have taken refuge in its neighbourhood. Accordingly, as the night wore away, Brutus was seen to whisper something successively to two of his attendants, and his words were observed to draw tears from those to whom they were addressed. He then spoke in Greek to P. Volumnius himself; reminded him of the studies which they had shared together; and plainly requested him to lend him his assistance in killing himself. But Volumnius refusing to comply,

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 354, 355. Appian, lib. iv. c. 123, *et seq.*

† Appian, c. 115.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 355.

† Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 51, *et seq.*

‡ Ζεῦ, μὴ λάθοι σε τῶνδ' ὃς αἴτιος κακῶν. *Med.* 333.

§ See Cornel. Nepot. *in Attico*, c. 8.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

and some one of the party observing, that it would not be safe to remain any longer where they were, Brutus arose from his seat, and said: "Yes, indeed, we must go hence; but it must be with our hands, and not with our feet." He then, with a cheerful countenance, shook hands successively with every one present, and declared to them the happiness it gave him to think that none of his friends had proved false to him. On his Country's account he might justly, he said, complain of the cruelty of Fortune; but for himself, he was even, at that moment, a happier man than the conquerors, inasmuch as he should leave behind him a character for goodness which neither their arms nor their treasures would ever procure for them. In conclusion, he conjured all his friends to provide for their own safety; and having said thus much, he left them, with only two attendants, and retired to some distance out of their sight. There, according to the general report, Strato, who was one of those who still remained with him, and who had been used to practise declamation with him, and to take part in his studies in Oratory, yielded at last to his repeated requests; and turning away his face, held out towards him the point of his sword. Brutus having placed it exactly at his heart, threw himself upon it, and expired immediately.

Death of Brutus.

Meantime, whatever was the numerical loss of the Constitutional army, many citizens of the noblest names in Rome had already fallen. M. Cato, the son of M. Cato of Utica, and L. Lucullus, the son of the conqueror of Tigranes, are particularly mentioned;* while Q. Hortensius, the son of the famous orator of that name, M. Favonius, so long known as the friend and imitator of Cato,† and M. Varro, who had been Quæstor under Brutus in Cisalpine Gaul, and a relation probably of that M. Varro, who was reputed the most learned of the Romans, had fallen into the hands of the enemy. When these prisoners were brought before the Triumvirs, they addressed Antonius with respect as an honourable adversary;‡ but directed against Augustus the bitterest reproaches; as, in addition to the perfidy and cruelty which he had before exhibited, he had been guilty of some atrocious instances of cold-blooded barbarity to some other captives who had fallen into his power in the last battle. Yet Antonius was not more merciful to them than his colleague, and Hortensius, Varro, and Favonius were all put to death. To complete the destruction of the Aristocratical party, L. Livius Drusus, the father of the future wife of Augustus, killed himself in his tent; and Quintilius Varus, having arrayed himself in the insignia of the Offices which he had borne, desired one of his freedmen to become his executioner.

Dispersion of the Aristocratical party.

The greatest part of the Constitutional army rallied under the command of M. Messala and L. Bibulus, at a little distance from the field of battle, and was soon joined by several persons of distinction, who, immediately after the action, had taken refuge in the island of Thasos. Messala was called upon to become the leader of this last hope of the Aristocratical party;§ but he wisely considered all further resistance as hopeless, and preferred to submit himself and all his troops to the Triumvirs, on a promise of full indemnity for them all. The magazines at Thasos were then surrendered;* and the victorious Generals, being now in fact absolute masters of the Empire, concluded a new agreement between themselves; in which, disregarding Lepidus altogether, they made some new arrangements in the division of the Provinces, and determined that Antonius, with the greater part of their army, should proceed into Asia, to organize that country, and to raise contributions in order to enable him to fulfil the promises which he had made to his soldiers; while Augustus should return to Italy, to superintend the division of lands there, and to establish the veterans in the settlements which they had been encouraged to expect. Meantime the officers of Brutus and Cassius, who had been left behind by them in Asia, now fled to L. Murcus and Cn. Domitius, whose fleet still remained unsubdued. But the battle of Philippi produced an universal derangement of the Constitutional party. L. Murcus,† with his squadron, joined Sex. Pompeius in Sicily, while Cn. Domitius acted for a time as an independent commander, and maintained his seamen, we must suppose, by forcible contributions raised upon the people of the sea coast, or by acts of piracy upon ships employed in commerce.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

In an evil hour for himself did Antonius turn his back upon Italy, and leave the immediate government of the Capital in the hands of his associate. Augustus, still suffering from ill health,‡ travelled slowly on his way towards Rome; whilst the population of Italy, who had already experienced his cruelty and rapacity, looked forwards with horror to the moment of his arrival, which would consign some of the finest districts of the peninsula to the occupation of a rapacious soldiery. How eagerly should we open the smallest volume of contemporary history, which might paint to us from the life the state of society in Italy, under the effects of this dreadful revolution! But not a single annalist of these times has reached posterity; and we must find our way, as best we can, with no other guidance than that of the weak and ignorant Greeks of a later age, whose testimony we have so often found worthless.

Augustus returns to Italy to superintend the division of lands among his soldiers.

It was not till the spring of the following year that Augustus returned to Rome, and found P. Servilius and L. Antonius, the brother of the Triumvir, in possession of the title of Consuls. Antonius had been Tribune three years before, and had then courted popularity by proposing divisions of land on a very extensive scale among the poorer citizens of Rome. He now saw a division on the eve of being made, which was to be still more extensive, and which was to benefit, exclusively, the officers and soldiers of the Triumvirs' army. So long as the Aristocratical party was strong enough to excite jealousy, that union between the popular party, and some ambitious military leaders which had first been observed in the coalition between Sulpicius and Marius, had continued for the most part unbroken; but when the power of the Senate was utterly destroyed, it was manifest to the most prejudiced of the popular leaders that the liberties

L. Antonius, the Consul, opposes the tyranny of the army.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 97.
† Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 13. ‡ Ibid. c. 13.
§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 97.

* Appian, lib. iv. c. 136. lib. v. c. 3. Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 357, 358.
† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 98.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 358.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

of Rome were at least as endangered by the usurpation of the army, as they had ever been by the oppression of the rich Nobility; and that large proportion of citizens, who, with all their turbulence and violence, were yet, in the main, sincerely attached to their Country, perceived that all their hopes of a beneficial change in the political system of the Empire, were about to be crushed in a manner that seemed likely to render them for ever desperate. Besides, there were considerations of immediate personal interest, which aroused the inhabitants of Italy in general against the Triumvirs. Their cities and their lands were to be torn from them, merely on the plea that it was necessary to fulfil the promises made by the Generals to their army. If the people had been guilty of any crime in supporting the Government against the rebellion of M. Antonius, it was a crime in which Augustus himself had shared: and again, since the formation of the Triumvirate, Italy had suffered much from the proscription on the one hand, and from the loss of its ordinary supplies of foreign corn on the other, but had submitted to all its calamities without resistance. Under these circumstances the contest which took place, nominally, between Augustus and L. Antonius, may be looked upon in reality as a struggle between the people of Italy and the army; as the last effort made in defence of liberty and property against a military despotism. It is said that L. Antonius and his sister-in-law, Fulvia, who was the partner of all his measures, at first quarrelled with Augustus, because they wished to have their share in the proposed distribution of lands to the soldiery;* and also that the promised rewards should be given in the name of M. Antonius as well as in that of Augustus. But the general clamours which prevailed throughout Italy, against this spoliation of property, induced L. Antonius to espouse a nobler cause, and to oppose altogether the pretensions of the army. In Rome itself,† and in all the principal towns of the peninsula, there were frequent and bloody engagements between the soldiers and citizens; which were attended with the destruction of a great number of houses; and as the pressure of scarcity began to be severely felt from the total cessation of all supplies from Sicily, robberies and disorders of every kind became common, till at last the shops in Rome were shut up, and the ordinary Magistrates of the city, utterly unable to preserve tranquillity, gave up their offices, we are told, to pacify the people, who were indignant at seeing the semblance of Government retained, when it had lost all its power of affording protection.

War between L. Antonius and Augustus.

L. Antonius now openly professed his opposition to the illegal power of the Triumvirate,‡ as well as to the spoliation of the cities and lands of Italy. His brother, he said, was willing to resign the title of Triumvir, to see the lawful authority of the Consulship restored, and to receive himself, in his election to that office, the reward of the sacrifice which he should make to his Country's good. All ranks of people joined the standard of opposition to the Triumvirate with equal eagerness;§ the Nobility and the Commons, the Patricians and Equestrian Order at Rome, as well as the inhabitants of all the cities of Italy, took up arms against Augustus, and the system of military tyranny of which he was the leader. He himself, leagued with his soldiers to support their mutual oppressions, was obliged to tolerate many acts of violence and disrespect to himself,* which his army, knowing their power, unscrupulously committed; and in order to attach them to his service, he plundered even the Temples, wherever they were in his power,† and thus added still more to the odiousness of his cause. But on the other hand, in proportion as L. Antonius became more evidently the head of a party truly national, so the feeling of the army in every part of the Empire was more interested to assist Augustus. Asinius Pollio and P. Ventidius,‡ who were both warmly attached to M. Antonius, and who commanded such a force in Cisalpine Gaul as would have enabled them readily to turn the scale in favour of his brother, hesitated when they saw that his success was likely to put a stop universally to the overgrown greatness of the army; and although they did not actually take part against him, yet they allowed Augustus and his Lieutenants to shut him up in Perusia, without making any effort in his favour, when he had advanced towards the frontiers of Cisalpine Gaul, relying on their cooperation. Abandoned thus to himself, and left to struggle against a veteran army, with only the feeble support of an undisciplined and unwarlike population, L. Antonius could only defend himself in Perusia, till the provisions of his garrison were exhausted, and he was then obliged to submit to his adversary. He was himself dismissed in perfect safety, for it was not politic to exasperate M. Antonius at such a juncture by the execution of his brother; his soldiers also were pardoned at the intercession of their comrades in the service of Augustus; but neither L. Antonius nor his troops were the chief objects of the Conqueror's jealousy and hatred; and the true nature of the contest was shown by the choice of the victims who were marked out for destruction at the close of it. There were captured at Perusia a great number of Roman citizens of distinction,§ who had taken up arms for the restoration of their liberties and laws; these Augustus put to death without remorse, and on this occasion displayed again the same vile and unfeeling nature which he had shown in the whole course of his public life. Though he was only three and twenty years of age, he heard the prayers and excuses of his victims without the least emotion, answering every suppliant by a repetition of the words, "you must die;" and to show that he considered his triumph as gained, not so much over L. Antonius as over the liberty of his Country, he selected three hundred persons from among his prisoners, some of the rank of Senators, and others of the Equestrian Order, and ordered them all to be butchered on the Ides of March, at an altar erected in honour of his uncle, Cæsar. To the citizens of Perusia he acted with equal cruelty; for they, in common with the people of the other Italian cities, had zealously entered into the war, to save their property from military violence. He

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

L. Antonius is obliged to surrender at Perusia.

Cruelties of Augustus.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 359. Appian, lib. v. c. 14.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 362. Appian, lib. v. c. 18.
‡ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxv. Appian, lib. v. c. 30.
§ Appian, lib. v. c. 27. 29. 31.

* Appian, lib. v. c. 15, 16.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 364.
‡ Appian, lib. v. c. 32.
§ Ibid. lib. v. c. 48. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 15. Dion Cassius, lib. xlvii. p. 365.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

put to death all the Magistrates of the town, and gave up the city to be plundered; and, in the confusion thus occasioned, it was set on fire, and burnt to the ground.

Towards the close of the siege of Perusia, P. Ventidius and the other officers who commanded the forces belonging to M. Antonius in Cisalpine Gaul, made a show of marching to the relief of their General's brother; but their efforts were hardly more than nominal, and plainly showed that they did not enter sincerely into the quarrel. Yet the union between L. Antonius and the friends of the old Constitution, seems to have brought about a temporary coalition between the remnants of the Aristocratical party and the officers of M. Antonius himself; and thus Cn. Domitius, who still commanded in his own name a portion of the fleet which had belonged to Brutus and Cassius, and was cruizing with it in the Adriatic to intercept the communications between Italy and the opposite coasts of Illyricum and Epirus, was now induced, by Asinius Pollio,* to submit himself to the command of Antonius; on the assurance, probably, that Antonius was disposed to join with his brother in restoring the lawful Government of the Commonwealth. And in the same spirit, when Julia,† the mother of Antonius, fled from Italy, after the success of Augustus at Perusia, she was received by Sex. Pompeius in Sicily, and treated by him with every possible attention and kindness. Amidst all the cruelties and profligacies of Antonius's life, some traits of generosity were recorded, which might lead men to believe, that he had acted rather from personal resentment than from a deliberate design to enslave his Country. Anecdotes in particular were told of his behaviour after the battle of Philippi,‡ which contrasted strongly with the mean and merciless cruelty of Augustus on the same occasion. It might not be impossible that the affronts offered to so many of his near relations by his ambitious associate, that the example of his brother, and some sense of the innumerable miseries under which Rome and Italy were groaning, might at last awaken the better feelings of his nature, and urge him to atone, as far as possible, for the guilt of the Proscription, by becoming now the restorer of his Country's liberty.

Appearances of a coalition between M. Antonius and the People, against the oppression of Augustus and the army.

Meantime the war in Italy was brought rapidly to an end after the fall of Perusia. An armed force had taken the field in Campania,§ in defence of the common cause of liberty and property, under the command of Tib. Claudius Nero, a man of the highest nobility. Ten years before this time he had been much valued as a young man by Cicero, and had nearly become his son-in-law;‖ he had afterwards served under Cæsar in Egypt, and had been by him created one of the Pontifices;¶ yet, after Cæsar's death, he had supported the party of the Aristocracy, though without taking a prominent share in the events of that period. He now, after the surrender of L. Antonius, endeavoured to raise the slaves in Campania to swell his forces; but failing in this attempt, he was obliged to fly to Sicily, accompanied by his wife, and by his son, a child of about two years of age. His wife was Livia Drusilla, who was shortly afterwards married to Augustus; and his son was that Tiberius, who in little more than fifty years from this period became the Sovereign of the Roman Empire.

Total overthrow of the national cause in Italy.

Caius Octavius (Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Such was the termination of this brief contest, which consigned the people of Rome and of Italy to many centuries of helpless weakness. In this, more than in any other of the civil dissensions of the Romans, it was a direct struggle between the army and the nation; and the triumph of the army, in which it ended, was a much more serious evil to the State, than the victories and usurpations of any political party, or even than the tyranny of Cæsar himself. It committed henceforward the whole power of the Empire to a mercenary standing army; and reduced all the other classes of society to that state of conscious insignificance in the Government of their Country, which most surely leads to the degradation of national and individual character. Literature may flourish under such circumstances, and the physical comforts of mankind may suffer at times little diminution; but the soul of civilized society, the power and the will to take part in the administration of the great system of national Government, to watch over and assist in the execution of the existing laws, and at the same time to observe their deficiencies, and propose their remedies; the spirit of real liberty which distinguishes the citizen from the mere subject—this is totally destroyed; and carries away with it that practical vigour of mind which, when diffused amidst the mass of the people, under the guidance of sound principles, is the greatest earthly blessing of which mankind are susceptible. The siege of Perusia, then, may be regarded as an event far more really disastrous to liberty than the battle of Philippi.

Fate of the expelled possessors of lands in Italy.

After the victory of Augustus the proposed distribution of lands among the soldiers was probably carried into effect in every part of Italy. The occupiers of estates or of farms, thus driven from their homes, sought, for the most part, we are told, an asylum in Sicily with Sex. Pompeius.* But great numbers wandered, it is probable, into the adjacent Provinces,† and there found settlements, we may conjecture, where their agricultural experience and industrious habits would make them valuable inhabitants. In this manner good may have arisen out of evil; and the civilisation of Gaul and Spain, and that general dissemination of the Latin language, which took place at so early a period in those countries, may have been accelerated by the desolation of Italy. There were others of the expelled Italians who repaired, it is likely, to Rome, and helped to increase the immense population of the Capital; for the inhabitants of Rome were too important to be neglected; and care was taken by the Government to provide for their maintenance, and even for their enjoyments, while the country of Italy was suffered to remain in a state of misery. But at the actual moment of which we are now speaking, Rome herself was

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 101.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 366.
‡ Valerius Maximus, lib. v. c. 1. Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 50.
§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 100.
‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vi. epist. vi.
¶ *Auctor de Bell. Alexan.* c. 25.

* Appian, lib. v. c. 53.
† The Mantuan Farmer, in Virgil, speaks of his countrymen flying to Africa, to Scythia, and to Britain; but these are only hyperbolical expressions to denote that species of exile in a less favourable climate, and a less civilized country, which was in reality, we may suppose, the lot of many of the Poet's neighbours and friends.

From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

sharing in the common distress; for the fleets of Sex. Pompeius still blockaded all the ports, and intercepted the supplies on which her subsistence depended.

Meantime M. Antonius had been recalled from Asia, by the tidings of hostilities in Italy, and, it is said, was induced actually to form an alliance with Sex. Pompeius in his dread of the ambition and ascendancy of Augustus. On his arrival off Brundusium he found the gates of that city shut against him, and he accordingly laid siege to it;* while his alliance with Sex. Pompeius, and the accession of force which he had lately gained through the submission of Cn. Domitius, gave him the undisputed dominion of the sea. But we hear nothing of his entering into the views of his brother Lucius; and his quarrel with Augustus now seems to have been of the same kind with his final contest with him a few years later, a mere struggle for dominion between two military leaders, in which the nation had no other interest than as far as it would decide which should be Sovereign. On the present occasion, however, the veteran soldiers were strongly averse to a war between Cæsar's oldest associate and his nephew, which would tend, perhaps, to raise a son of Pompey on the ruins of their common cause. Accordingly the mutual friends of the two Generals endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation; and C. Mecænas was despatched by Augustus to Brundusium,† together with L. Cocceius, a common friend to both parties, to settle all their differences. The death of Fulvia,‡ the wife of Antonius, which happened about this time, removed, it is said, one obstacle to peace; and suggested the plan of cementing the union of the Triumvirs by the marriage of Antonius with Octavia, the sister of Augustus. In other points it was agreed, that all the Provinces, eastward of the Ionian Gulf,§ should be held by Antonius, and those to the westward of the same boundary, by Augustus; that both the Triumvirs might equally raise recruits for their armies in Italy; that Lepidus should be left in possession of Africa; and that Antonius should afford no protection to Sex. Pompeius against Augustus.

turn of tonius Italy.

ace of rundu-

U. C. 713.

The peace of Brundusium was celebrated by both the Triumvirs with the ceremony of the smaller Triumph or Ovation;‖ and the marriage, which had been agreed on between Antonius and Octavia, was soon after concluded. The people of Rome,¶ meanwhile, finding their usual supplies of provisions still intercepted by the fleets of Sex. Pompeius, were clamorous against the Triumvirs for not relieving them from this evil; and Antonius, probably ashamed of having deserted Pompeius, was desirous of including him in the general peace. Accordingly, after some preparatory correspondence, the Triumvirs and Pompeius met at Misenum,** on the coast of Campania, and there concluded a treaty by which Pompeius was to hold the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, and the Province of Achaia, for the same period as the Triumvirs should retain the command of the other Provinces of the Empire. It was agreed, besides, that he should be allowed to hold the office of Consul without appearing personally at Rome; that he should be appointed a member of the College of Augurs; and that the sum of about £565,104. should be given to him as a compensation for his father's property which had been confiscated. Pompeius, on his part, was to withdraw his garrisons from all the ports which he occupied on the coasts of Italy; he was not to add to the actual number of his ships, nor receive any deserters from the service of the Triumvirs; and he was to allow the usual tribute of corn to be sent from his Provinces to Rome. But the stipulation which reflected most honour on Pompeius, was that in which it was agreed that all persons who had fled from Italy, during the Proscription, should be allowed to return in perfect safety, and should recover a fourth part of their forfeited property; that all others, who had any reason to dread the resentment of the Triumvirs, should enjoy a general amnesty; and those whose property had been confiscated, should receive back its full value. The assassins of Cæsar were alone exempted; but most of these, probably, had already perished; and Cn. Domitius, who had, at least, the reputation of belonging to their number, was not only freed from all personal danger by his previous submission to Antonius, but a few years afterwards was raised to the dignity of Consul. In this manner Sex. Pompeius earned the real glory of putting an end to the worst part of the miseries of the Civil wars, and of closing that long course of banishments and forfeitures by which the late revolution had been accompanied. In the succeeding contests, the leaders of parties, with a few of their principal officers, were all who suffered on the vanquished side; Proscription lists were no more needed, and the old Constitution having been already effectually destroyed, there was no renewal of those scenes of general devastation which had marked the convulsions of its overthrow. Society began to settle in its new form, and to taste that tranquillity which, during the later years of the life of Augustus, was enjoyed so universally.

From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Peace between the Triumvirs and Sex. Pompeius, U. C. 714

We shall make no apology for passing briefly over the events of the eight following years, which intervened between the peace concluded with Sex. Pompeius, and the final contest between Augustus and Antonius. When we can copy the narrative of a good contemporary historian, the most ordinary times deserve attention; but when we can only follow the compilations of writers of a distant age, from whom it is vain to expect a faithful picture of the physical condition of mankind, or of their opinions, feelings, and morals; during the period under review, there are many wars and intrigues which may be safely dismissed with only a bare outline of their origin and issue. Such, for instance, are the campaigns of P. Ventidius and of Antonius himself against the Parthians; the last war between Augustus and Sex. Pompeius, and the deposition of Lepidus from that scanty share of dominion which he had till then been suffered to retain. The connection between Antonius and Cleopatra will be more properly noticed in the sketch of Egyptian history, which will be given in a separate article.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 373. Appian, lib. v. c. 56.

† Horace, *Sat.* v. lib. i. Appian, lib. v. c. 64.

‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 374. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 30.

§ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 374. Appian, c. 65. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 30.

‖ *Fasti Capitolini, apud Sigonium.*

¶ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 375, 376. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 102.

** Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 102. Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 378. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 32. Appian, lib. v. c. 72.

put to death all the Magistrates of the town, and gave up the city to be plundered; and, in the confusion thus occasioned, it was set on fire, and burnt to the ground.

Towards the close of the siege of Perusia, P. Ventidius and the other officers who commanded the forces belonging to M. Antonius in Cisalpine Gaul, made a show of marching to the relief of their General's brother; but their efforts were hardly more than nominal, and plainly showed that they did not enter sincerely into the quarrel. Yet the union between L. Antonius and the friends of the old Constitution, seems to have brought about a temporary coalition between the remnants of the Aristocratical party and the officers of M. Antonius himself; and thus Cn. Domitius, who still commanded in his own name a portion of the fleet which had belonged to Brutus and Cassius, and was cruizing with it in the Adriatic to intercept the communications between Italy and the opposite coasts of Illyricum and Epirus, was now induced, by Asinius Pollio,* to submit himself to the command of Antonius; on the assurance, probably, that Antonius was disposed to join with his brother in restoring the lawful Government of the Commonwealth. And in the same spirit, when Julia,† the mother of Antonius, fled from Italy, after the success of Augustus at Perusia, she was received by Sex. Pompeius in Sicily, and treated by him with every possible attention and kindness. Amidst all the cruelties and profligacies of Antonius's life, some traits of generosity were recorded, which might lead men to believe, that he had acted rather from personal resentment than from a deliberate design to enslave his Country. Anecdotes in particular were told of his behaviour after the battle of Philippi,‡ which contrasted strongly with the mean and merciless cruelty of Augustus on the same occasion. It might not be impossible that the affronts offered to so many of his near relations by his ambitious associate, that the example of his brother, and some sense of the innumerable miseries under which Rome and Italy were groaning, might at last awaken the better feelings of his nature, and urge him to atone, as far as possible, for the guilt of the Proscription, by becoming now the restorer of his Country's liberty.

Appearances of a coalition between M. Antonius and the People, against the oppression of Augustus and the army.

Meantime the war in Italy was brought rapidly to an end after the fall of Perusia. An armed force had taken the field in Campania,§ in defence of the common cause of liberty and property, under the command of Tib. Claudius Nero, a man of the highest nobility. Ten years before this time he had been much valued as a young man by Cicero, and had nearly become his son-in-law;‖ he had afterwards served under Cæsar in Egypt, and had been by him created one of the Pontifices;¶ yet, after Cæsar's death, he had supported the party of the Aristocracy, though without taking a prominent share in the events of that period. He now, after the surrender of L. Antonius, endeavoured to raise the slaves in Campania to swell his forces; but failing in this attempt, he was obliged to fly to Sicily, accompanied by his wife, and by his son, a child of about two years of age. His wife was Livia Drusilla, who was shortly afterwards married to Augustus; and his son was that Tiberius, who in little more than fifty years from this period became the Sovereign of the Roman Empire.

Total overthrow of the national cause in Italy.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Such was the termination of this brief contest, which consigned the people of Rome and of Italy to many centuries of helpless weakness. In this, more than in any other of the civil dissensions of the Romans, it was a direct struggle between the army and the nation; and the triumph of the army, in which it ended, was a much more serious evil to the State, than the victories and usurpations of any political party, or even than the tyranny of Cæsar himself. It committed henceforward the whole power of the Empire to a mercenary standing army; and reduced all the other classes of society to that state of conscious insignificance in the Government of their Country, which most surely leads to the degradation of national and individual character. Literature may flourish under such circumstances, and the physical comforts of mankind may suffer at times little diminution; but the soul of civilized society, the power and the will to take part in the administration of the great system of national Government, to watch over and assist in the execution of the existing laws, and at the same time to observe their deficiencies, and propose their remedies; the spirit of real liberty which distinguishes the citizen from the mere subject—this is totally destroyed; and carries away with it that practical vigour of mind which, when diffused amidst the mass of the people, under the guidance of sound principles, is the greatest earthly blessing of which mankind are susceptible. The siege of Perusia, then, may be regarded as an event far more really disastrous to liberty than the battle of Philippi.

Fate of the expelled possessors of lands in Italy.

After the victory of Augustus the proposed distribution of lands among the soldiers was probably carried into effect in every part of Italy. The occupiers of estates or of farms, thus driven from their homes, sought, for the most part, we are told, an asylum in Sicily with Sex. Pompeius.* But great numbers wandered, it is probable, into the adjacent Provinces,† and there found settlements, we may conjecture, where their agricultural experience and industrious habits would make them valuable inhabitants. In this manner good may have arisen out of evil; and the civilisation of Gaul and Spain, and that general dissemination of the Latin language, which took place at so early a period in those countries, may have been accelerated by the desolation of Italy. There were others of the expelled Italians who repaired, it is likely, to Rome, and helped to increase the immense population of the Capital; for the inhabitants of Rome were too important to be neglected; and care was taken by the Government to provide for their maintenance, and even for their enjoyments, while the country of Italy was suffered to remain in a state of misery. But at the actual moment of which we are now speaking, Rome herself was

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 101.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 366.
‡ Valerius Maximus, lib. v. c. 1. Plutarch, *in Bruto*, c. 50.
§ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 100.
‖ Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. vi. epist. vi.
¶ *Auctor de Bell. Alexan.* c. 25.

* Appian, lib. v. c. 53.
† The Mantuan Farmer, in Virgil, speaks of his countrymen flying to Africa, to Scythia, and to Britain; but these are only hyperbolical expressions to denote that species of exile in a less favourable climate, and a less civilized country, which was in reality, we may suppose, the lot of many of the Poet's neighbours and friends.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

sharing in the common distress; for the fleets of Sex. Pompeius still blockaded all the ports, and intercepted the supplies on which her subsistence depended.

Meantime M. Antonius had been recalled from Asia, by the tidings of hostilities in Italy, and, it is said, was induced actually to form an alliance with Sex. Pompeius in his dread of the ambition and ascendancy of Augustus. On his arrival off Brundusium he found the gates of that city shut against him, and he accordingly laid siege to it;* while his alliance with Sex. Pompeius, and the accession of force which he had lately gained through the submission of Cn. Domitius, gave him the undisputed dominion of the sea. But we hear nothing of his entering into the views of his brother Lucius; and his quarrel with Augustus now seems to have been of the same kind with his final contest with him a few years later, a mere struggle for dominion between two military leaders, in which the nation had no other interest than as far as it would decide which should be Sovereign. On the present occasion, however, the veteran soldiers were strongly averse to a war between Cæsar's oldest associate and his nephew, which would tend, perhaps, to raise a son of Pompey on the ruins of their common cause. Accordingly the mutual friends of the two Generals endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation; and C. Mecænas was despatched by Augustus to Brundusium,† together with L. Cocceius, a common friend to both parties, to settle all their differences. The death of Fulvia,‡ the wife of Antonius, which happened about this time, removed, it is said, one obstacle to peace; and suggested the plan of cementing the union of the Triumvirs by the marriage of Antonius with Octavia, the sister of Augustus. In other points it was agreed, that all the Provinces, eastward of the Ionian Gulf,§ should be held by Antonius, and those to the westward of the same boundary, by Augustus; that both the Triumvirs might equally raise recruits for their armies in Italy; that Lepidus should be left in possession of Africa; and that Antonius should afford no protection to Sex. Pompeius against Augustus.

Return of Antonius to Italy.

Peace of Brundusium.

U. C. 713.

The peace of Brundusium was celebrated by both the Triumvirs with the ceremony of the smaller Triumph or Ovation;‖ and the marriage, which had been agreed on between Antonius and Octavia, was soon after concluded. The people of Rome,¶ meanwhile, finding their usual supplies of provisions still intercepted by the fleets of Sex. Pompeius, were clamorous against the Triumvirs for not relieving them from this evil; and Antonius, probably ashamed of having deserted Pompeius, was desirous of including him in the general peace. Accordingly, after some preparatory correspondence, the Triumvirs and Pompeius met at Misenum,** on the coast of Campania, and there concluded a treaty by which Pompeius was to hold the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, and the Province of Achaia, for the same period as the Triumvirs should retain the command of the other Provinces of the Empire. It was agreed, besides, that he should be allowed to hold the office of Consul without appearing personally at Rome; that he should be appointed a member of the College of Augurs; and that the sum of about £565,104. should be given to him as a compensation for his father's property which had been confiscated. Pompeius, on his part, was to withdraw his garrisons from all the ports which he occupied on the coasts of Italy; he was not to add to the actual number of his ships, nor receive any deserters from the service of the Triumvirs; and he was to allow the usual tribute of corn to be sent from his Provinces to Rome. But the stipulation which reflected most honour on Pompeius, was that in which it was agreed that all persons who had fled from Italy, during the Proscription, should be allowed to return in perfect safety, and should recover a fourth part of their forfeited property; that all others, who had any reason to dread the resentment of the Triumvirs, should enjoy a general amnesty; and those whose property had been confiscated, should receive back its full value. The assassins of Cæsar were alone exempted; but most of these, probably, had already perished; and Cn. Domitius, who had, at least, the reputation of belonging to their number, was not only freed from all personal danger by his previous submission to Antonius, but a few years afterwards was raised to the dignity of Consul. In this manner Sex. Pompeius earned the real glory of putting an end to the worst part of the miseries of the Civil wars, and of closing that long course of banishments and forfeitures by which the late revolution had been accompanied. In the succeeding contests, the leaders of parties, with a few of their principal officers, were all who suffered on the vanquished side; Proscription lists were no more needed, and the old Constitution having been already effectually destroyed, there was no renewal of those scenes of general devastation which had marked the convulsions of its overthrow. Society began to settle in its new form, and to taste that tranquillity which, during the later years of the life of Augustus, was enjoyed so universally.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Peace between the Triumvirs and Sex. Pompeius, U. C. 714

We shall make no apology for passing briefly over the events of the eight following years, which intervened between the peace concluded with Sex. Pompeius, and the final contest between Augustus and Antonius. When we can copy the narrative of a good contemporary historian, the most ordinary times deserve attention; but when we can only follow the compilations of writers of a distant age, from whom it is vain to expect a faithful picture of the physical condition of mankind, or of their opinions, feelings, and morals; during the period under review, there are many wars and intrigues which may be safely dismissed with only a bare outline of their origin and issue. Such, for instance, are the campaigns of P. Ventidius and of Antonius himself against the Parthians; the last war between Augustus and Sex. Pompeius, and the deposition of Lepidus from that scanty share of dominion which he had till then been suffered to retain. The connection between Antonius and Cleopatra will be more properly noticed in the sketch of Egyptian history, which will be given in a separate article.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 373. Appian, lib. v. c. 56.
† Horace, *Sat.* v. lib. i. Appian, lib. v. c. 64.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 374. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 30.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 374. Appian, c. 65. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 30.
‖ *Fasti Capitolini, apud Sigonium.*
¶ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 375, 376. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 102.
** Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 102. Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 378. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 32. Appian, lib. v. c. 72.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Before the battle of Philippi, Brutus and Cassius had despatched an officer to the Parthian Court,* to solicit the assistance of that power. The officer employed on this mission was a son of T. Labienus, of that General who, alone in Cæsar's army, had remembered his duty to his country, and had left the standard under which he had gained so many laurels, as soon as it became dishonoured by the guilt of rebellion. His son, the younger Labienus, found the Parthian Court unwilling to give him a decisive answer, and in this manner the time passed away, till Brutus and Cassius had perished, and the Aristocratical party was utterly ruined. Labienus, foreseeing that his return to his own country was now hopeless, continued to remain in Parthia; and when it was known that M. Antonius had abandoned all public business for the society of Cleopatra in Egypt, and that Augustus was engrossed in Italy with the struggle between the army and the people; Labienus prevailed on the Parthian King to seize the favourable moment and attack the Roman Empire. A large Parthian army was intrusted to his guidance, and with this he suddenly invaded Syria. Many of the Roman troops in that Province had served under Brutus and Cassius, and had passed under the standard of Antonius after the battle of Philippi; and these now immediately joined Labienus. Thus strengthened, he was enabled to give battle to Decidius Saxa, whom Antonius had made his Lieutenant in Syria, and totally defeated him. The conquest of all Syria and Palestine, with the exception of the single city of Tyre, was the result of this victory; after which Pacorus, the son of the Parthian King, remained in the conquered Provinces with a part of the army, while Labienus, with the other part, advanced into Cilicia. There was no force capable of resisting him; so that he not only occupied the whole of Cilicia, but attacked the Province of Asia, obliged L. Plancus, the Governor of the Province, to retire to one of the islands of the Ægean, and made himself master of all the cities on the continent, except Stratonicea, which he besieged for a long time in vain. Yet the contest between Augustus and L. Antonius in Italy seemed of more urgent importance to M. Antonius than even the recovery of the eastern Provinces; and accordingly, as we have seen, he hastened to return to Italy, and Labienus was left in the undisturbed possession of his conquests till after the conclusion of the Treaty between the Triumvirs and Sex. Pompeius in the year 714.

War in the eastern Provinces. The Parthians overrun Syria, Cilicia, and Asia.

They are driven out of all their conquests by P. Ventidius.

Immediately after that treaty,† Antonius crossed over into Greece, and despatched P. Ventidius before him into Asia, to attack Labienus. The fortune of that officer was as rapid in its ebb as it had been in its flood; he was surprised, and driven out of the Province of Asia almost without resistance; then, having halted on the frontiers of Cilicia, and being reinforced by the Parthians, he was attacked by Ventidius, and his army defeated and dispersed. He himself fled in disguise, but was discovered soon after and, as it seems, put to death.‡ Cilicia was thus recovered, and a second victory over the Parthians in Syria put the Romans again in possession of all their former dominions, except the town of Aradus, which being exceedingly strong in its natural situation, was long and obstinately defended.* It was in the following year, while Antonius was still lingering in Greece, that Pacorus, the son of the Parthian King, made a second attempt to reconquer Syria, and was defeated and slain by Ventidius in a battle which the Romans dwelt on with peculiar delight, as a retaliation for the defeat and death of Crassus.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Augustus, probably, was by this time well aware of the little danger he had to apprehend from the character of Antonius; and he commenced, accordingly, his attacks upon Sex. Pompeius, in order to make himself sole Sovereign of the western Provinces, in a spirit of undisguised ambition, which a more observant and active rival would have repressed by a timely resistance. He at this time received into his service a man of the name of Menas,† one of the ablest officers of Sex. Pompeius, who, being an enfranchised slave and a mere soldier of fortune, was tempted easily to follow a master so much more powerful than his old one. Menas, not content with his own desertion, gave up to Augustus the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, and an army of three legions, which had been intrusted to his command; and when Pompeius remonstrated against this breach of the Treaty, Augustus answered him by complaints of counter violations of it on his own part; accusing him of having built new ships of war, and of still encouraging, secretly, the commission of acts of piracy on trading vessels bound to Italy. It appears that some of the men taken on board of some piratical ships, were put to the torture,‡ and it was thus that the confession was extorted from them, that they were acting at the instigation of Sex. Pompeius. On the other hand, Pompeius complained that the exiles, who had returned to Italy, had not recovered the portion of their property which had been promised them, and that Achaia was not ceded to him; but that Antonius was draining it to the utmost of all its wealth,§ that when he gave it up it might be a useless acquisition to its new master. When we compare the respective grounds of complaint alleged by the two parties, and consider, besides, which was most likely to be anxious for a new rupture, there can be little doubt but that Augustus was the aggressor, and that Pompeius was in truth, according to the expression of Tacitus,‖ deceived to his ruin by a mere show of peace. Be this as it may, the war was speedily renewed, and Augustus requested Antonius to co-operate with him in conducting it. Antonius, who was then in Greece, crossed over to Brundusium to meet him;¶ but not finding him there, he returned again immediately, with so little apparent cause for his sudden departure, that men accounted for it according to their own fancies, and some attributed it

Renewal of the war between Augustus and Sex. Pompeius.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 371, *et seq.* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 103. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxvii.

† Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 380. Plutarch, *in Antonio*; c. 33.

‡ "*Extinctus est virtute et ductu Ventidii*," are the words of Paterculus: "*P. Ventidius Parthos, prælio victos, Syriâ expulit, Labieno eorum duce occiso*," is the account of the Epitomizer of Livy. But as it appears from the more detailed and seemingly probable account of Dion Cassius, that Labienus was not killed in the field, but was made prisoner, his death seems to have taken place in the manner described in the text, and not in battle.

* Strabo, lib. xvi. p. 873. edit. Xyland.

† Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 384, *et seq.* Appian, lib. v. c. 77.

‡ Καὶ ὁ Καῖσαρ τινα λῃστήρια συλλαβὼν ἐβασάνιζεν. Appian, lib. v, c. 77.

§ Dion Cassius, p. 385. Appian, c. 77.

‖ *Annal.* lib. i. c. 10.

¶ Dion Cassius, p. 385. Appian, c. 79.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

to a superstitious alarm occasioned by a reported prodigy. Perhaps he was glad of any excuse for not taking part in the contest, and availed himself of some rumours respecting the progress of the Parthians in the East, as a reason for returning instantly to his own Provinces. Augustus, however, resolved to carry on the war alone, but his first attempts to invade Sicily were so foiled by storms, and the resistance of the enemy, that he recalled his ablest Lieutenant, M. Agrippa, from Gaul, to assume the direction of his forces, and began to make preparations for another attempt on a scale proportioned to the greatness of his power.*

Treaty of Tarentum between Augustus and M. Antonius. U. C. 716.

It seems to have been towards the close of the year 715, when Augustus was greatly annoyed by the disappointment of his hopes of conquest in Sicily, and irritated at receiving no assistance from Antonius, that Antonius crossed over to Italy once more with a fleet, as it is said, of three hundred ships of war,† which he seemed as much inclined to employ against Augustus as in his behalf. His honour and his interest, indeed, alike urged him to defend Sex. Pompeius; but his unsteady resolutions were liable to be influenced by any motive that could gain a momentary ascendency over him; and on this occasion, his wife Octavia was as injurious to her husband's interests, by persuading him to peace with her brother, as she was a few years afterwards when the affronts which she received from him became one of the ostensible causes of the last decisive war. Antonius and Augustus met at Tarentum; Antonius contributed a large portion of his fleet for the prosecution of the Sicilian war, and received in exchange two legions from Augustus to strengthen the army which he intended soon to lead into Parthia. Then, as the term of their Triumvirate was just expiring, they renewed it, by their own sole authority, for five years more; and to cement their union more strongly, a further interchange of marriages between the different members of their families was agreed on, but was never carried into effect.‡ When this new arrangement was settled, Antonius left Italy, to return to it no more; and consigning Octavia, as well as his children by his former marriage, to the care of Augustus, he immediately hastened into Asia.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

About this same time Augustus married his third wife Livia,* who was given up to him by her husband, Tiberius Nero, although she was at that very time far advanced in her pregnancy. Into this act, indecent and scandalous even in the estimation of the Romans themselves, Augustus was hurried, it is said, by his passion for the person of Livia; and this union of mere sensuality, with a temper of the utmost coldness and heartlessness, is by no means uncommon; and shows with what facility vices, apparently the most opposite, can exist together in a character totally unprincipled. We have already mentioned that the first marriage of Augustus with Clodia, the daughter-in-law of Antonius, originated altogether in political views; insomuch, that he treated her with total neglect even while their connection nominally lasted; and he divorced her when her mother, Fulvia, joined with L. Antonius in opposing his dominion in Italy. He then married Scribonia,† the daughter of L. Scribonius Libo, and whose sister was the wife of Sex. Pompeius; and the second marriage was concluded like the first, from mere motives of personal interest, when he dreaded the union of Antonius and Sex. Pompeius against him soon after the siege of Perusia, and was anxious to form some connection with those whose influence might be supposed to be powerful over Pompeius. But Scribonia's conduct, according to his own account, was exceedingly profligate,‡ and he chose to divorce her, it is said, on the very day on which she became the mother of his daughter Julia;§ though, as we are told, that he was already enamoured of Livia, the guilt of Scribonia may be as doubtful as that of Anne Boleyn, whom her husband accused of infidelity, when his own affections were diverted to a new object. It should be remembered, that when Augustus formed his new connection with Livia, after having been twice married from political views, and having been twice divorced, he was still no more than twenty-five or twenty-six years of age.

Marriage of Augustus with Livia, the wife of Tib. Nero.

Beginning of the Sicilian war.

The whole of the year 716 was employed by Augustus and Agrippa in completing their naval preparations. The Italians and the Provinces were again oppressed with a fresh load of taxation to furnish the money that was required;|| while the establishments of all Senators, members of the Equestrian order, and other wealthy individuals, were called upon to supply a certain number of slaves to man the fleet as rowers. It was on this occasion also, that M. Agrippa converted the lakes, Lucrinus and Avernus, on the coast of Campania, into harbours, in which the ships might be assembled,¶ and where the seamen might be exercised at the oar in perfect safety, alike secured from storms and from the enemy. At length, in the spring of 717, Augustus commenced his operations, being supported not only by the fleet which he had received from Antonius, but by the military and naval force of the Province of Africa, which the third

---

* Dion Cassius, p. 387. Appian, c. 96.

† Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 35. Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 390. Appian, lib. v. c. 93.

‡ The character of all these transactions between the Triumvirs is well given by Tacitus, in the following words: "*Antonium Tarentino Brundusinoque Fœdere, et nuptiis Sororis illectum, subdolæ affinitatis pœnas morte exsolvisse.*" *Annal.* lib. i. c. 10. Augustus and Antonius were the exact counterparts of Louis XI. of France, and Charles Duke of Burgundy; and the manner in which Augustus amused his rival, till he had cut off all his other opponents, brings strongly to mind the cautious observance which Louis showed towards Charles, till he had destroyed the Count de St. Pol, and divided and broken the power of his own Nobles, in whom the House of Burgundy might have found such useful auxiliaries. The cunning and calculating cruelty of Augustus, his wisdom in the choice of his servants, his skill in corrupting those of his rivals, the address with which he made his political talents supply his total deficiencies as a General, and his utter want of generosity and noble feeling, are all represented over again most faithfully in Louis XI.; while the violent and headstrong selfishness of Antonius, the cruelties in which he indulged from passion and resentment, the easiness with which he was managed by his adroit antagonist, that incapability of pursuing his own interest steadily, which rendered his military prowess so often nugatory, together with those gleams of a noble spirit, which sometimes burst through the darker parts of his character, are qualities which the reader of Philip de Comines will recognise as distinguishing the unfortunate Charles of Burgundy.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 104. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 10. lib. v. c. 1.

† Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 62. Appian, lib. v. c. 53.

‡ "*Cum hâc etiam divortium fecit, pertæsus, ut scribit, morum perversitatem ejus.*" Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 62.

§ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 377.

|| Ibid. lib. xlviii. p. 387.

¶ Ibid. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 104

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

member of the Triumvirate, M. Lepidus, was to bring over to his aid. A force thus overwhelming could gain little glory by its victory;* but Sex. Pompeius bravely resisted it, and in one engagement totally defeated the enemy's fleet, commanded by Augustus in person, and reduced to the utmost distress the legions which, under the command of Cornificius, had effected a descent on the coast of Sicily. They were however relieved by M. Agrippa, and soon after Sex. Pompeius, having been defeated by Agrippa in a general naval engagement,† and being utterly unable to withstand the united forces of Augustus and Lepidus on shore, abandoned the contest and escaped with his family and most valuable effects to Peloponnesus.

Sex. Pompeius is conquered.

The moment was now favourable to Augustus for ridding himself of another rival. Some disputes had already arisen between him and Lepidus, because Lepidus naturally objected to that tone of superiority which his associate pretended to assume;‡ but the quarrel came to an height when the army of Sex. Pompeius at Messina, surrendered to Lepidus in the absence of Augustus; and Lepidus saw no reason for yielding up to his colleague a force which had voluntarily submitted to himself. In this state of things, Augustus presented himself, wtih only a small guard attending his person, at the camp of Lepidus; and being allowed to enter without suspicion, he began to tamper with the soldiers of his rival, trusting that his superior power and ability would prevail on them to desert to him. But he was disappointed in this hope, and the soldiers of Lepidus, irritated by his proposals, fell upon him and his escort, and obliged him to save his life by a precipitate flight. When treachery had thus failed, he applied himself to open force; and bringing up his whole army, prepared to besiege the camp of Lepidus. Lepidus, destitute of all personal influence over his soldiers, saw them now gradually abandon him, and go over to his enemy; till at length, despairing of his fortune, he laid aside his General's dress, and, in a mean habit, betook himself to the camp of Augustus, and prostrated himself before his feet. With that nice discrimination which led him to shed no blood, unless it were for his interest, and to show no mercy towards those whom he respected and feared, Augustus merely deprived Lepidus of his power as Triumvir, and granted him the free enjoyment of his life and of his private property; while he put to death, with few exceptions, every Senator and member of the Equestrian Order whom he found amongst the followers of Pompeius, and either gave up all the slaves among his prisoners to their former masters for execution, or, if their masters could not be found, ordered them himself to be crucified.

Disputes between Augustus and Lepidus.

Lepidus is deserted by his army, and deprived by Augustus of all his power.

U. C. 718.

Immediately after these great successes, the army in Sicily,* conscious of its power, began to mutiny; and finding that their demands were not listened to, the legions petitioned for their discharge, imagining that Augustus would be afraid to disband them, and thus leave himself exposed to the attacks of Antonius. But the example of his uncle's conduct in similar circumstances, was not lost upon him; he professed his readiness to comply with their wishes, and first discharged all those who had served under him against M. Antonius at Mutina; he then dismissed every soldier who had been enlisted as long as ten years; but to these last he refused to give the rewards and settlements in land which they had expected; and by this punishment, and by declaring that he would never again employ any of the troops whom he should now discharge, he terrified the rest of the army, and made them desirous of continuing in his service. Having thus restored order, he proceeded to conciliate the late mutineers by a display of his liberality. Besides various honorary rewards, and a donation in money, he assigned to them those settlements in land which they coveted above every thing else; and, to increase the value of the gift, he purchased, we are told, a large tract of country in Campania, to be divided amongst his soldiers;† and repaid the former colonists

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

Mutiny of the army suppressed by Augustus.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 392, *et seq.* Velleius Paterculus, c. 104. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxix.

† The whole account of this battle given by Dion Cassius, is almost a transcript of the famous description of the decisive defeat of the Athenians in the harbour of Syracuse, in the seventh book of Thucydides, c. 70, 71. We care little for the plagiarism, but it shows the manner in which the later Greek historians compiled their narratives, not giving authentic accounts of the battles or sieges which they profess to describe; but borrowing some famous passage of description from one of their old writers, and applying it, without scruple, to their own immediate subject.

‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 398, *et seq.* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 105.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 106. Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 399.

† Dion Cassius and Paterculus, *locis citatis*. We have copied the statement of Dion Cassius, but without being at all confident of its accuracy. Capua, as we believe, became a Roman colony in consequence of the Julian law, passed by Cæsar in his first Consulship, U. C. 694. But the soil of this part of Campania was so much coveted, that succeeding demagogues or usurpers were not pleased to be deprived of a means of bribing or rewarding their followers; and accordingly we find that M. Antonius, soon after Cæsar's death, planted new colonies in Campania, regardless of the rights of those already established there, and encroaching in particular on the territory of Capua. Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 39, 40. Appian tells us, that Capua was one of the cities which the Triumvirs gave up to their soldiers when they commenced their usurpation. Probably it was not a military colony, and its inhabitants might therefore have been ejected without scruple. But a colony of veterans seems to have been settled there, when Augustus divided so large a portion of all Italy amongst his soldiers, after the battle of Philippi. This colony, however, was capable of receiving a greater number of inhabitants: ἐνοίκων ἡ πόλις πολλῶν ἐδεῖτο, are the words of Dion Cassius. Possibly the veterans who had been settled there had been tempted to serve again either under Augustus or Antonius, and many of them may thus have perished, either in the East, or in the actions with Sex. Pompeius. Besides, the decay of these military colonies was often inconceivably rapid, from the habitual extravagance of the soldiers, and their ignorance of farming; so that they soon parted with their shares, and were eager to go to the wars again, to entitle themselves to a new division of spoil. But it was competent to the Government to fill up the numbers of colonies thus diminished; "*Colonos novos adscribi posse*," Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 40. because the State never lost its right of reentering into the possession of its demesne lands, if the tenants to whom they had been granted, or their heirs, ceased to occupy them. According to Dion Cassius, however, we must suppose that Augustus gave the revenues in Crete to the old colonists of Capua, as a compensation for the land which he reclaimed, for the purposes of the State, in Campania; and which may have come into their hands as the shareholders dropped off, in the same way that the national lands were so often usurped of old by the rich citizens, as the small landholders became obliged to part with their shares. But if we could be sure that Dion Cassius had copied his account from Velleius Paterculus, and certainly the passages strongly resemble one another, we should think that he had misunderstood the writer whom he was following; and that Paterculus had meant to say, that the revenues in Crete were given to the Roman treasury, as a compensation for the loss of the Campanian rents, which were at

From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

of Capua by a grant of a larger revenue arising from some lands in Crete. Before he returned to Rome, he was desirous of crossing over into Africa, to superintend the settlement of that Province, which, on the deposition of Lepidus, had submitted to his authority without resistance; but he was prevented by a continuance of stormy weather;* and thus, it is said, Africa and Sardinia were the only Provinces in the Empire which, in the course of his life, he never visited.

He returned to Italy in time to check a rising insurrection in Tuscany; this is all that Dion Cassius tells us;† nor have we any means of estimating the magtude of the danger from which his timely victory in Sicily had delivered him: But, as it was, he found nothing in Italy but an excess of servility. He seemed already to be regarded as the Sovereign of the Empire; for he had for some years resided amidst the Romans, while Antonius was engaged in distant wars, or had been revelling in Greece and in Egypt; and now Antonius appeared to be altogether forgotten, while the Senate, if we may still call it by that name, was lavishing on Augustus those excessive and odious distinctions which had before been heaped upon his uncle. As if in ridicule of its own flattery, we are told that the Senate presented to Augustus a list of the different honours which had been voted to him,‡ that he might either accept the whole, or select as many as he thought proper. It is said that he chose the following: to enter the city with the ceremony of the smaller Triumph, or Ovation; that his victory should be commemorated every year by some days of solemn thanksgiving; and that his statue in a triumphal dress should be erected in the *Forum*, on the top of a pillar ornamented with the beaks of ships. The dignity of *Pontifex Maximus*, which was held by M. Lepidus, was also offered to him; but as it could only be legally vacated by death, he refused to accept it; he was invested, however, with the more valuable character of perpetual Tribune;§ that is, his person was declared sacred; and to offer any violence to him was made as great a crime as to injure the person of a Tribune. On his first arrival at Rome, he addressed the Senate and the people successively in set speeches, which he afterwards published; and which contained a general exposition of his whole political career: He then promised his hearers the enjoyment of a state of peace and prosperity; and in some measure to verify his words, he remitted all the yet unpaid taxes which he had imposed for the support of the war with Sex. Pompeius, and gave a general discharge to all those who were indebted to the treasury before the commencement of the Civil war; but this last piece of liberality excited some ridicule, inasmuch as he made a merit of resigning what he had little chance of ever recovering. The system of audacious robbery, which the distresses of the times had long fostered in Rome, he now took effectual measures for suppressing;* and by the establishment of a strong night patrole, and the appointment of an officer with those ample powers with which the special Commissions even under the old Government had always been invested, he is said to have delivered the country entirely from this evil in the space of a twelvemonth. Another of his measures rivalled in cruelty the sweeping massacres of Sylla, and was marked by a perfidy which was eminently characteristic of Augustus. Great numbers of slaves had enlisted some years before in the service of Sex. Pompeius;† and when he concluded his treaty with the Triumvirs, it was stipulated that all these persons should be allowed their liberty, and might return in safety to Italy.‡ But Augustus suspecting that they would cherish a fondness for the memory of Sex. Pompeius, which would make them disaffected towards himself, is said to have sent sealed orders to all his armies, with directions that they were all to be opened on the same day; and on that day all the freedmen, who had gained their liberty from the Treaty between Pompeius and the Triumvirs, were arrested and sent to Rome. Augustus then ordered them all to be given back to their former masters, or to their masters' heirs, if they belonged to a Roman, an Italian, or a Sicilian; and if no one appeared to claim them, they were sent to the cities in which they had lived in their state of slavery, and were there put to death. A somewhat similar act of bloody treachery is recorded to have been committed by the Spartans upon those of their Helots, whose spirit and enterprise they most dreaded; but while the Spartans have been ever justly condemned for this and other such deeds, the memory of Augustus has escaped the detestation which it deserves, and this perfidy and cruelty has been called, even by a modern historian, "a severe, but well-concerted reform."§

Honours paid to Augustus on his return to Italy.

His perfidy towards the freedmen who had served under Sex. Pompeius.

Sex. Pompeius did not long survive this treatment of his old followers. When he reached the coast of Peloponnesus, he was joined by several vessels which had escaped from Sicily; but despairing of continuing the war, he recommended their Captains to provide for their own safety; and himself, with a very small force which he still retained, sailed for Asia, with the intention of requesting the protection of Antonius. He first stopped at the island of Lesbos; at that very

all times so valuable a part of the revenue; and which were constantly paid by the small farmers who cultivated those parts of the national lands which had not yet been divided out as colonies. See Cicero, *de Lege Agrariâ*, *Orat.* ii. c. 30, 31.

We should apologize, perhaps, to the general reader for this long and unsatisfactory note; but if any person, well conversant with the Roman history, should peruse these pages, the statement of what is to us a difficulty, may, perhaps, direct his attention more successfully to the same subject; and thus even a display of our own ignorance, may possibly not be without its benefit to our readers.

* Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 47.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 400.
‡ Appian, lib. v. c. 130.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 401.

* Appian, lib. v. c. 132. † Ibid. c. 131.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 378. Appian, lib. v. c. 72.
§ Ferguson, vol. v. 8vo. edit. 1805. p. 7. In this instance, as well as in the account of Sylla's massacre, which we formerly noticed, Ferguson has completely misrepresented the facts of the case; for he entirely omits to mention that the slaves were men who had served under Sex. Pompeius; that they had received their liberty by a solemn Treaty; and that they were living peaceably, as far as appears, in Italy, at the moment at which they were treacherously seized. According to Ferguson, they were slaves who, having deserted during the Civil war, were "enrolled with the levies which were continually forming by *different parties*;" and Octavius wished "to purge the army of a dangerous class of men by whom it was overcharged and contaminated." If, indeed, the freedmen, who had formerly served under Pompeius, had enlisted since their emancipation in the army of Augustus, it only enhances the atrocity of his conduct towards them; but it does not appear that they had done so, but rather that they were living peaceably in Italy on the faith of that Treaty which had stipulated for their liberty.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

city of Mitylene,* in which his mother and himself, then a boy, had received his father in his flight from the battle of Pharsalia, and where the inhabitants still cherished with a fond regard the memory of his father's virtues. The kind reception which they gave him revived his hopes; at the same time he received tidings of the disastrous expedition of Antonius against the Parthians, and of the dissension between Augustus and Lepidus in Sicily. He is said accordingly to have played a double part, on the one hand endeavouring to win the support of the Parthians, and on the other soliciting the friendship of Antonius, when he found that he had returned from Parthia in safety. But we are told also, that C. Furnius,† who was the Lieutenant of Antonius in the Province of Asia, had shown an unfriendly disposition towards Pompeius from the first moment of his arrival at Lesbos; and that M. Titius, whom Antonius had sent from Syria to oppose him, on the first tidings of his hostile purposes, had formerly received kindnesses from him, which he had repaid by deserting his service and going over to Antonius. What provocation then these two officers may have given, or how far they may have misrepresented to their General the conduct of Pompeius, is difficult to say; but we are told, that Pompeius having collected a small force partly from his own partisans who now again joined him after their dispersion, and partly from that distressed portion of the population which seems in these times to have abounded in every quarter of the Empire, and to have been always ready to follow any standard in the hope of plunder, began to act in a hostile manner in Asia. Some of his principal friends,‡ and among the rest his own father-in-law L. Libo, are said to have left him, from a conviction of the utter hopelessness of his cause, and to have made their own terms with the officers of Antonius. Pompeius himself was willing to surrender himself to C. Furnius,§ but this offer was refused; and he could not bear to put himself in the power of Titius, whom he considered an ungrateful traitor. But being overpowered by the force brought against him, and having in vain endeavoured to make his way into the interior of Asia Minor, he was finally taken prisoner, and, as might have been expected, was put to death by Titius,‖ at Miletus. It is the more probable account that this act was committed without the knowledge of Antonius; but it was received by Augustus at Rome as a triumph won by his associate,¶ and he celebrated it by rejoicings, and by paying some public compliments to Antonius, while the people at large, indignant at the death of the last surviving son of the great Pompey, retained a strong detestation of Titius as the author of it; and some time afterwards, when he was exhibiting some games in the Theatre of Pompey,** he was driven from the theatre by a general burst of public feeling, as if one of the monuments of Pompey's munificence ought not to be profaned by the presence of the murderer of his son.

Last adventures of Sex. Pompeius.

He is put to death in Asia by Titius, one of the Lieutenants of Antonius, U. C. 719.

In the interval, which followed before the commencement of the final contest with Antonius, we read of several wars carried on by Augustus and his Lieutenants against the rude tribes inhabiting the Alps, and against the Dalmatians;* it is mentioned, also, that he now led the Roman armies, for the first time, against the Pannonians, who lived between Dalmatia and the Danube, and whom he attacked without any provocation for the mere object of keeping his soldiers in employment. On his return from these wars to Rome, fresh honours were lavished upon him in the distinctions conferred upon his wife Livia,† and his sister Octavia, whose persons were declared sacred, like those of the Tribunes; and they were allowed the privilege of managing their own affairs without a guardian or trustee, whose agency was necessary to all women in legal transactions, as no female was supposed to be independent, or was capable of acting in her own name.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 723. — A. C. 45. to 31.

The Triumvirs had renewed their power for a period of five years, as we have already seen, from the beginning of the year 716; and the succession to the ordinary offices of the Commonwealth had been settled for eight years, when the Triumvirs concluded their treaty with Sex. Pompeius in the year 714. According to this arrangement, the Triumvirate properly expired on the last day of the year 720; and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and C. Sosius were the persons who had been named as Consuls for the year 721. Already were the signs of an approaching quarrel between Augustus and Antonius become clearly visible; Antonius could not be insensible to the great accession of power which his rival had gained by his acquisition of Sicily, Sardinia, and Africa; nor was this his only ground of complaint;‡ but he expressed his dissatisfaction that Augustus had appropriated to himself the military resources of Italy, which were to be divided jointly between them; and that in assigning settlements in lands to the veteran soldiers, he had confined his grants almost exclusively to those who had served particularly under his own standard. Augustus, in reply, taxed Antonius with having, on his part, occupied Armenia, and having brought disgrace on the Roman name, by the treacherous murder of its King; he said Egypt was, in fact, become his Province through his connection with Cleopatra; and that his soldiers could not claim their share of settlements in Italy, till they chose to divide, with equal fairness, what they had won themselves in Media and Parthia. This was a mere insult on the disasters of Antonius's late expedition into those countries; and there was hardly more weight in another accusation which Dion Cassius ascribes to Augustus, namely, that Antonius had put Sex. Pompeius to death, whereas he himself had purposely allowed him to escape from Sicily. But Augustus's main reliance was on the feeling of national pride which he hoped to awaken in the Romans, by representing his rival as one who had cast off his duty to his country, and was become the mere slave of a foreign Queen. With this view every tale of the levities in which Antonius indulged in his hours of festivity with Cleopatra, and of the attentions and gallantries which he paid to her, was eagerly caught up and industriously circulated; and the public were

First beginnings of the quarrel between Augustus and Antonius.

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 402. Appian, lib. v. c. 133.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 402.
‡ Appian, lib. v. c. 139. § Ibid. c. 141.
‖ Ibid. c. 144. Strabo, lib. iii. p. 150. edit. Xyland.
¶ Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 403.
** Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 104.

* Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxxi. Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 412, 413.
† Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 414.
‡ Ibid. lib. l. p. 419. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 55

taught to deplore the degradation of the majesty of the Roman name; because Antonius had assumed the character of Gymnasiarch, or master of the gymnastic exercises at Alexandria;* because he had called Cleopatra his Queen and Sovereign lady; and because she had some Roman soldiers amongst her guards, and her name was inscribed on their shields as their commander and mistress.

Consulship of C. Sosius and Cn. Domitius. U. C. 721.

But the two Consuls, C. Sosius and Cn. Domitius, were friends of Antonius, and as the Triumvirate was now legally at an end, the Consular power might seem entitled to resume its ancient ascendency. Accordingly, on the very first day of the year,† C. Sosius delivered a speech full of the praises of Antonius, and of invective against Augustus; and he would have immediately proceeded to employ the authority of his office in some measure adverse to the interests of the latter, had not Nonius Balbus, one of the Tribunes, interposed with his negative. But this revival of the legal Government of the Commonwealth was, of all things, most unwelcome to Augustus; he returned, therefore, speedily to Rome, (for he had absented himself purposely from the meeting of the Senate on the first of January,) assembled the Senate, and surrounding his person with a military force, and with a multitude of his partisans, armed, it is said, with concealed daggers, he took his seat on the Curule chair, which he was used to occupy, between the chairs of the Consuls, and after having spoken at some length in defence of himself, he uttered a strong invective, in his turn, against Sosius and Antonius. The actual presence of his soldiers intimated sufficiently that "the Master of the Legions" was not a person with whom it was safe to argue; no one therefore answered him, and he summoned the Senate to meet again on a fixed day, when he assured them that he would produce written proofs of the unworthiness of Antonius. Meanwhile the Consuls, followed by a considerable number of Senators, left the Capital privately, and repaired to Antonius; while Augustus, to avoid the odium which their retirement cast upon him, pretended that he had himself allowed them freely to withdraw, and that he would not oppose the departure of any other friends of Antonius, who might wish, in like manner, to join him. It appears that Antonius had already begun to prepare for war;‡ and that both Cleopatra and himself were about this time in Asia Minor, while their land and sea forces were gathering together in the same quarter and in the Ægean. Here he heard of the proceedings which were going on against him at Rome,§ of the subsequent meeting of the Senate which took place after the departure of the Consuls, and of the language which Augustus used both in speaking and writing concerning him. Upon this he assembled a sort of counter Senate, consisting of the numerous Senators who had repaired to him from Rome. After much debate, it was resolved that the war should be undertaken; and Antonius sent a formal divorce to Octavia, exactly as Augustus had divorced his first wife, Clodia, on the occasion of his quarrel with her mother Fulvia and with L. Antonius. But the notoriety of the connection of Antonius with Cleopatra, made it appear that Octavia was rather sacrificed to his passion for the Egyptian Queen, than divorced on account of his quarrel with her brother; and this also was used as a topic on which to excite the national pride of the Romans, by representing a noble Roman lady as dishonoured and despised by her husband, in order to gratify the jealousy of his barbarian paramour.

The Consuls leave Rome and repair to Antonius.

Antonius announces his connection with Augustus and divorces Octavia.

This feeling, indeed, was not confined to the Romans of the Capital; even the officers of Antonius were disgusted at the evident influence which Cleopatra exercised over him, and against which their wisest counsels were sure to be offered ineffectually. They might conjecture too, from the infatuation of their General, the probable result of the war; and thus L. Plancus,* who had formerly made so many professions of fidelity to the old Constitution, and had afterwards joined the Triumvirs, and procured from them the murder of his own brother as one of the rewards of his treason, now deserted the cause of Antonius. Accompanied by his nephew, M. Titius, the author of the death of Sex. Pompeius,† he hastened to Rome to transfer his services to Augustus. Plancus and Titius had been deeply trusted by Antonius, and they now betrayed to his enemy every secret of which they were in possession. Amongst the rest they intimated to him the contents of the Will of Antonius, which they had themselves attested; and informed him in whose care it was deposited. Augustus immediately got this document into his power;‡ and, with shameless baseness, broke open the seals, and read the contents of it publicly, first to the Senate, and afterwards to the assembly of the People. The clause in it, which especially induced Augustus to commit this act, was one in which Antonius desired that his body might, after his death, be carried to Alexandria, and there buried by the side of Cleopatra. This proof of his romantic passion for a foreigner, seemed, in the eyes of the Romans, to attest his utter degeneracy, and induced the populace, at least, to credit the inventions of his enemies, who asserted that it was his intention, if victorious in the approaching contest, to give up Rome to the dominion of Cleopatra, and to transfer the seat of Empire from the banks of the Tiber to those of the Nile. It is clear, from the language of those poets, who wrote under the patronage of Augustus,§ that this was the light in which the war was industriously represented; that every effort was made to give it the character of a contest with a foreign enemy; and to array on the side of Augustus the national pride and jealousy of

He is deserted by L. Plancus and M. Titius.

They betray the contents of his Will to Augustus, who publishes them before the Senate and People.

* Dion Cassius, lib. l. p. 421. † Ibid. p. 419.
‡ Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 56.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. l. p. 420.

* Dion Cassius, lib. l. p. 420. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 58.
† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 108.
‡ Dion Cassius, p. 420. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 58. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 17.
§ *Antehac nefas depromere Cæcubum*
Cellis avitis; dum Capitolio
Regina dementes ruinas,
Funus et Imperio parabat,
Contaminato cum grege turpium
Morbo Virorum. Horace, *Carm.* lib. i. Ode 37.

Hinc Augustus agens Italos in prœlia Cæsar,
Cum Patribus Populoque, Penatibus et Magnis Diis,
Hinc ope barbaricâ, variisque Antonius armis,———
———sequiturque, nefas! Ægyptia conjux!
* * * * *
Omnigenumque Deûm Monstra, et latrator Anubis
Contra Neptunum et Venerem, contraque Minervam,
Tela tenent. Virgil, *Æneid.* viii. v. 678. 685. 698.

Biography. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

the people of Rome. Nor were these arts unsuccessful; insomuch, that the infamy of stealing and divulging the contents of a Will was forgotten, in the indignation felt by the Romans, at the preference shown by Antonius to Egypt, rather than to his own country; and it is said, that the Senate, as soon as they had heard the Will read, decreed that Antonius should be deprived of the Consulship to which he was to have succeeded in the following year,* and of all his other authority as an officer of the Roman Commonwealth. His adherents moreover were encouraged to desert him, by promises of indemnity and honours.

Declaration of war against Cleopatra.

At the same time war was declared against Cleopatra, and Augustus discharged the office of *Fecialis* or Herald, in going through all the usual ceremonies in denouncing it. But for a contest of this magnitude, immense resources were requisite, and accordingly Augustus imposed an income tax of twenty-five per cent. on all the free citizens who possessed any land in Italy;† and a tax upon capital at the rate of £12. 10*s*. per cent. on all freedmen who were worth fifty thousand *denarii*, or about £1614. The inequality of these burdens was greatly resented by the freedmen; and numerous disturbances were the consequence, insomuch, that it was supposed that the appearance of Antonius in Italy at that moment, would have ensured him a complete victory over his rival. But whether Antonius was not sufficiently advanced in his preparations to risk such an attempt, or whether there was any failure of enterprise on his part, it is certain that Augustus was suffered to crush the discontents of Italy without any interruption. His fleet was assembled in the neighbourhood of Brundusium,* and threatened the opposite coast of Epirus, about the autumn of the year 722; and Antonius judging it too late in the season to commence any active operations, fell back from Corcyra, to which place he had advanced in the hope of carrying the war into Italy before his adversary was ready to meet him, and passed the winter at Patræ, on the north-western coast of Peloponnesus. And thus having brought the two parties to the eve of the decisive struggle, we shall here pause in our narrative; and referring our readers to the History of Egypt for the details of the Actian war, we shall hereafter resume the story of Augustus at the period when his ambition was fully gratified, and he was become the sole Sovereign of the Roman Empire.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 709. to 722. — A. C. 45. to 32.

* Dion Cassius, lib. l. p. 421.
† Ibid. p. 424. Plutarch, *in Antonio*, c. 58.

* Dion Cassius, p. 424.

HISTORY

CHAPTER XXIV.

OF EGYPT.

FROM A. M. 3681. TO 3974. B. C. 323. TO B. C. 30.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

In our IXth volume (p. 213) we have brought down the History of Egypt to the accession of the Greek dynasty, in the person of Ptolemy the First, who is usually surnamed Soter; and in our account of the military exploits of "Alexander's Successors," we have supplied to our readers an outline of the more important occurrences which respected that country, considered as a part of the Macedonian Empire. It is our intention to give, in the present Chapter, a rapid sketch of the internal History of Egypt during the reigns of the Grecian Kings; beginning with the renowned son of Lagus, whose name has been already mentioned, and ending with Cleopatra, whose imprudent conduct hastened the downfall of the Royal house, and the final subjugation of the Egyptian people.

Accession of Ptolemy Soter. B. C. 323.

The Province of Egypt having upon the death of Alexander the Great, been assigned to Ptolemy, he proceeded thither without delay to assume the direction of its affairs. Cleomenes, an officer who had enjoyed the confidence of the Macedonian Prince, was already in that country, charged with the superintendence of its finances, and appointed to collect that portion of its revenue which the Egyptians had bound themselves to pay to their conquerors as the price of their security; and it would appear that the Council of Generals who sanctioned the division of their late master's territories, had resolved that this faithful envoy should continue to exercise his wonted authority, and divide the cares of administration with the new Governor. But Ptolemy, whose ambition very soon aspired to the Sovereignty of Egypt, determined to have no rival. He speedily procured the murder of Cleomenes; seized upon the Treasury at Alexandria, which contained eight thousand talents; added to his army, and increased the number of his ships; and in a word left no means unemployed whereby he might strengthen his own interests, and defeat the designs of his enemies. He laboured, at the same time, to gain the affections of the natives, and to secure their co-operation in his great designs: and anticipating the dissensions that were about to burst out among his military colleagues in the other Provinces, he fortified his dominions so strongly against every species of assault from abroad, that, when the eventful struggle did take place among the Successors of Alexander, Egypt alone remained almost entirely unmoved by those tremendous convulsions which shook every other part of the Macedonian Empire to its very centre.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

We must refer the reader to our History of ALEXANDER'S SUCCESSORS for an account of the wars which ensued, first between Perdiccas and Ptolemy, and afterwards between the latter and Antigonus. Twenty years had passed away amidst the labours of the camp, or in the uncertain tranquillity of an occasional truce, until at length the victory obtained at Ipsus confirmed so completely the power of the Egyptian ruler, that he was enabled thenceforward to devote a large share of his attention to the internal improvement of his country, and to the furtherance of Learning and of the Arts.

It has been said of Ptolemy that, like the founder of the Roman Empire, he exhibited at different periods of his life a remarkable diversity of character. As long as his fortunes were suspended on the casualties of war, or were menaced by the intrigues of his enemies, he showed himself very little scrupulous as to the means which he employed to ensure success: but no sooner was his Kingdom placed on a firm basis, by the defeat of Antigonus, and by the acquisition of such frontier Provinces as he deemed necessary to its defence, than he laid aside the stern policy which had theretofore distinguished his measures, and turned all his thoughts to the happiness of the people, and to the decoration of his Capital.†

It may seem somewhat paradoxical to observe, that these benevolent and liberal views on the part of Ptolemy were greatly promoted by the unsettled state of the neighbouring nations. But this is not the only occasion on which a wise and moderate Government has profited by the anarchy of surrounding States. Thousands of ingenious persons who were driven from home by the violence of war, or by the dread of domestic insurrection, found an asylum in Egypt; whither they carried with them the Arts which promote the general wealth of every community, and the love of Literature and Science, which are the most lasting basis of National Glory.

* Pausanias, *Attic.* c. 6. Arrian *apud* Photium. Diodorus, lib. xx.
† Justin, lib. xv. c. 4. Diodorus, lib. xx. Plutarch, *in Demetrium.*

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323 to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

Among the more illustrious of the exiles who sought the protection of Ptolemy, we have to place the name of Demetrius Phalereus. This distinguished scholar, after having governed Athens ten years, with singular ability and zeal, found himself compelled to seek for refuge in the new Capital of Egypt; and being kindly received by Ptolemy, he soon rendered his literary knowledge of the greatest avail in forwarding the schemes which that wise Monarch had already devised, for extending among the higher classes of his subjects a desire for elegant amusement and philosophical research. At the suggestion of the Phalerean he resolved to establish a Library on such a liberal and magnificent scale as that he might deposit in it, not only the various literary works with which the genius of Greece had begun to enrich the shores of the Mediterranean, but also such ancient and curious books as his growing intercourse with more Eastern nations might enable him to collect. The fame of this institution has reached even to our own times; and it has contributed in no ordinary degree to exalt the reputation of the first Ptolemy, and to confer upon his reign the character of a more generous and lofty spirit than has been bestowed upon the government of any of his contemporaries.*

Alexandrian Library.

In connection with the Alexandrian Library, the King of Egypt was in like manner pleased to found a Museum; of which the main object appears to have been to supply to studious men at once the means and the encouragement to follow out their several pursuits. The members lived together and partook in common of the bounty of the Sovereign: who, in addition to the munificence of a liberal establishment, stimulated their researches by his example; animated their discussions by listening to their arguments, or by taking a side in their philosophical hypotheses; creating respect for their association by condescending to share in its labours, and to accept of its honours.†

We must rest satisfied with referring the reader to Eusebius, Strabo, and Quintilian, for a list of the Poets and Dramatists who adorned the Court of Ptolemy. It is of more consequence to mention that this renowned Prince established at Alexandria four separate Schools for the advancement of Science. The first of these was the School of Critics and Commentators; which numbered among its members the celebrated names of Eratosthenes, Aristophanes, Aristarchus, Apollodorus, and Aristodemus; and which continued to shed a light more or less constant on the annals of literature, from the period now under consideration down to the full ascendancy of Roman power in the reign of Augustus.

School of Criticism.

Of Mathematics.

Mathematics occupied the attention of the second School founded by Ptolemy. This important Science had made considerable progress at Athens, in the Academy of Plato, whose pupils carried the love and reputation of their favourite study into all the principal cities of Greece. The Alexandrian School has transmitted to posterity, in the works of Euclid, Apollonius, and Archimedes, the most satisfactory evidence of the singular success with which the abstract truths of Geometry had been pursued by the older Philosophers of Attica: accompanied, at the same time, with a pleasing and most convincing proof, that the patronage of the Egyptian King had not failed to accomplish its object. The ingenuity of modern times has added nothing to the elementary principles of Euclid; and the most successful experimenters in the most improved of the physical sciences have despaired of equalling the splendid results which were effected by the apparatus of Archimedes.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

The third School was devoted to the study of practical Astronomy. Of the labours of this distinguished association we have given a full account in another place, and narrated how the sages of Alexandria undertook to calculate the distances and magnitudes of the planets, the rate of their movements, and to trace the causes, and estimate the quantity of that apparent irregularity, which shows itself in the revolution of all the heavenly bodies. Timocharis and Aristillus first began to collect those valuable observations which were afterwards so much increased, and so ably employed by Aristarchus of Samos, and Hipparchus of Nicæa, and on which was ultimately founded the reformation of the Roman Calendar under the auspices of Julius Cæsar.†

Of Astronomy.

The School of Medicine, which was the last of the four institutions established by the King of Egypt, proved of great advantage to his people. By an indulgence extremely rare in that age, the teachers of Anatomy were allowed to illustrate their lectures by the dissection of human bodies. Tertullian, in his work *De Animâ*, assures us that Herophilus, one of the first Professors in the Alexandrian School, dissected six hundred men, in order to make himself fully acquainted with the structure and offices of the various parts of the human frame. He showed his contempt for mankind, says the venerable Father, by the means which he used to obtain a complete knowledge of their physical nature. "*Herophilus ille medicus—qui hominem odiit ut nôsset.*"‡

Of Medicine.

Philosophical liberality of Ptolemy.

Though Alexandria was afterwards celebrated for the zeal with which her Philosophers recommended the doctrines of Plato, the Royal patronage was not confined to the tenets of that eloquent writer. On the contrary, he himself appears to have inclined to the opinions of Aristotle; whilst there is no doubt that Demetrius Phalereus, his favourite Minister and literary confidant, had openly avowed his preference for the dogmas of the latter School. But whether Platonists, or Pythagoreans, or Peripatetics, all men of ingenuity and research found a safe retreat and a liberal protection at the Court of Ptolemy. He was too much a lover of Learning to yield a bigoted attachment to any one sect; and he was much more desirous to extend among his subjects the general principles of Science, than to indulge his own partiality in favour of any particular system of opinions.§

The example of Ptolemy himself would stimulate the industry of the historian. His work is unfortunately lost to Literature; but we learn from the narrative of Arrian, that the favourite General of Alexander was not less distinguished by his abilities

* Diodorus, lib. xx. c. 45. Ælian, *Var. Hist.* lib. iii. c. 17. Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. iii. c. 2.

† Strabo, lib. xvii.

* Pappus, *Collec. Math.* lib. vii. Diogenes Laertius. Proclus. Euclid, lib. i. c. 4. Philopon. *Commentar. in Analyt. Poster.* Valerius Maximus, lib. viii. c. 12.

† Ptolemy, *Syntag. Mag.* lib. vi. c. 3. Celsus, *in Præf. Fulgen. Mytholog.* Galen, tom. iv.

‡ See Galen, *ut supra.*

§ Diogenes Laertius, *in Pythag.* Athenæus, lib. iv.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

as an author, than by his skill as a commander. The ravages of time and of barbarian conquerors have, indeed, allowed but few memorials to remain of the Historic Muse; and it is only from references which are found in scattered volumes, that we are enabled to form some judgment, in regard to the treasures of learning which were buried in the ruins of Alexandria.

We reserve for the article EGYPT, in the MISCELLANEOUS DIVISION of our Work, an account of the improvements which the Greek Capital of that ancient kingdom owed to Ptolemy Soter, and to his son, Philadelphus. The Arts as well as the Sciences had sought a refuge in the enlightened society of Alexandria; and they never fail to repay the protection under which they are permitted to flourish. The advanced state of Egypt in regard to the fine Arts in particular, received a remarkable illustration in the Coronation festival of the young Ptolemy, which was celebrated by the King two years before his death.

Coronation of Ptolemy Philadelphus. B. C. 286.

This solemnity is said to have drawn to Alexandria crowds of strangers from the greater part of Asia. The native of India joined the mountaineer of Caucasus and the swarthy inhabitant of Ethiopia, to witness the magnificence of the Egyptian Princes. The pavilion in which the Ptolemies received the more illustrious of the visitors, was elevated on pillars seventy-five feet high; imitating in their form the elegance of the palm tree and the fantastic thyrsus of Bacchus. Its centre was overshadowed by a rich canopy of scarlet; the floor was adorned with the carpets of Babylon or of Persia. The hall exhibited a hundred marble figures of different kinds of animals, and a great variety of the most choice paintings of the Sicyonian masters. Two golden eagles, each above twenty feet in height, towered on the summit of this splendid edifice. It would be tedious to describe the tripods, the vases, the couches, and tables, formed of gold, and adorned with precious stones; the materials alone are said to have exceeded in value the amount of two millions sterling.

In the following details, which are translated from Callixenus of Rhodes, we use the version of Dr. Gillies. In the procession which ensued, says the Rhodian, and which lasted from morning till sun-set, the superstition of Greece was recommended to the Egyptians and Asiatics by whatever could please the fancy or soothe the senses. The image of each divinity, always of a colossal magnitude, was accompanied by his emblems, his altar, and his car of triumph: while the dramatic representation of his attendants, or paintings nearly as impressive, exhibited the labours which he had encountered, and the benefits which he had conferred. The pomp of Bacchus is described circumstantially, and this part may help the imagination to grasp the magnificence of the whole. His car, crowned with vines and ivy, was preceded and followed by troops of Satyrs, mimics, and Priests, with all the inferior votaries of that jolly God. Golden censers diffused around the most precious perfumes. Behind the image of the God followed that of his nurse Nysa; at first reclined in her chariot, but afterwards rising spontaneously and pouring forth libations of milk. Wine distilled from innumerable fountains, and particularly from a movable wine-press drawn by three hundred men, and trodden by sixty satyrs, who enlivened their work by chanting the Vintage hymn.

This procession, however, was only a prelude to one still more extraordinary, in which Bacchus appeared in his character of an Eastern conqueror; represented by an idol eighteen feet high mounted on an elephant, attended by five hundred Nymphs in purple tissues, and a proportional number of Satyrs completely armed. Twenty elephants adorned the most splendid of Roman triumphs, that of the Emperor Aurelian; but twenty-four chariots, each drawn by four of these huge animals, appeared in one scene of this gorgeous procession; in which the Ptolemies had united the rarest objects in nature with the most exquisite productions of art. It is sufficient to mention eight hundred waggons laden with spices and perfumes; Negroes bearing ebony, ivory, and gold; the natives of Hindústán displaying in captivity the elegant clothes and rich jewels of their country; birds of various plumage hovering round artificial grottoes; innumerable yokes of fierce panthers and beautiful zebras; white oxen from India; the camelopard and rhinoceros from Ethiopia; Numidian lions and savage tigers, with Hyrcanian and Molossian dogs, rivalling in ferocity and strength those tyrants of the desert. The pageant of Bacchus was followed by that of the other Divinities. Alexander the Great, alone more Godlike than the whole hierarchy, came the last of all. His statue was of pure gold, and his car was drawn by elephants of unrivalled magnitude. Pallas and Victory attended their favourite hero.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

We have introduced this abridgement of a description, the full details of which would have fatigued the patience of the reader, in order to give some idea of the costly magnificence which illustrated the Court of the first Ptolemies, and thereby to afford the means of judging as to the condition of the Arts which ministered to that Royal display. The paintings and sculptures, which mingled with the other ornaments of this gorgeous solemnity, certainly justify the inference that coarser and more useful productions of the Arts were likewise at that period sufficiently abundant in Egypt. The perfumes, too, and the multitude of other foreign commodities which were lavished during the procession and entertainments, prove the extensive commerce which had already rewarded the wise policy of Alexander and his first Successor. In short, the Coronation festival of Ptolemy affords the most satisfactory proof that Egypt was, at the accession of Philadelphus, in a state of great prosperity; powerful in its natural resources, enriched by trade, adorned by the Arts, and secured in all its possessions by able councillors and by numerous fleets and armies.

Removal of the image of Serapis from Pontus to Alexandria

There is one proceeding in the reign of this sagacious Prince, for which we find it somewhat difficult to account, particularly when invested with the importance which he chose to attach to it. We allude to the removal of the image of Serapis from Pontus to Alexandria; a measure which was preceded by more negociation, and accomplished with greater solemnity, than the transference of all the States which arms or Treaties had added to the Egyptian dominions. Tacitus in his *History* deigns to take notice of this event, and to ascribe the conduct of Ptolemy to a supernatural cause. The God appeared to him in a dream, and exhorted him to obtain from the King of Sinope the sacred emblem under which he was worshipped in

* Callixen. Rhod. *in Athenæo.*

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

Pontus, persuading the Egyptian Monarch that he would thereby ensure for his country a high degree of felicity and honour. Ptolemy forthwith obeyed the celestial admonition, and sent Ambassadors to Sinope But so greatly were the people of that district attached to the divine effigy of Serapis, that they refused for more than two years to listen to the proposal of their powerful neighbour. Famine at length accomplished that which the intreaties and bribes of the King of Egypt had failed to effect. The inhabitants of Sinope consented to barter the image of their God for a certain quantity of corn. A Temple was built for it at Alexandria, called the Serapeion, a structure on which so much cost and skill was lavished, that, as Ammianus Marcellinus maintains, it surpassed in beauty and magnificence all the temples in the world, except the Capitol at Rome. To the Serapeion, moreover, was attached that Library, which we have already noticed, and which has been celebrated in all succeeding ages for the value and number of the books which it contained.*

A. M. 3720. — B. C. 284. — OL. 124. 1.

Death and character of Ptolemy Soter.

Ptolemy the First died in the eighty-fourth year of his age, about two years, as we have already observed, after he had admitted his son to a share in the government. He was unquestionably the best and ablest Prince of all his race; and left for the direction of his successors such examples of prudence, justice, and clemency, as very few of them had firmness to imitate. He presided over the affairs of Egypt for about forty years subsequently to the death of Alexander; in which time he raised it to a height of grandeur and power far above that of any other contemporary Kingdom. He retained on the throne the same simplicity of manners by which he had been distinguished when he was yet a Macedonian soldier; and so little was his mind accessible to the temptations of avarice, that he neglected to accumulate any personal property. His maxim on this subject is said to have been, "that it is more honourable in a King to enrich others than to be rich himself."

The dominions to which Philadelphus succeeded were extensive and powerful, and so well connected, that in the event of an attack from abroad, each separate portion could afford assistance to every other. Besides Egypt, he found subjected to his authority the important Provinces of Phœnicia, Cœle-Syria, Arabia, Lybia, Ethiopia, the Island of Cyprus, Pamphylia, Cilicia, Lycia, Caria, and the isles called the Cyclades.†

Death of Demetrius Phalereus.

It is said that he disgraced the beginning of his reign by the murder of Demetrius Phalereus, who had given the young Prince offence by the counsel which he offered to his father, the late Ptolemy, in regard to a successor. He ordered the Philosopher to be seized and confined in a remote fortress, until he should determine in what manner to treat him. The bite of a poisonous reptile put an end to the life of that great man, to whom Egypt owed so much, and who had certainly merited even at the hands of Philadelphus, a very different fate.‡

State of Egypt on the accession of Philadelphus.

The wars which Ptolemy the Second carried on, both against his brother Magus and the King of Syria, are narrated at some length in our historical sketch of ALEXANDER'S SUCCESSORS. The reader will find greater pleasure in surveying the outlines of a picture, in which the prosperity and happiness of Egypt have been delineated by several authors of good information and veracity. We have already referred to Theocritus, who in his *Idylls* assures us, with all the fervour of patriotism, that Egypt under the sway of Ptolemy was governed by mild and equal laws; was defended by invincible armies; and was at once the best cultivated and the most commercial country on the face of the earth. He subjoins, in a tone of innocent exaggeration, that the regal authority of his patron was acknowledged in more than thirty thousand cities or towns, all flourishing and wealthy; that the fleets on the Red Sea and Mediterranean were employed in conducting a most extensive traffic; and that a nation which had long languished under the yoke of the Persians, and had sunk into the degraded condition of a Province, once more raised its head in its original splendour, and exercised a secure dominion over the islands of Greece, the seaports of Asia, and the remote regions of Lybia and Ethiopia.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

Military resources.

The narrative of Appian, an historian of great fidelity, and who possessed the most ample means of information in regard to Egypt, is less inflated than that of Theocritus, but is nevertheless fitted to excite in the mind of the reader the most elevated notions respecting the power of Ptolemy. He tells us, that his army consisted of two hundred thousand foot, forty thousand horse, three hundred elephants, and two thousand armed chariots. His magazines were filled with all sorts of military stores and engines, and contained armour for three hundred thousand soldiers, in addition to those which he maintained in a state of equipment. Nor was his navy less numerous or efficient; it consisted of a hundred and twelve ships of an extraordinary size, some of them having thirty-five tiers of oars; fifteen hundred trireme and quadrireme galleys; besides two thousand armed vessels of smaller dimensions. Four thousand Egyptian merchantmen are said to have navigated the Mediterranean; and eight hundred barges, decorated with gold and silver, are described as plying on the Nile, and ministering to the pleasure of the wealthy inhabitants who occupied its banks. The public arsenals, too, were stored with an inexhaustible supply of marine equipments, being equal, at least, to all the wants of a navy double the amount of that which was at any time actually ready for sea.*

Treasure.

The treasures of Ptolemy were in full proportion to his mighty fleets and armies. At his death the number of talents which he had accumulated from the national revenue, amounted to seven hundred and forty thousand; a mass of wealth, of which the extent will be more easily comprehended by the reader, when we mention that it is equivalent to about two hundred millions sterling. Such, indeed, were the revenues and the magnificence of the Second Ptolemy, that even in the very height of Roman greatness, they were still spoken of as proverbially singular; and the epithet *Philadelphian* was employed in the Capital of Italy to characterise those extraordinary and splendid undertakings, in which the expensiveness of the materials could only be rivalled by the nobleness of the design, and the exquisite beauty of the workmanship.

Sources of wealth.

Various causes have been assigned with the view of accounting for that uncommon tide of wealth which

* Tacitus, *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 83, 84. Plutarch, *de Isid. et Osir.* Clemens Alexandrinus, *in Protrept.* p. 31. Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xxii. c. 16.

† Theocritus, *Idyll.* xvii.

‡ Diogenes Laertius, *in Demet.* Cicero, *in Orat. pro Rabir.*

* Appian, *Hist. Roman. in Præm.* Athenæus, lib. v.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

flowed into Egypt during the reign of Philadelphus. The possession of a long line of sea-coast, furnished with excellent harbours, and communicating with countries naturally very rich, secured to his subjects a lucrative traffic. Above all, the occupation of Arabia, and the maritime parts of eastern Africa opened to him a valuable trade as well in spices and perfumes, as in the precious metals. Timosthenes the Rhodian, who commanded the Egyptian fleets in the Red Sea, is known to have examined the seaports of Adel, beyond the Straits of Babelmandel, and to have explored the African coast as far as Ophir, or Sofala, the land of gold, situated as is now ascertained nearly opposite to the Island of Madagascar. Even the wild regions of Ethiopia were found accessible to the adventurous spirit of Ptolemy's Lieutenants; and the city which they built nearly four hundred miles farther south than Syene, attests at once the splendid objects which their master had in view, and the great progress which he had made towards the final accomplishment of his plan.*

Commercial policy.

Strabo informs us, that Ptolemy traded directly to India, with the view it would seem, of rendering himself independent of those Arabian tribes, who in his time, as well as at a more early period, employed themselves in carrying spices down into Egypt. It does not appear, however, that his intercourse with the people of India was carried to any considerable extent. He had to encounter many ancient habits and usages, which opposed a serious obstacle to his innovations. He could overcome the physical difficulties which presented themselves, both on the northern and eastern shores of his Kingdom; and he joined by a canal the waters of the Red Sea to those of the Mediterranean; a work which first engaged the enterprise of Sesostris, and afterwards exhausted the resources or defeated the skill of Darius the Persian. But the inveterate habits of man are less pliant than the rocks of the mountain or the sands of the desert. Ptolemy effected a navigation across the Isthmus of Suez, but he failed in his attempt to induce the Ethiopians to relinquish their caravans between Abyssinia and Egypt, and to trust their treasures to his numerous ships.

It appears to have been the policy of the first Grecian Kings of Egypt to divert the wandering tribes which were used to traverse the deserts between that country and the Red Sea, from the traffic in which they so much delighted, and to direct their attention to agriculture, for which both their land and their habits were extremely ill adapted. The Priests at that period were the chief patrons of trade; and their Temples, both in Egypt and Ethiopia, were frequently used as the magazines or the entrepots of the valuable commerce in which the caravans were engaged. But whilst Ptolemy was pursuing his favourite object, and labouring to place in the hands of his sailors the migratory trade of the Ethiopian wilderness, the Priests of that country were all inhumanly massacred; an event which could not fail to excite some suspicion that the assassin cooperated in this horrid deed with the avowed policy of the Egyptian Monarch. The barbarous act now mentioned, is, no doubt, ascribed to the King of Meroe, who is said to have obtained, through the medium of the Greek Philosophy, certain new views on the subject of Religion; and who, to signalize his conversion to more rational tenets, is reported to have immolated the unfortunate Priests, as being the main supporters of the abandoned superstition.* It is nowhere said that Philadelphus had any share in this wicked transaction; yet the ruin of the Priests who, as we have already mentioned, were the main adventurers in the Ethiopian trade, at the very time that an attempt was making to reduce the people of the desert to fixed settlements, would appear to indicate that all these measures were parts of one great design for bringing the traffic into a new channel.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

The reign of this Ptolemy was greatly illustrated by the numerous and distinguished authors who had repaired to Alexandria. Among the Poets, the names of Aratus, Callimachus, Theocritus, and Lycophron, are known to every reader. Philosophy also continued to receive the most marked encouragement; and the King, after the example of his father, promoted the love of knowledge by extending his countenance to all, without attaching himself exclusively to any particular sect. The objects of Moral Science were not indeed wisely selected; and the doctrines maintained in regard to both body and mind were extremely absurd. Fable, too, mixed with their history; which at best was calculated rather to gratify the silly pride of barbarians, than to instruct the curious or to inform the ignorant. Their discussions more frequently respected the mysterious powers which were supposed to reside in plants and minerals, than the qualities of matter which reveal themselves to the senses. Their knowledge of Astronomy was greatly debased by its intermixture with those absurd opinions, which traced the history of nations and the fortunes of individuals to the influence of the stars. Their books were full of wonders and prodigies; nature was studied by them in her exceptions rather than in her general rules; and they noted her apparent aberrations, and gave them a place in their Philosophy, whilst they neglected that smooth and even tenour of her operations, which is regarded as the basis of all true Science.†

State of Literature.

It is but justice to mention, at the same time, that the Astronomical School of Alexandria arrived at very considerable attainments both in regard to fact and to principle. Aristarchus is the author of a work on the distance and magnitude of the Sun and Moon, in which he greatly enlarged the boundaries which had been formerly assigned to the Solar system; and though his conclusions did not approach to the magnificence of the Copernican theory, they yet satisfied him that the Sun was the centre of revolution to the Earth and its accompanying satellite.‡ He encountered a variety of objections, some of which arose from entire ignorance, others from the imperfect state of the Science. Of the latter class we may mention the difficulty suggested by one of his antagonists, who observed that, on the supposition of the Earth's annual motion, the fixed stars as viewed from it, would be found to be continually changing their position, with regard to each other. His answer deserves our particular attention, on account of the sublime views which it implies, relative to the system of which our globe makes a part. The whole orbit of the Earth, said he, is little more than a point in comparison of the heavens; and by this re-

* Strabo, lib. xvi. Agatharchides, *de Mari Rubro apud* Photium.

* Diodorus, lib. iii. s. 6.

† Ælian, *Var. Hist.* lib. xi. Strabo, lib. vi. Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.*

‡ Aristarchus, *de Magni. et Dist. Solis et Lunæ.*

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

mark, which appears at once in the light of a principle and of an inference, he both weakened the force of his opponent's argument, and also showed, that, in forming his theory, he had fully anticipated the whole weight of the objection. Such doctrines, however, were found much too bold for that ignorant and superstitious age. Aristarchus was forthwith accused of impiety: he was charged with shaking the throne of Vesta, an ancient and venerable Goddess; but as he shook more rudely the settled opinions of the Schools, in regard to the heavenly bodies, his tenets were proscribed as at once dangerous and unphilosophical. His conclusions accordingly suppressed for the time, remained unpatronized during several centuries; till at length in an age hardly more propitious to Science, they were once more revived, to become once more the object of persecution, and of an ignorant and groundless calumny.*

Septuagint.

We cannot finish our sketch, however brief, of the reign of the Second Ptolemy, without adverting to the controversy regarding the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, which is said to have been effected under his auspices. It is certainly extremely probable that the version in question was made at Alexandria whilst Philadelphus was on the throne; both because a great multitude of Jews were resident in that city during his government, and also from the obvious circumstance, that such families of them as had removed thither, in the former reign, must have so far forgotten their native speech, as to require a translation of their sacred books into the language which they were now accustomed to use. Prideaux in his valuable *Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, has examined into this matter with great freedom and ability; and the impression which at present prevails among the learned, in regard to the narrative of Aristeas, is altogether unfavourable to its truth and authenticity. That there was, says the Dean, a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, made in the time that the Ptolemies reigned in Egypt, is not to be doubted; for we still have the book, and it is the same which was in use in our Saviour's time; for most of those passages which the holy penmen of the New Testament do, in the original of it, quote out of the Old Testament, are now found verbatim in this version. But, he adds, the book going under the name of Aristeas, which is the ground-work and foundation of all that is said of the manner of making this translation, by seventy-two elders sent from Jerusalem to Alexandria for this purpose, in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, is a manifest fiction, made out of design, thereby to give the greater authority to this translation. The Jews after their return from the Babylonish captivity, to the time of our Saviour, were much given to religious romances, as appears from their Apocryphal books extant, many of which are of this sort; and that the book which we now have under the name of Aristeas was such a romance, and written by some Hellenistic Jew, plainly appears, says the Dean, from a variety of considerations.†

For an examination of the several circumstances, which seem to prove the imposture of Aristeas, we must refer the reader to the able work which we have just quoted. It deserves to be noticed however, that all the subsequent histories of the Septuagint translation of the ancient Scriptures by Aristobulus, Philo, Josephus, Clemens, and Eusebius, are borrowed with very little variation from the fictitious narrative of the Alexandrian Jew.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

But the era of Philadelphus, clouded as it may have been by ignorance, and obscured by fable, was, notwithstanding, the brightest period of Egyptian literature. The same reign was likewise distinguished by the first act of political intercourse between Egypt and Rome. When the Romans, on the defeat and death of Pyrrhus, had clearly established their reputation as a military people, it seemed expedient to Ptolemy to send a chosen embassy to the Senate, in order to congratulate them upon their success; and the return of this civility, which was performed on the part of the Commonwealth with suitable pomp, afforded to the Romans a desirable opportunity for making themselves known to the Government of Alexandria. Nor was it long before an occasion occurred to secure to them all the advantages of it. The terms of amity, which such a mission seemed to imply, were made by Ptolemy a pretext for refusing to the Carthaginians all assistance, either of men or of treasure, in the bloody and protracted war which soon afterwards ensued between the two Republics.*

Intercourse with Rome.

A. M. 3758. — B. C. 246. — OL. 133. 3. Ptolemy Evergetes.

At the age of sixty-three, Philadelphus yielded to the natural weakness of his constitution, and the effects of an increasing intemperance; leaving to his son a throne which he had filled with no small ability and reputation during the period of twenty-eight years.

The Third Ptolemy was scarcely invested with the regal authority, when he found himself involved in those hostilities with Seleucus Callinicus, the King of Syria, of which we have elsewhere given an account. (vol. ix. p. 817.) His invasion of Syria, his advance into the Province of Upper Asia, and his Ethiopian expedition, in the course of which he betrayed so glaringly the weakness and rapacity of his character, are there detailed.. A marble slab, recently discovered among the ruins of Axum, attests the historical truth of this enterprise, and proves that the Egyptian army had succeeded in reaching the ancient Capital of Abyssinia.

Ptolemy Philopator. A. M. 3783. — B. C. 221. — OL. 134. 4.

Evergetes was followed in the Government of his native dominions by his son Philopator, who ascended the Throne in the two hundred and twenty-first year before Christ. He disgraced the commencement of his reign by inflicting severe cruelties on the family of Cleomenes, the Spartan King, who had taken refuge at Alexandria; where he perished in an attempt to rouse the subjects of Ptolemy to a sense of their degradation and servitude. The death of his mother, his wife, and his sister, threw a cloud over his domestic history; and it is even asserted, that he was sarcastically denominated Philopator, from a nefarious conspiracy in which he was engaged to take way the life of his father by poison.

The infamy of his private character was in some measure redeemed by the success of his arms against the King of Syria. In the field of Raphia he gained a splendid victory, which secured to his dominions the

* Plutarch, *de facie in orb. Lunæ.* Hesiod, *Theogon.* Ovid, *Fasti*, lib. vi.

† Prideaux, *Connection*, part ii. book ii. Clemens Alexandrinus, sec. i. and v.

* Valerius Maximus, lib. iv. c. 3. Appian, *Excerp. de rebus Siculis.*

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

Provinces of Cœle-Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine. But his debaucheries brought him to his grave in the thirty-seventh year of his age, and seventeenth of his ignoble reign.

On the occurrence of this premature demise, the eldest son of Philopator was only four years of age; but his title to the Crown was immediately recognised, and the affairs of the Kingdom were placed under the administration of wise and faithful guardians. This important charge was committed to the hands of Sosibius and Aristomenes, who acquitted themselves of their trust ably and conscientiously, both to their Prince and their country. They secured to the nation the valuable Provinces of Cœle-Syria and Palestine, and renewed an alliance with the Romans, immediately after their successes over Hannibal, at the conclusion of the second Punic War.

Ptolemy Epiphanes. A. M. 3800. — B. C. 204. — OL. 138. 1.

But Ptolemy, who was surnamed Epiphanes, having reached his fourteenth year, which according to the laws and customs of Egypt, was the age of maturity, took the reins of Government into his own hands, and gave speedy proof of his incompetence to discharge aright its difficult and important duties. He rejected the wise counsels of the men who had managed and improved the Kingdom; he gave himself up to the vices, and practised the cruelties which had rendered infamous the memory of his father; and after a tyranny of fifteen years, he fell a victim to his own extravagance, being poisoned by his Ministers in the twenty-ninth year of his age.*

In justice to his memory, it may be esteemed worthy of remark, that the Grecian annals are much more favourable to his reputation than the Jewish. We know not whether it will be regarded as corroborating this view of his character, if we mention that Epiphanes was raised by the adulation of the Egyptian Priesthood to the rank of the Gods. It appears from a monument lately recovered in that country, that the decree for the Deification of Ptolemy was passed in the ninth year of his reign, or when he was about to assume the personal direction of his Government. The Idol of the King was to be duly worshipped; his shrine of gold adorned with crowns and protected by amulets, was to be carried in sacred procession with the shrines of other Gods; his name was to be celebrated by games and festivals; and the decree establishing these ceremonies was to be inscribed on solid stone, in the sacred language of religion, in Egyptian, and also in Greek characters. His son Ptolemy, surnamed Philometor, succeeded him on the throne. At the death of his father he was only six years of age, from which period until he reached the term of maturity, the Kingdom was governed by his mother Cleopatra, and, after her decease, by a favourite eunuch.

Ptolemy Philometor A. M. 3823. — B. C. 181. — OL. 154. 2.

Engaging in a war with Antiochus Epiphanes, he was defeated and made prisoner; and the Egyptians in his absence raised his brother Physcon to the Throne. The Syrian Monarch, however, wishing to retain the influence which he had acquired over his captive, degraded the usurper, and restored Philometor to the exercise of the Regal functions. But this measure did not effect the object which Antiochus had in view: aware of the policy of that Prince, the King of Egypt recalled his brother to a share of the Sovereign power and honours; in order that through their united counsels and exertions, they and their country might be delivered from foreign domination. Notwithstanding the power of Syria still seemed to threaten the Royal house of Egypt, and accordingly to avert the impending destruction, Ptolemy repaired to Rome, and implored the Senate to assist him against his insidious and determined enemy. Through the intervention of the Romans, Egypt was guarded against the hostile designs of Antigonus, and both the Royal brothers were provided with distinct and independent Kingdoms; the younger reigning over the Lybian Cyrene till the death of the elder, when Egypt with its appendages came also under his dominion.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974 — B. C. 30.

This arrangement was not, however, acceded to, until after a long war between Philometor and Physcon. The latter was in general worsted in the field; but, whether owing to the clemency of his brother, or to the weighty interposition of the Romans, he was not stripped of the territories with which his ambition had been temporarily allayed.

Ptolemy having employed his arms to drive an usurper from the throne of Syria, was offered the magnificent remuneration of the vacant Crown. He wisely and generously declined so great a reward; recommending to their affections their lawful Prince, whom he undertook to assist in his efforts to recover his rights and power. The fate of Syria was determined in a great battle, in which the King of Egypt and his allies found themselves conquerors. But Ptolemy received a mortal wound, which in the course of eight days put an end to his life and to his reign, in the hundred and forty-sixth year before the Christian era.†

It was in the nineteenth year of his Government, that Philometor established a colony of Jews in the district Heliopolis, and granted them permission to build a Temple, after the model of that at Jerusalem, and to appoint Onias to be their High-priest. The gratitude of the colonists was proved by a sincere attachment to his interests, and by undergoing much labour and suffering in promoting his cause, during the Civil war with his brother Physcon. Amidst repeated persecutions they continued to maintain their ground in Egypt, venerating the institutions of Moses, and exercising their peculiar worship in their colonial Temple, till at length, in the reign of the Emperor Vespasian, orders were issued to level it with the dust, about five years after the destruction of their Capital and Government in Judea.‡

Ptolemy Physcon. A. M. 3859. — B. C. 145 — OL. 158. 4

At the death of Philometor, his only son being yet an infant, the reins of Government were seized by Physcon, the brother of the late King, who had so long disputed with him the right to fill the Throne of Egypt. The army continuing in Syria, some time after the loss of their Royal commander, the opportunity of usurping the Crown, which was thereby afforded him, was eagerly embraced by this unprincipled usurper; who, advancing towards Alexandria, at the head of a mercenary force, whose services he had purchased,

* Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. xii. c. 4. Polybius, lib. xxiii. c. 1. Maccab. ii. c. 3.

* Valerius Maximus. Livius, lib. xlvi. Polybius, lib. xxxi. c. 5.

† Strabo, lib. xvi. Livius, lib. li.

‡ Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. ii. Diodorus, *Excerp.* Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. vii. c. 30.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

soon possessed himself of that Capital, married the widow of his deceased brother, and on the very day of these disgraceful nuptials, murdered his nephew, the lawful heir of the Kingdom.*

A reign begun under such auspices, was not likely to be either happy or glorious. The cruel tyranny with which their King pursued his mad career, drove his subjects at length into actual rebellion; and he found it necessary to take refuge from their indignation in the island of Cyprus. Previously to this, however, he had repudiated Cleopatra, the widow of Philometor, and married her daughter, born to a former husband. On the abdication of Physcon, the Princess now named was called to the Throne by the people of Alexandria; upon which the barbarous exile, in order to wound her feelings in the tenderest point, murdered two sons whom she had born to him, and sent the head of the youngest to her, in a casket, on the anniversary of her birth-day.

This act of studied cruelty, confirmed against him the hatred of his Egyptian subjects, who, upon hearing that he intended to attempt a descent upon their shores, with the view of reinstating himself on the Throne, made immediate preparations for opposing his invasion. The inhabitants of Alexandria took arms under the direction of Marsyas, whom the Queen had appointed Commander; and at length meeting the troops of Physcon, which had succeeded in making good their landing, they trusted the fortune of their country to the issue of a general battle. Hegelochus, who led the invaders, proved superior to the patriotic General to whom he was opposed; he defeated the Alexandrians, took Marsyas a prisoner, and shut up the Queen within the walls of her Capital.

In this extremity, Cleopatra applied to her son-in-law the King of Syria; using the strongest arguments to induce him to defend Egypt against the brutal vengeance of Physcon. Demetrius listened to her entreaties, and forthwith made preparations for besieging Pelusium; but the unsettled state of his own country soon requiring his presence, he was obliged to desist from his undertaking, and to lead back his troops, in order to suppress a formidable insurrection, which had been abetted by the King of Egypt, and organized by an impostor, Alexander Zebina. Alarmed by the progress of Hegelochus, the Queen-regent of Egypt embarked with all her treasures, and sailing for Ptolemais, where her daughter, the wife of Demetrius, had fixed her abode, she resolved there to await the issue of events. Physcon meanwhile recovered his abdicated dominions, where he soon afterwards enjoyed the fullest gratification to his vindictive feelings, in finding that Demetrius had fallen a victim to the scheme which he had formed for his destruction.†

This profligate and sottish Prince seems still to have retained a portion of that hereditary love of letters, which has illustrated the family of the Ptolemies. He is said to have studied so assiduously under the Grammarian Aristarchus, that, as Epiphanius informs us, he merited some of the highest honours of Philology. He wrote twenty-four books of Historical Commentaries; and farther signalised his zeal for learning, by composing a laboured criticism on the text of Homer. To enrich the Alexandrian Library, he spared no pains, and left no means unemployed, whether just or unjust; and in prosecution of this favourite object, he is represented as having disgraced the cause of Literature, by the tyrannical measures which he adopted for its accomplishment. He caused all ships touching at any of his ports to be searched for books and manuscripts; and either to encourage the manufacture of the proper material at home, or to prevent other countries from rivalling Egypt in the extent of their Libraries, he issued a command that no papyrus should be exported from his Kingdom.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

After a reign of twenty-nine years, in the course of which he had repeatedly exhausted the patience of his subjects, Physcon died, in the midst of peace and of a comparative popularity. He left Cleopatra as Regent of the Kingdom, and intrusted her with the choice of either of their two sons, Lathyrus or Alexander, to succeed him on the Throne.* Actuated by the love of power, the Queen selected the younger; Lathyrus having been sent into Cyprus in quality of Viceroy, but obviously with the intention of excluding him from the succession. The voice of the people, however, prevailed, and the eldest son of the late Sovereign was called by them to assume the Sceptre.

Ptolemy Lathyrus. A. M. 3888. — B. C. 116. — Ol. 164. 4.

The enmity of his mother disturbed the reign of Lathyrus. Having taken part with the King of Syria against the Jews, who, under their able leader Hyrcanus, had recently become formidable to their ancient oppressors, he exposed himself to the resentment of his unnatural parent, who chose to grant her countenance to the arms of the Israelites. She resolved to replace on the Throne her favourite son, Alexander, who had been sent to succeed his brother as Governor of Cyprus. To accomplish her purpose she had recourse to a stratagem, by which she hoped to stain the character of the King with the guilt of intended parricide. She instructed her eunuchs to rush out of the palace streaming with blood, and to implore the aid of the citizens of Alexandria against Lathyrus, whom they with difficulty had prevented from embruing his hands in the blood of his mother. A tumult ensued: the injured Monarch fled on ship-board, to seek refuge beyond sea; and Alexander arriving from Cyprus, was once more invested with the Supreme authority.†

But the furious passions of Cleopatra, and her inordinate love of dominion, permitted only a subordinate power to rest in the hands of the new King. Finding himself condemned to be her instrument in the most tyrannical measures, he soon relinquished altogether the external possession of a power, which was in fact exercised by another. She, however, perceiving that she would not be allowed to reign, except through the medium of one of her sons, induced him again to accept the Regal honours. Their interests soon proved incompatible, and a miserable catastrophe put an end to their jealousies and mutual dislike. Alexander employed a dagger against his mother, and thereby opened a way for the restoration of Lathyrus, who still continued at the head of a powerful army. A battle decided the cause of the brothers; Alexander was taken prisoner, and put

Alexander Ptolemy the First.

* Valerius Maximus, lib. ix. c. 1. Justin, lib. xxxviii. c. 8.
† Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. xiii. c. 9. Diodorus, *Excerp.*

* Pausanias, *Attic.* Justin, lib. xxxix. c. 5. Ibid. lib. xxxix. c. 3.
† Pausanias, *Attic.* c. 9.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

to death, and the reins of Government passed once more into legitimate hands.

The remaining years of Lathyrus are distinguished by only one event, which has claimed the attention of history. A rebellion broke out at Thebes, the ancient Capital of Egypt, to suppress which an army was despatched into the south, with orders to inflict a severe punishment upon the insurgents. A siege of three years completed the demolition of that celebrated city, which was immediately stripped of every monument of its former grandeur.* Ptolemy VIII. survived this memorable expedition but a very short time. He died, bequeathing to a natural son the isle of Cyprus, and leaving Berenice, his only legitimate daughter, to inherit the Crown of Egypt.

Alexander Ptolemy the Second.

Alexander, the brother of the late King, left a son of the same name, who had been educated in the island of Cos, and had afterwards fallen into the hands of Mithridates, the Ruler of Pontus; having escaped from captivity, he placed himself under the protection of Sylla, the Roman Dictator, through whose mediation, as well as on the ground of some personal claims to the throne of Egypt, he obtained the hand of his cousin Cleopatra, and was associated with her in the Government of the kingdom. But this union, apparently so auspicious, was soon dissolved by the death of the Queen, who, it is said, was murdered by the order of her barbarous husband, nineteen days after their marriage.† His possession of the Throne, however, was not of long duration; for he soon disgusted his subjects by the atrocity of his conduct, and like many of his predecessors, was removed by a violent death. This event paved the way for the succession of his brother, who, on his elevation to the Throne, assumed the distinctive appellation of Alexander Ptolemy III. and reigned, it is said, during a short period, in considerable tranquillity; dissensions, however, at length arose, which compelled him to seek refuge in the city of Tyre; where he died about sixty-five years before the Christian era, having previously named the Romans as heirs of his Kingdom as well as of all his personal property.‡ In consequence of this testament, the Triumvirs, in the Consulate of Cæsar, received six thousand talents from the next Egyptian King, to secure him in the possession of his dominions.

Alexander Ptolemy the Third.

Ptolemy Auletes.

On the abdication of Alexander Ptolemy III. the prevailing faction in the Capital placed on the Throne his cousin Ptolemy Auletes, so named for his excellence as a player on the flute. This Prince was a mere tributary under the Roman Senate, and was compelled not only to pay large sums of money to purchase the protection of the Consuls and Commanders, who directed their affairs in the East, but even to relinquish all claims upon Cyprus, one of the most valuable dependencies of Egypt, and to see it wrested from the possession of his family. Clodius, the Tribune, whose resentment had been accidentally inflamed against the Viceroy of that island, stimulated the avarice of the people in power, and prevailed with them to send Cato as their accredited agent in this disgraceful robbery. The austere Envoy, arriving at Cyprus, seized the spoils of the unresisting Governors, and afterwards carried home with him to Rome, a sum of coin not less in amount than fifteen hundred thousand pounds of our coin, besides various other booty.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

To ensure the countenance of Pompey and Cæsar, the King of Egypt was necessitated to make large demands upon his subjects, who, at length tired of his exactions, rose against him and drove him from his Capital. Meeting Cato in the island of Rhodes, the fugitive Monarch informed the Ambassador that he had resolved to repair to Rome, with the view of soliciting aid from the Senate; and, notwithstanding the arguments of the latter, who endeavoured to divert him from his intention, he actually took up his residence in that city, and paid his court in person to the haughty, avaricious Senators.†

Is expelled, and repairs to Rome.

Auletes had no sooner fled from Alexandria, than the Egyptians placed on the vacant Throne his daughter Berenice. To confirm her Government, she was induced to marry first one of the Princes of the Syrian family, who is known by the name of Seleucus Cybiosactes, and afterwards Archelaus, the Cappadocian, whom Pompey had invested with the hereditary Priesthood of Comana, in Pontus. But these arrangements, it should seem, did not answer the purpose of the leading men at Rome. It was resolved to reinstate Auletes; and with this view he was sent into Syria, with a recommendation from the two Consuls, Cæsar and Pompey, addressed to Gabinius; instructing him to despatch a part of his army towards the Egyptian frontier, to act in concert with the friends of the exiled King. The Proconsul sent Antonius, his Master of the Horse, with orders to surprise the principal fortress at the mouth of the Nile. The Romans succeeded in their attempt. Archelaus, the husband of Berenice, was killed fighting at the head of his guards; and the Queen herself, expelled by the invaders, was shortly afterwards put to death. Gabinius left with Auletes a large body of horse and foot to overawe his reluctant subjects, and to enable him to extort from them the enormous sum of ten thousand talents, for which he had become bound to his Roman creditors and patrons. He reigned four years after his restoration; and previously to his death, which took place in the fifty-first year before the Christian era, he settled the succession to his Kingdom in a manner corresponding to the dependant condition in which it had long subsisted. By his Will, he left Egypt under the guardianship of Rome; and while the original of this document was retained in Alexandria, a copy of it, duly authenticated, was transmitted to Pompey, who placed it in the Roman Treasury, as a warrant for future demands on the Sovereignty or wealth of that devoted Kingdom. He named his son and daughter, who, according to the Egyptian usage, were to marry together, as his successors on the Throne; and as both these Princes were still under age, Pompey was appointed by the Senate to act the part of guardian, and to see all the provisions of the late King's testament duly fulfilled.

Is restored by the Romans.

Dies. A. M. 3953 — B. C. 51. — OL. 182.

The daughter, mentioned in this Royal Will, was the celebrated Cleopatra, who was at that time in her

Accession of Dionysius and Cleopatra.

* Pausanias, *Attic.* c. 9. Strabo, lib. xvii. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* lib. ii. c. 67.

† Appian, *de Bell. Civil.* lib. i. c. 102.

‡ Cicero, *cont. Rull.*

* Florus, lib. iv. c. 3. Plutarch, *in Catone.* Dion Cassius, lib. xxxix. Strabo, lib. xix.

† Plutarch, *in Catone.*

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

seventeenth year. Her brother, who shared with her the nominal Sovereignty of their Kingdom, was named Dionysius, and is known to historians as Ptolemy XII. the last of that family and patronymick.

The affairs of Egypt were now so closely connected with the policy of Rome, that the principal events which characterised the Government of the expiring power of the Grecian Kings, may be traced either to the intrigues or the ambition, the avarice or the licentiousness of the Italian Commanders. The youth of Dionysius was altogether unequal to the cares of State, which at that period would have oppressed the maturest age; and the talents of his sister, it would appear, were not steadily or wisely directed to consolidate their tottering power, as vassals of the Roman Senate. An insurrection at Alexandria, which occasioned the murder of two sons of the Proconsul Bibulus, at that time commanding in Syria, disturbed the very commencement of their reign; and we find that Cleopatra could not oppose the tide of popular fury connected with that occurrence, but was compelled to resign the splendour of Royalty, and seek protection in a temporary exile.* The abdication of this Princess, though probably arising from the tumult just mentioned, was unquestionably accelerated by the designs already entertained by the young King and his ambitious Ministers. Their object became manifest when Cleopatra, after a few months residence in Syria, returned towards her native country to resume her seat on the Throne. Dionysius prepared to oppose her by force of arms, and a Civil war would inevitably have ensued, had not the rival pretensions of the children of Auletes been speedily determined, by an authority which neither was at liberty to dispute.

Expulsion of Cleopatra.

Cæsar sails to Egypt in pursuit of Pompey, and restores Cleopatra.

It was while their respective armaments were stationed near Pelusium, that Cæsar sailed to the coast of Egypt in pursuit of Pompey. We have already mentioned, in the life of the former of these Commanders, that, upon his arrival on the shores of the Nile, he was presented with the head of his vanquished rival; and that he almost immediately afterwards landed with his troops at Alexandria, in quality of Consul, attended by Lictors bearing the fasces. This display of authority, as belonging to the Representative of the Roman Senate and People, could not fail to create suspicion and alarm; and Cæsar, accordingly, found that the safety of his person could not be secured, except by taking possession of the strongest part of the Palace, of which he made haste to increase the fortifications.†

Empowered by the official rank which he held in a Kingdom which could not now be viewed in any other light than that of a Roman Province, Cæsar issued an order to the two Royal persons who were disputing for the Throne, commanding them to suspend their hostilities, and to submit the several points which had armed them against each other, to his arbitration. In compliance with this injunction, both parties sent suitable Representatives to wait upon the Consul, and to state their respective claims and grievances.

Meanwhile, the army of the young Ptolemy remained before Pelusium, and Cleopatra had not yet returned from Syria. The latter, however, trusting more to her personal influence, than to the eloquence of her Ministers, resolved to plead her own cause in the presence of Cæsar. She therefore put herself on board a small skiff, under the protection of Apollodorus, a Sicilian Greek, and having reached the harbour of Alexandria in safety, gave instructions that she should be conveyed into the chamber of the Roman General, in the form of a large package of goods. The stratagem gave infinite pleasure to the hero of Pharsalia, who is said to have been as much delighted with the wiles of love, as with those of war; and if the beauty and wit of Cleopatra be viewed in connection with the amorous character of Cæsar, the result of her visit may be easily anticipated. This Princess was now in her twentieth year, distinguished by extraordinary personal charms, and surrounded with all the graces which give to those charms their greatest power. Her voice sounded like the sweetest music; and she spoke a variety of languages with propriety and ease. She could, it is said, assume all characters at will, which all alike became her; and the impression which was made at first by her beauty, was confirmed by the fascinating brilliancy of her conversation. It is known that she bore to the Consul a son, who, from the name of his father, was called Cæsarion.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

Character of the Queen, and her device to obtain an audience of Cæsar.

Propositions of the Roman Consul.

The day after this singular meeting, Cæsar summoned the King, as well as the citizens of Alexandria, to listen to certain propositions which he had to make for restoring peace to their country. The Will of Ptolemy Auletes was read; after which the Roman Commander assured them he had no other object in view than to ensure a full compliance with its injunctions. For this purpose he suggested, not only that Dionysius and Cleopatra should resume their joint Sovereignty in Egypt, but also that the younger brother and sister should likewise be married, and reign together over the island of Cyprus, in the possession of which he undertook to guarantee them.

No measure could have been either more popular or more just than that which Cæsar proposed as the basis of the new arrangement. The adherents of the King, however, had proceeded too far against Cleopatra not to have reason to dread her resentment; and Pothinus, in particular, in whose intriguing spirit all the dissensions of the Court had originated, saw no safety for himself but in the continuance of the Civil war, and the ultimate defeat of the Roman faction. The army of Pelusium was accordingly placed under the command of Achillas, the murderer of Pompey, with instructions to advance suddenly upon Alexandria, and crush the handful of soldiers whom Cæsar had stationed round his person.

Opposed by Pothinus and Achillas.

But the movement of the Egyptian army did not deceive the vigilance of the Roman Consul. He detained the young King in his custody, and thereby threw upon the troops opposed to him, the guilt, or at least the appearance of rebellion; and when Achillas did at length arrive in the streets of the Capital, the palace was so well defended, that twenty thousand soldiers could make no impression upon its walls. An obstinate battle was at the same time fought between the fleets, which, owing to the gallantry and skill of the Rhodians, terminated in a decided victory

* Valerius Maximus, lib. iv. c. 1.
† Plutarch, *in Cæsar*, Hirtius, *de Bell. Alexan.*

* Dion Cassius, and Plutarch, *in Cæsar.*

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323 to A. M. 3974 — B. C. 30.

for Cæsar; but as the contest took place almost in the very harbour, the conflagration of the vanquished ships communicated to several magazines, and finally reached the Royal Library, in which were consumed about four hundred thousand volumes.* But the advantage obtained on this occasion, did not break the spirit, nor impede the exertions of the Alexandrians. The war raged with unabated fury, and the situation of Cæsar became every day more perilous.

Besides Cleopatra, and the King her brother, the Romans had detained in the Palace Arsinoe, the youngest sister of these Princes; who, availing herself of an opportunity presented by the incessant tumult, escaped from the restraint of Cæsar's quarters, and offered the advantage of her authority and countenance to the army under Achillas. She was accompanied in her flight by Ganymede, an ambitious eunuch, who eagerly seconded the aspiring designs of his mistress. Nor did the enterprise altogether fail of success. The Alexandrians received with rapture the spirited daughter of their late King; and to make way for her favourite Ganymede, they found no difficulty in sacrificing their Commander Achillas. Cæsar, at the same time, suspecting the faith of Pothinus, condemned him to death; an event which placed the conduct of the Alexandrian war under auspices completely different from those under which it had commenced.†

Arsinoe escapes from the Palace, and Ganymede assumes the command.

Ganymede, now at the head of the army, resolved to attack the Romans with a new weapon. Alexandria was supplied with water from the Nile; to cut off the usual resource, therefore, it was only necessary to stop up the conduits by which it was conveyed, and to let in the sea-water by means of the drains which communicated with the shore. The consternation at first was excessive; many of the inhabitants threatened to quit the city; and it was with the greatest difficulty that Cæsar could prevail upon them to dig wells, which he assured them would yield an abundant supply, as they were almost on the level of the sea. At length his counsel was listened to, and all their expectations were gratified.

He cuts off the water.

The scene of warfare was now transferred almost entirely from the land to the water. To protect a convoy which brought to him from Asia his thirty-seventh legion, with ample supplies of provisions and military stores, Cæsar put to sea and engaged the Egyptian fleet. The brave and skilful Rhodians were never deserted by victory; and the Roman soldiers accordingly entered the harbour in triumph, and gave a decided superiority to the cause of their General. Repeated defeats, however, did not depress the courage of Ganymede. He equipped a larger fleet than before, and again defied the strength of the Romans and the naval science of their allies. Fortune once more declared for Cæsar; the Egyptians were worsted, and compelled to take refuge under the fortifications of the isle of Pharos.‡

The island now named was protected by two castles of considerable strength, which, as they afforded a retreat to his enemies, Cæsar had determined to reduce. In this attempt he nearly lost his life; for after he had taken one of the forts, and was preparing to attack the other, the citizens of Alexandria assailed him so furiously, that he was compelled to throw himself into a boat, in order to reach the opposite side of the harbour. A crowd of fugitives instantly sank the boat; upon which Cæsar plunged into the waves, and swam across the strait which divided him from his ships, whence he immediately sent a reinforcement to assist such of his men as were left behind. It was on this occasion that he is said to have carried in his teeth, while he swam towards his fleet, some valuable papers which he held in his hand at the moment of the attack; and also to have dragged after him, in a similar way, the purple garment worn by the Roman Generals in battle, and thereby to have saved from the disgrace of capture, the proud ornament which distinguished his rank. Dion Cassius, however, mentions a different rumour which had reached his ears, in regard to the purple; that it had fallen into the hands of the enemy, who displayed it on a trophy, which they hastily erected to commemorate their success.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

During these events, Ptolemy Dionysius, impatient of the restraint under which he had been so long detained, contrived a plan for obtaining the consent of Cæsar to his liberation. He made the Roman believe that the Alexandrians, no longer able to bear the Government of Arsinoe and the eunuch, were desirous to have their King at their head, under whose auspices they would willingly enter into such terms of accommodation as Cæsar might be pleased to dictate. The artifice succeeded, and Ptolemy soon found himself in the camp of his army, acknowledged as a Sovereign, and obeyed as a Commander.

But the issue of the war was no longer to remain doubtful. A strong reinforcement was already on the march from the Syrian Province, under Mithridates and Antipater. These Commanders having reduced Pelusium, advanced into the country by the way of Memphis; whilst Cæsar and Ptolemy hearing of their approach, sailed at the same time, the one to co-operate with the invaders, the other to check their progress. The King of Egypt could by no means compete with the conqueror of Pharsalia in the art of war. Cæsar surprised his camp in the night, put his troops to the rout, and forced him to attempt his escape in such terror and confusion, that the boat into which he threw himself went to the bottom, and he was drowned. In this manner died Ptolemy XII., in the eighteenth year of his age, and after an unhappy reign of three years and eight months; a youth whose talents were superior to his fortune, and whose ambition was not unworthy of the rank which he was born to possess.*

Defeat and death of Ptolemy Dionysius. A. M. 3957. — B. C. 47. — OL. 183. 2.

Cæsar was now master of Egypt, and nothing remained to employ his time and his genius, but to distribute the political power of the Kingdom into those hands by which he wished it to be exercised. Every thing was settled agreeably to the inclinations of Cleopatra; for having associated with her in the Government her youngest brother, a child of eleven years of age, he constituted her Sovereign of Egypt and of Cyprus, and gave her three Roman legions to support her authority. Her sister, Arsinoe, was ba-

* Seneca, *de Tranquillitate.*
† Hirtius, *de Bell. Alexan.* c. 5—9. Plutarch, *in Cæsar.*
‡ Hirtius, *de Bell. Alexan.* Dion Cassius, and Plutarch, *in Cæsar.*

* Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. xiv. c. 2. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

nished from the country which she had presumed to govern; and after being carried captive to Rome, was allowed to find an asylum in one of the Greek Temples of Asia. The blandishments of the accomplished Queen had nearly subdued even the ambition of Cæsar, and made him forget that the world was at his feet. At length he tore himself from her, and resumed his victorious career in Asia; whence he afterwards repaired to Rome, to endure temptations and to encounter enemies still more formidable than those from whom he had escaped.*

During the six years, which immediately followed the events now described, the reign of Cleopatra seems not to have been disturbed by insurrection, nor to have been assailed by foreign war. The dissension among the rival leaders, who divided the power of Cæsar, had, no doubt, nearly involved her in a contest with both parties; but the decisive issue of the battle of Philippi relieved her from the hesitation under which some of her measures appear to have been adopted, and determined her inclinations, as well as her interest, in favour of the conquerors.

To afford her an opportunity of explaining her conduct, Antonius summoned her to attend him in Cilicia; and the meeting which she gave him on the river Cydnus has employed the pen not only of the historian, but of the most sublime and fanciful of all Poets.

> The barge she sat in, like a burnished throne,
> Burn'd on the water: the poop was beaten gold;
> Purple the sails, and so perfumed, that
> The winds were love-sick with them; the oars were silver,
> Which to the tune of flutes kept stroke, and made
> The water which they beat, to follow faster,
> As amorous of their strokes. For her own person,
> It beggared all description: she did lie
> In her pavilion, (cloth of gold, of tissue)
> O'er-picturing that Venus, where we see
> The fancy out-work nature

A. M. 3968. — B. C. 36. — OL. 186. 1.

The artifices of this fascinating Princess so far gained upon Antonius, as not only to divert his thoughts from his original purpose of subjecting her Kingdom to the payment of tribute, but entirely to lull his ambition asleep, and make him sacrifice his great stake as a candidate for the Empire of the world. After a fruitless attack upon the territory of Palmyra, he hastened, to forget his disgrace, in the arms of the Egyptian Queen, passing several months at Alexandria in the most foolish and puerile dissipation. The death of his wife, and his subsequent marriage with Octavia, the sister of his colleague in the Triumvirate, delayed, for a time, the crisis which his ungoverned passions were preparing for him. But though he had thus extricated himself from the snares of Alexandria, his inclinations too soon returned to that unhappy city; for we find that when he left Rome to proceed on an expedition against the Parthians, he despatched, in advance, his friend Fonteius Capito to conduct Cleopatra into Syria. His military enterprise ended in a disastrous retreat; several thousands of his men perished from fatigue in an unseasonable and hasty march; after which, the infatuated Commander returned to meet Cleopatra, and to submit himself once more to that willing bondage which had already rendered him contemptible in the eyes of most of his followers.

* Plutarch, *in Cæsar.* Dion Cassius.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681 — B. C 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

We have already noticed his divorce of Octavia. This act of infatuation was followed by one still more offensive to the national pride of his Roman friends. Cleopatra prevailed upon him to invest herself and the boy, whom she bore to Cæsar, in the free and unrestricted possession of the Kingdom of Egypt. He decked one of her sons, born to himself, in the insignia of the Syrian Kings, having resolved to raise him to the Throne of the Seleucidæ, now at the disposal of the Romans; and arrayed another in the splendid robe and tiara which distinguished the great Monarchs of the East, not doubting but that he would, in due time, have the pleasure of conferring upon him the Sovereignty of Media or of Parthia.*

War declared against Cleopatra. U. C. 721. — B. C. 32. — OL. 187. 1.

In the life of Augustus, (vol. x. p. 335,) we have already traced the steps which led to the declaration of war against Cleopatra. In this declaration Augustus deemed it neither prudent nor, indeed, necessary to include his rival by name, being satisfied that the first movement of the Roman arms to attack Cleopatra would bring the troops of her paramour into the field.

Preparations of Antonius.

Antonius was in Armenia when the news reached him of the policy and views which had been recently pursued at Rome. No longer doubtful, in regard to the projects of his late colleague, he concluded a treaty with the King of Armenia, and immediately after proceeded with his army towards the shores of the Mediterranean. In the course of his march he sent orders to his several Lieutenants to collect their troops, and issued commands to his tributary Princes to make ready for the field their stipulated reinforcements. Cleopatra met him in his progress through the Lesser Asia; having undertaken to assist him with two hundred gallies, twenty thousand talents, and with corn for his whole army, to be conveyed by her transports whithersoever occasion might require. Ephesus being appointed for the rendezvous of his fleet, the Queen accompanied him thither; hence they went to Samos, and afterwards to Athens, where they immediately relapsed into their former licentiousness and extravagance. From the moment that Cleopatra joined him, the thoughts of Antonius were withdrawn from the approaching contest; and he accordingly allowed a powerful naval armament, and a hundred thousand legionary soldiers to remain inactive and useless, during a period of several months, and even until his antagonist was prepared to meet him on more than equal terms. He sent his fleet to winter in the Ambracian Gulf, which looks towards the eastern coast of Italy; and scattered his soldiers among the Grecian islands, to wait the return of the season, and the motions of Augustus.†

Dispositions of Augustus.

In the meantime, the latter Commander put into action all the resources with which experience and the military character of the Romans supplied him, in order to bring to a successful issue, the momentous struggle in which he was about to engage. He assembled his land forces at Brundusium and Tarentum;

* Plutarch, *in Antonio.* Dion Cassius.

† Plutarch, *in Antonio.* Dion Cassius, lib. i. c. 10. Orosius, lib. vi. c. 19.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

to which places he summoned such of the citizens as he thought too powerful to be left at home unemployed, or too little attached to his interests to be trusted in his absence. Availing himself too of the procrastination which ruined the councils of the opposite party, he resolved to fix the theatre of the war in Greece; for which purpose, having embarked his troops, he directed his course for the shores of Acarnania, and, finally, landed at no great distance from the Gulf of Ambracia, where the enemy's fleet had passed the winter. He next took possession of Toryne, a town of Epirus, situated on the northern shore of the gulf already named; whilst Antonius, having placed his head-quarters at Actium, commanded the southern shore of the same entrance, and watched the movements which he no longer had it in his power to prevent.*

Number of the forces on each side.

If we follow the authority of Plutarch and of Dion Cassius, we shall find that Antonius brought to the war five hundred gallies, of which there were many mounting eight and even ten tiers of oars, and that his land forces consisted of one hundred thousand legionary troops, twelve thousand horse, and a great number of auxiliaries supplied by the tributary Kings of Syria and Asia Minor. The army of Augustus is represented as amounting to only eighty thousand foot, and twelve thousand cavalry; but as it appears to have been composed of not less than forty-five legions, there is reason to believe that, in numerical strength, it was not inferior to that with which it was about to contend. It was only in his ships that the superiority lay with Antonius. His vessels were larger and more numerous; the seamen were regarded as more experienced in the use both of oars and of arms; the munitions of war were more abundantly supplied, and a long train of successes had given confidence both to officers and men. At the commencement of the contest, accordingly, the Egyptian fleet kept possession of the sea, while that of Augustus sought protection from the army, which was encamped in such a position as to check any hostile movement on the part of the enemy.†

Both sides seem unwilling to risk an action.

Antonius, upon finding that his antagonist had made good his landing, and could not any longer be successfully opposed, but by bringing on a general action, on shore as well as at sea, seems to have exercised more than his usual caution, in order to prevent a premature and disadvantageous engagement. He confined his views, in the first instance, to the occupation of a post, whence he might restrain the excursions of the assailants and cut off their supplies; concentrating, in the meantime, the different divisions of his army, and resolving to wait the issue of events which he ought to have directed. Augustus, on the other hand, who appears to have been equally reluctant to hurry on the decisive combat, employed the interval in making descents on the neighbouring coasts, and in reducing, by means of a squadron under the command of Agrippa, several important towns which had espoused the cause of Egypt, and which contained some of the magazines which the Queen had formed for the convenience of her allies.‡

* Strabo, lib. vii. Dion Cassius, lib. i.
† Plutarch, and Suetonius.
‡ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 84.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

The greater part of the summer was spent in these unimportant operations, when at length, Antonius, finding himself distressed for want of provisions, avowed the necessity either of making a retreat or of risking a general action. His fleet having suffered from storms as well as from the waste incident to protracted warfare, he now placed his chief reliance on the bravery of his army; for which reason he proposed, in a Council of his officers, to destroy or abandon his ships, and to rest his cause on the event of a battle by land. From this resolution he was soon dissuaded by the arts and importunity of Cleopatra, who trembled at the prospect of being cut off from her own country, and of falling perhaps into the hands of an insidious and unrelenting enemy. She therefore entreated her Roman ally to accompany her to Alexandria at the head of their united squadrons, and to avoid a sea-fight, unless they were positively attacked. She recommended, at the same time, that such detachments of his army should be left, as would be sufficient to keep possession of the principal strong-holds in Greece and Asia Minor, until he, having summoned to his standard all the forces of Egypt, Syria, and Armenia, should be placed in a condition to overwhelm the army of the Republic, or at least to dispute the Empire of the world in more favourable circumstances. It was further insinuated, that a battle at present could hardly be attended with success. Fatal omens, and the most menacing auguries had struck the minds of the soldiers with the greatest fear and despondency; it was therefore suggested by the partisans of the Queen, that were Antonius to fight in opposition to such a manifest declaration of the will of heaven, he would provoke the anger of the Gods, and thereby expose his fortune to a malign and destructive influence.*

Antonius resolves on a retreat.

These motives determined the wavering mind of Antonius. He consented to retreat into Egypt with Cleopatra, and to avoid a rencontre with the enemy, unless he were actually compelled to sustain an attack. The combined fleet was accordingly prepared for sea, and equipped both for fighting and for sailing. The treasury was embarked; additional canvas was put on board to accelerate the speed of the galleys; and such warlike engines were provided as appeared most adapted for securing victory, or for repelling an assault. But in a squadron of five hundred sail, where the object was to escape rather than to seek the enemy, there was found a want of experienced rowers; a resolution was therefore taken to burn a hundred and forty of the least serviceable ships, and to man the remainder with the most expert of the mariners, both Egyptian and Roman.

These preparations did not elude the vigilance of Augustus. He perceived that his opponent meant to quit his station, and whether the object might be to fight or to retreat, he resolved to be in readiness to meet him. He intrusted the command of his fleet to Agrippa; under whom Livius led the right wing, and Arruncius the left. He strengthened his crews with as many archers and slingers selected from the army as could conveniently serve on board his ships; and having provided against every emergency as far as experience and military skill can anticipate the oc-

* Plutarch, *in Antonio*. Dion Cassius, and Velleius Paterculus.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

currence of accidents, he held his armament in perfect readiness to thwart the designs of his enemy. In his address to the officers, however, he still affected to consider Cleopatra as the principal party in the war. Antonius, he reminded them, had only condescended to become her dependant and follower, and was now preparing, he presumed, not to give battle, but to accompany the Queen of Egypt in her flight.*

In regard to the plan of the action, Augustus was disposed to let the enemy get under sail, and even to allow them to pass unmolested the promontory of Actium; upon which he intended to attack their rear with such vigour, as would instantly convert their retreat into a flight, and thereby secure to him all the credit and advantages of a victory, without incurring the hazard of a more regular engagement. Agrippa recommended a different method of attack, which promised to be at once more certain in its aim, and more decisive in its effects. He proposed to meet the hostile fleet in front at the mouth of the bay; to direct the onset against the strongest part of their line; and in this way to throw them into confusion before the larger ships could be brought into action; in which case, if a victory should be obtained, the enemy would find it impossible to renew the war, either in Asia or in Europe. Augustus yielded to the reasoning of his Admiral, and proceeded to strengthen still farther the crews of his ships, by drafting from the land forces an additional body of men expert in the use of all kinds of missile weapons.†

In the distribution of authority on board his fleet, Antonius placed the centre under the direction of Marcus Justeius and Marcus Octavius; the left under that of Cœlius; reserving for himself and Publicola, the command of the right. Both fleets being now in readiness, each waited with anxiety the first motions of the other. A storm, which continued four days, and which was succeeded by a heavy swell running directly into the Gulf, compelled them to seek shelter in their respective harbours; but on the fifth day, the wind having abated, and the sea becoming smooth, Antonius advanced with his division towards the mouth of the strait. He appears to have been desirous to bring on the action in the entrance of the bay, rather than trust his unwieldy galleys in more open water; being aware that where there is sufficient room for manœuvring, the smaller ships compensate by the rapidity of their motion, for their deficiency of weight.

But Antonius was not allowed to deliberate any longer. His antagonist immediately got under sail, and passing the promontory of Toryne, formed his line opposite the entry of the straits, at the distance of about a thousand yards from the combined fleet. Both armies were at the same time drawn out on the shore to witness the impending conflict, upon which hung at that moment the future destiny of the Roman Commonwealth, and perhaps that mastery of the World. Still it remained somewhat doubtful, whether Antonius would advance, or retire once more into the recess of the gulf; whither, he knew, the enemy would not deem it safe to follow him; nor was it till noon that his ships began to clear the straits, and thereby afforded a certain indication that he at length meant to force his way through the opposing line.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30

Upon observing the movement now mentioned, Agrippa extended his front, with the intention of surrounding the galleys which had already advanced, before they could be supported by the main body. Publicola, who commanded under Antonius, performed a similar manœuvre, and spread out his division so as to equal the line of the enemy. Immediately upon this the battle began between these detached portions of either fleet, extending its course to the whole armament; in proportion as the several ships came in contact with one another at the outside of the bay. On the part of Augustus, the vessels being small, and manned with able rowers, had a considerable advantage over the lofty and more unmanageable *quinqueremes* of Antonius, sweeping round them with inconceivable rapidity, and brushing away their oars and outward defences by the mere velocity of their movement. It was in vain that the Egyptian sailors endeavoured to run down their diminutive opponents, or to ward off their assault by means of poles and grappling-irons; for the activity of the Romans eluded every impression attempted to be made by weight of hull and strength of timbers. Agrippa, it was obvious, placed his chief confidence in the dexterity of his rowers, and on the steadiness and certainty with which the soldiers on board discharged clouds of javelins, darts, and spears.

Battle of Actium. B. C. 31. Sept. 22. — U. C. 723. — OL. 187. 2.

In this manner the battle continued about two hours without any decisive advantage on either side, when at length the terror of Cleopatra threw the victory into the hands of Augustus. In the beginning of the action, the Queen's galley had been stationed near the front line, where she witnessed the progress of the contest with some degree of firmness; but finding that the issue was becoming more and more doubtful, and overcome by anxiety and fear, she gave orders to be removed to a greater distance from the scene of conflict. This partial retreat soon became a general flight. Her vessel, distinguished by its gilded poop and purple sails, was seen by the whole fleet making all haste to escape from the hazard of discomfiture, and displaying, it is said, signals to the other ships to follow her example. Sixty Egyptian galleys, either in obedience to the Queen or under pretext of defending her person, immediately quitted the line and joined the fugitives; whilst Antonius, now in despair of his fortunes, or with the intention of checking this unforeseen defection, threw himself into a swift-sailing vessel, and pursued the path of Cleopatra. Being observed from the Queen's galley, he was invited to go on board; where, without attempting to rally her fleet, which was still comparatively entire, he at once became the companion of her flight. It is added, indeed, that though for her sake he consented to relinquish the chance of victory, and to resign the hope of governing the greatest people in the world, he could not, at that moment, endure her presence; but turning his eyes from her, and throwing himself with violence on the deck, he exhibited the deepest symptoms of shame, anguish, and despondency.†

Cleopatra flies, and is followed by Antonius.

* Dion Cassius, lib. i. c. 15. † Ibid. c. 23.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 84. Plutarch, *in Antonio.*
† Florus, lib. vi. c. 11. Velleius Paterculus.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

But the flight of Antonius did not immediately put an end to the combat. His officers continued to exert themselves with a degree of courage worthy of better auspices, till four in the afternoon; when, after having been exposed some time to the discharge of ignited weapons, and finding their vessels severely damaged in their oars and rigging, the greater part surrendered to the enemy. Three hundred gallies were either taken or destroyed.

The loss in men has been variously reported; Plutarch stating the amount at five thousand, while Orosius maintains that twelve thousand were killed and six thousand wounded. The neighbouring shores were covered with dead bodies, and the fragments of broken ships; and, in a word, every thing announced to Augustus that his victory was complete and apparently decisive. To secure, however, all the advantages of conquest, he remained the succeeding night on board his ship; having first detached a squadron in pursuit of such of the enemy's vessels as had escaped, and used all other means for prosecuting his ulterior views against Antonius and his Egyptian ally.*

Submission of the army to Augustus.

The hasty retreat of the vanquished Triumvir prevented him from issuing orders to direct the future motions of his army. Having witnessed his defeat from the adjoining heights, the soldiers retired to their camp, expecting either to see their Commander reappear amongst them, or to receive such instructions from him as might seem most likely to retrieve their common fortunes. Canidius retained them in their duty seven days, during which they would not listen to any terms on the part of the enemy; but at the end of this period, their hopes and allegiance gradually gave way, and the greater number both of Romans and provincials, prepared to make their peace with Augustus. Under these circumstances Antonius's Lieutenant relinquished his command, and left the camp in the night with such of the soldiers as were disposed to accompany him in his flight towards the more Eastern Provinces; where they hoped they might still render some service to their unfortunate, infatuated General. In adopting this resolution, they anticipated the orders of Antonius, who, upon hearing, at the promontory of Tenarus, that his army was still entire, sent a messenger to Canidius, desiring him to make the best of his way into Macedonia, and thence into Asia Minor. These orders were, however, too late. Before the messenger arrived, there was no longer any army to command; all the troops who had not abandoned the camp in despair, having already made their submission to the future Emperor of Rome.†

Conduct of Pinarius.

It was the policy of Augustus to secure the friendship, or at least the neutrality, of all the Princes who had ranged themselves under the banner of his rival. For this purpose he willingly recognised the titles of the three Kings who had been created by Antonius; Herod of Judæa, Archelaus of Cappadocia, and Amyntas of Galatia. He likewise interposed in behalf of such of the Grecian States as had suffered from the pressure of the war, and the extortion of the Egyptian officers; confining all his resentment to the ambitious projects of Cleopatra, and the foolish cooperation of his late colleague and brother-in-law.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

The news of his disasters reached the coast of Africa before Antonius could arrive there with the remains of his fleet. Pinarius, to whom he had committed the Government of Cyrene, refused to let him land, or to supply him with the most needful succours. Embracing the interests of the successful party, he surrendered to Cornelius, an officer in the service of Augustus, not only the important Province of the Pentapolis, but also four legions, which had been left to defend it. Antonius, thus repelled by the treachery of his Lieutenant, joined Cleopatra in Alexandria, whither he immediately proceeded to concert measures for the approaching campaign, which was to decide finally all his pretensions to a share in the Government and territory of Rome.

Measures of Cleopatra.

When Cleopatra, on her return from Actium, approached the harbour of Alexandria, she gave orders to display all the ensigns of victory, and proceeded into the harbour with shouts of triumph and congratulation. But she could not long conceal her reverses; and, resolving to obviate their worst effects, she instantly began to repair her navy, though she was compelled to derive her means from the plunder of private citizens, and the riches of the Temples. Under the impression of fear, she projected a powerful naval establishment on the shores of the Arabian Gulf; and with this view she caused a number of gallies to be conveyed over land, and others to be built in the several ports of the Red Sea; trusting that a long time would elapse before the fleets of Rome could threaten her safety in that remote part of her dominions. But after this project was partly carried into execution, the jealousy of the Arabs defeated her views of success. They demolished the docks, plundered the stores, and burnt the ships upon which her treasures had been expended, and reduced her to the necessity of making her defence on the banks of the Nile.†

Augustus appears to have passed part of the following winter at Rome, in arrangements connected with the civil Government of the Republic, as well as in soothing the minds of his veteran soldiers; who having now endured the fatigues and privations of war, were eager in their demands for the usual recompence. But it is certain that early in the Spring of next year, he had crossed the Adriatic, and was at the head of his army; intent upon his great object of annihilating the power of Antonius, and of adding Egypt to the number of Roman Provinces. His plan was to invade that Kingdom on two sides at once; at Peritonium on the West by the legions under Cornelius Gallus, and at Pelusium on the East with the troops which himself was to lead in person.‡

The Queen of Egypt, meanwhile, in conjunction with her lover, adopted various means for diverting or mitigating the calamity with which they were threatened. They made offers of a conditional submission to the Conqueror; they addressed him with flattering messages and splendid gifts, professed to

* Orosius, lib. vi. c. 19. Dion Cassius, and Plutarch, *in Antonio.* Suetonius, *in Octavio.*

† Plutarch, *in Antonio.* Dion Cassius.

* Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. xv. c. 10. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 2. Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 443.

† Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 447. Zonaras, lib. x. c. 35.

‡ Orosius, lib. vi.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

receive him as a friend, and were eager to apologize for whatever appearances in their past conduct he might regard as not quite in unison with their present declarations. But the penetration of Augustus was too acute, and his resolutions too firmly taken, to be deceived by such diplomatists. Nor was he impeded in his designs by a measure of a more important nature, which suggested itself to Antonius in the midst of his difficulties. Cæsarion, the reputed son of Julius Cæsar by Cleopatra, was now of sufficient age to take a part in public affairs; and him, accordingly, Antonius presented to the Romans, as the right heir of his father's inheritance, and the proper representative of his family and claims. This stratagem, however, only involved in an untimely fate the youth who was made the object of it, as well as the eldest son of the Triumvir himself by his first wife; and while he thus exasperated his antagonist by the most irritating personal insults, he failed to adopt any rational plan for the defence of the Kingdom, which he saw was just about to be attacked by an overwhelming force. He even absented himself from all Counsels that were held on this subject, declined taking any part in the management of affairs, and withdrew in disgust from the society of Cleopatra.

There is reason to believe that the agents of the Queen, at the camp of Cæsar, did not fail to put in practice all their arts, both to ascertain his intention relative to the person of their Mistress, should she fall into his power, and also the extent of his inclination to treat with her, as the Sovereign of Egypt, without any reference to the views and conduct of Antonius. The prudence of the Roman Commander kept him from committing his faith on these delicate points. He indeed encouraged Cleopatra to hope for a separate treaty, but he advised her, in the meantime, to break off her connection with his rival, and to surrender herself and Kingdom to the generosity of the Conqueror; insinuating that her charms would have more influence upon his mind than the justice of her cause, and that neither she nor her subjects would have cause to repent the unbounded confidence which he expected her to repose in him.*

Advance and successes of Augustus. B. C. 30. — U. C. 724. — OL. 187. 3.

The season for active operations having arrived, Augustus began the campaign by attacking Egypt, as he had arranged, both on the side of Pelusium and on that of Peritonium. A glimpse of good fortune attended the arms of Antonius, when he sallied forth from Alexandria at the head of his cavalry, to check the enemy's horsemen on their approach to the Eastern frontier. His spirit revived, and he seemed once more about to retrieve the character for valour and military skill, which had made him the friend of Julius Cæsar. But his exertions were not seconded. The arts of Augustus had, it is presumed, so far prevailed with Cleopatra, that she was led to conceive her interests to be more closely connected with the failure of Antonius than with his success. Pelusium fell into the enemy's hands without even a show of resistance. It was impossible not to suspect treachery, and the deluded Triumvir complained to the Queen that her arms were turned against him; but she, delivering to his resentment the officer who had surrendered the stronghold, assured him of the constancy of her attachment to his person, and of her firm resolution to oppose the invader even to the last extremity.*

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

Encouraged by these representations, he collected all his forces by sea and land, and resolved to make one great effort to recover at once the power and the reputation which he had lost since the battle of Actium. He met his opponent in the field, under the walls of Alexandria, whilst he gave orders to his fleet to attack the gallies and transports which were at anchor near the harbour; but hardly was the action begun when the Egyptian sailors struck their flags, the cavalry deserted to the enemy's ranks, and the infantry fled into the city in the utmost trepidation. The fate of Egypt was now decided; resistance was become equally impracticable and useless; and Antonius had only to pour into the ear of the Queen unavailing complaints that he had been deceived, insulted, and betrayed.†

Antonius defeated.

Devices of Cleopatra, and death of Antonius.

Whilst these scenes were passing, Cleopatra had shut herself up, with a few attendants and the most valuable part of her treasure, in a strong building, which appears to have been intended for a Royal Sepulchre. To prevent intrusion by friend or enemy, she caused a report to be circulated, that she had retired into the monument to put herself to death; and a rumour soon followed, that she had executed her threat, and was already dead. Antonius, not less unhappy in his love than in his ambition, resolved to follow the example of the Queen; and, giving his sword to the freed slave, whom he had retained for the express purpose of ending his life when he should no longer wish to retain it, desired him to strike the fatal blow. The affectionate freedman turned the point of the weapon against himself, and inflicted a mortal wound; upon which, the Roman Commander, snatching the sword from the body of the slave, plunged it into his own. He did not, however, immediately expire; and, while he lay bleeding on the ground, some one told him that Cleopatra was still alive and safe in the upper part of the tower. He desired that he should be carried into her presence, and his wish was gratified. He was drawn up by means of machinery to the top of the wall; and when he was laid at the feet of the Queen, streaming with blood and about to draw his last breath, she tore her hair, and beat her breast in the deepest distress; agitated by a variety of passions, which, though perhaps real on so painful an occasion, she had long learned to affect and employ for the accomplishment of very questionable purposes.‡

Character of Antonius.

The reputation of Antonius depends chiefly on his military talent; and, doubtless, if we except the great Cæsar, there was hardly any one else, in the troubled period in which he lived, who surpassed him in the knowledge which is necessary for planning a campaign, and in the courage and presence of mind which are requisite for carrying it on successfully. He was, however, naturally voluptuous; and after he became

* Dion Cassius, lib. li. c. 9.

* Plutarch, *in Antonio*. Orosius, lib. vii. p. 268.
† Dion Cassius. Plutarch, *in Antonio*.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. li. c. 10. Zonaras, lib. x. c. 30. Plutarch, *in Antonio*.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

involved in the factions which divided the Republic, he was tempted, like most of his contemporaries, to regard the possession of power as the main object of desire, and the acquisition of wealth as one of the most legitimate means by which it could be obtained and secured. He considered the Empire of Rome as the prize of his ability and the reward of his toils; and in aiming at the Sovereignty of the world, it is not surprising that he should have experienced those reverses which, if they proved the weakness of his moral nature, displayed not less the versatility of his genius and the extent of his intellectual resources. His connection with Cleopatra completely blasted his prospects and changed the current of his thoughts. Fascinated by her, he became an easy prey to the cool and persevering ambition of his competitor in power; and when at length he fell by his own hand, he might be considered as at once the victim of political rivalry and of faithless love. He died deserted by every Roman citizen that had at any time been attached to his interests, betrayed by those he had most trusted, and deceived by one with whose character he ought to have been the most intimately acquainted.

Cleopatra sent to Augustus a formal notice of Antonius's death; hoping, it may be, that the main obstacle, to a compromise with the victor, was now removed. But the views of Cæsar, in regard to her person and wealth, were not to be affected by the little arts which she thought it expedient to employ; the former he meant should grace his Triumph, and the latter recruit his exhausted coffers. That such were his motives, the Queen herself appears from the outset to have suspected; and it was for this reason that she had provided her retirement with several kinds of poison, by which she might, in case of necessity, put a gentle termination to her life. To divert her from this fatal resolution, which had by some means become known to the Conqueror, he from time to time renewed the hope that she might yet obtain from the Senate such terms of agreement, as would leave her Sovereignty unimpaired, and at length he even condescended to pay her a visit in her own apartments. When this intention was made known to her, she prepared for the reception of the Master of Rome, with all the pomp of which her circumstances would admit. Her chamber was decorated in the most elegant manner; she gave a prominent place to the picture and bust of Julius Cæsar; and placed before her on a table a bundle of letters which she had received from the amorous Dictator. Her person was arrayed in mourning; a dress which suited at once her complexion, and the solemn occasion of the interview which she was about to hold. When Augustus presented himself, she rose to meet him with an air of melancholy and downcast eyes. She called him her master, and reminded him that to his father she owed all her fortunes, and now willingly resigned them into the hands of the son. The memory of the great Julius, she declared, would be a sufficient comfort to her in all her afflictions; she would even take pleasure in considering him as revived in the distinguished hero who now inherited his fortunes and his name. But "would to God," she exclaimed, bursting into tears, "that I had died before him, so should I have escaped the evils which his death has been the means of bringing upon me."*

Interview of Augustus with Cleopatra.

* Plutarch, *in Antonio*. Dion Cassius, lib. li. c. 12.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

The conduct of Augustus, during this conference, confirmed her worst fears. She saw that he meant to carry her to Rome, and expose her to the gaze of the populace at his Triumph; upon which she finally determined to disappoint his unmanly and vindictive pride. But she found it necessary, meantime, to disguise her purpose; being closely watched by the agents of Augustus, who had received the strictest orders to preserve her life. She therefore affected more than usual lightness of heart; pretended to pack up her jewels as if on the eve of a long journey; and even to select such of them as might be esteemed suitable gifts for the wife and sister of Augustus, which, she said, she meant to deliver with her own hand. Having completed her arrangements, she wrote a letter to the Conqueror, which she sent under the charge of a faithful servant, acquainting him with her knowledge of his designs, and also of the means which she had taken to render them for ever abortive. She added several expressions of triumph and delight, that she had been able so to thwart his cruel purpose concerning her, and thereby to escape from the hands of enemies whom she could not in any other way disarm.*

Death of Cleopatra.

Augustus was at no loss to perceive the import of her remarks and the subject of her congratulation. He gave instant orders to prevent the accomplishment of her intentions; but they were too late. Before his injunctions could reach the sepulchral tower, the Queen was already dead. One of the two women, who attended her, lay stretched lifeless at her feet; the other was just expiring. The latter, however, upon seeing the messenger of Augustus enter the chamber, cast her eyes on her Mistress, and observing that the Crown had fallen from her head, exerted the last feeble remains of her strength to replace it. A small puncture in the arm was the only mark of violence which could be detected on the body of Cleopatra; and it was therefore believed that she had procured death, either by the bite of a venomous reptile, or by the scratch of a poisoned bodkin. She was in her thirty-ninth year, having reigned twenty-two from the death of her father. Augustus, it is said, though deprived by this act of suicide of the greatest ornament of his approaching Triumph, gave orders that she should have a magnificent funeral, and that her body, as she had desired, should be laid by that of Antonius.

Character of Cleopatra.

In the grave of Cleopatra was deposited the last of the Royal race of the Ptolemies, a family which had swayed the sceptre of Egypt two hundred and ninety-four years. Of the real character of this celebrated Queen herself, it is not possible to speak, at this distance of time, with any degree of confidence. That she had beauty and talents of the highest order, is admitted by every historian who has undertaken to give the annals of her reign; and that she was accomplished in no ordinary degree, is established by the fact that she was a great proficient in music, and mistress of nearly all the languages which were cultivated in her age. She was well skilled, for example, in Greek and Latin; and she could converse with Ethiopians, Troglodytes, Jews, Arabians, Syrians, Medes, and Persians, without an interpreter, always

* Plutarch, *in Octavio*. Dion Cassius, lib. li. c. 19. Orosius, lib. vi. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 87.

History. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

giving an answer to such individuals of these nations as had occasion to address her, in the tongue or dialect which they happened to employ. If her conduct was not at all times strictly pure, we must seek for an apology in the religion and manners of her country, and must ascribe the most glaring of her frailties to the absurd institutions which regulated the matrimonial connections of Egyptian Princes, and which paid no respect to the age, affections, or temper of the parties. Her lot, too, was cast in a time when the Civil commotions and military power of Rome shook the foundations of society over the greater part of the civilized world, and when no policy pursued on her part could have saved the independence of her Kingdom, or even have long delayed the subjection into which she had the misfortune to see it fall.

Egypt. From A. M. 3681. — B. C. 323. to A. M. 3974. — B. C. 30.

CAIUS OCTAVIUS CÆSAR AUGUSTUS.

PART II.

CONTAINING A VIEW OF THE HISTORY OF ROME.

FROM U. C. 722 TO U. C. 766. A. C. 32 TO A. D. 13.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

If we were to judge of God's moral government, exclusively from the various earthly fortune of good and bad men, there are few instances of successful wickedness which would more disturb our faith than that of the long and peaceful reign of Augustus Cæsar. Other usurpers have enjoyed till their death their ill-gotten power; but it has been beset by fears and anxieties; and the severity of their government has betrayed their consciousness of the real feelings with which they were regarded, and has proved that they could truly anticipate the sentence which after ages would pass upon their memory. But Augustus reigned amidst the grateful obedience of his people; and the flattery with which his own Court resounded, has been echoed by successive generations, till he has been habitually ranked amongst the best and greatest of Sovereigns; and the period of his dominion has been considered synonymous with the highest state of civilisation and public prosperity. Yet the man thus eulogised had shown himself capable of every wickedness, so long as his interests required it; and the merit of his later years, consists only in that clearness of understanding which taught him that power, although most readily gained by crime, was most wisely exercised in promoting the happiness of mankind; and that justice and mercy, when they demanded no personal sacrifices, were only a means, as easy as effectual, of promoting at once his own security and greatness.

Augustus settles the Government of Egypt.

The conquest of Egypt became a most seasonable source of riches to Augustus, and he availed himself of it to the utmost. It is said that, besides the immense treasures accumulated by Cleopatra,* and the heavy forfeitures imposed on all those Egyptians who had served their Queen with most distinction during the late war, a tax was imposed on the whole people of Egypt to the amount of two-thirds of their property, besides a heavy contribution levied on the citizens of Alexandria, as a ransom for the exemption of their city from plunder. In this manner Augustus, we are told, was enabled to pay all the arrears due to the army, and to discharge his obligations to those creditors who had lent him money for the expenses of the war; while at the same time he carried off a great number of magnificent offerings which had ornamented the temples of Egypt, and were now to be laid up in those at Rome. It is said too, that after all the spoliations, the wealth and resources of Egypt appeared to him so formidable, that he was afraid to intrust that Province to the charge of any man of rank or influence, lest he should raise up a rival to himself. He therefore committed the Government of the country to Cornelius Gallus, a citizen of the Equestrian Order, and a person of very low extraction;* he would not allow the city of Alexandria to possess any municipal Council; and he declared all Egyptians incapable of being admitted into the Senate at Rome At the same time he employed his soldiers in clearing out many of the old canals with which the country had been formerly intersected,† and which had been for a long period choked up by the mud and sand deposited in the successive inundations of the Nile. He then departed from Egypt, passed through Syria, and thence continued his progress to the Province of Asia, wherein he resolved to remain during the winter.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

Honours decreed to him by the Senate. U. C. 723.

The tidings of his final victory over Antonius and Cleopatra, arrived at Rome in the month of September,‡ when, by a curious coincidence, M. Cicero, the son of the Orator, was just entering on his Consulship; for that office, which was now a mere empty title, was not held as formerly for the whole year; but, in order to multiply the patronage of the Sovereign, was given successively to several persons, each of whom only retained it for two or three months. Although it might have been thought that all conceivable modes of flattery to the conqueror had been already exhausted, yet the Senate, on this occasion, was once more lavish of its honours to the chief of the victorious party, and of its marks of disgrace on the memory of the vanquished. All monuments in honour of Antonius were ordered to be defaced, or destroyed; the day of his birth was to be held accursed, and no member of his family was ever to bear the prænomen of Marcus. On the other hand, solemn games were to be celebrated every five years in honour of Augustus; his birth-day, and the anniversary of the day on which the news of his victory had reached Rome, were to be kept as days of thanksgiving; he was to be met, on his approach to the Capital, by the Vestal virgins, the Senate and people, in procession with their wives and children; and his power of protection, as Tribune, to any one who appealed to him, was to extend to the distance of seven stadia and a half without the walls of Rome; and further, he was to have a privilege of pardoning any criminal, by giving what was called the vote of Minerva, when the number of the voices which condemned, exceeded only by one the number of those which acquitted. Finally, on the first of January in the ensuing year, U. C. 724.

* Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 455. edit Leunclavii.

* Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 455. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 66.
† Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 456. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 18.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 456. Pliny, *Hist. Natural.* lib. xxii. c. 6. Plutarch, *in Cicerone*, c. 49.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

the Senators all took an oath to observe all his Acts; and the gates of the Temple of Janus were shut, as if Augustus, by his conquest of Egypt, had delivered the Commonwealth from every enemy, and had brought it to a state of perfect peace.

Meantime the cities of Asia, wherein Augustus was passing the winter, were vying with Rome itself in the flatteries which they offered him. They professed to regard it as a great distinction, when he allowed Temples, dedicated to Rome and to the divine Julius, to be raised at Ephesus and Nicæa,* and two others consecrated to Rome and to Himself to be built at Pergamus and Nicomedia. It is observed, however, that the care of the Temples dedicated to Julius Cæsar, was committed to the Roman citizens resident in the cities wherein they were placed; while the charge of the Temples of Augustus was given to the native inhabitants, or, as they were commonly styled, the Greeks. The Romans, it is said, would not, at this time, condescend to become priests in the Temple of a living man,† although they did not object to bestowing divine honours on the same individual after death. But the subjects of Rome were less scrupulous, and the example of the Greeks of Asia was soon followed, we are told, by the inhabitants of the other Provinces of the Empire.

Flatteries paid him by the Greek cities of Asia.

Augustus returns to Rome.

In the summer of this year Augustus crossed over from Asia into Greece, and thence to Italy.‡ He lavished the treasures of Egypt so liberally on all classes of people, in donations to his soldiers, in largesses of 100 *denarii*, or about £3. 4*s*. 6*d*. to each individual citizen, and in paying all the sums which he had borrowed for the expenses of the war, that all his crimes and oppressions were forgotten amid the splendour of his munificence; nor did he give less general satisfaction by refusing the golden crowns which were offered to him, as they had been to his uncle, by the cities of Italy, and by remitting all arrears of taxes which were still due to the Treasury. Such an overflow of money was at this time poured into the market at Rome, that the price of land rapidly rose,§ and the usual rate of interest was reduced to only one-third of what it had been before; the great mass of disposable capital making every one eager to become a purchaser of land as the readiest means of investing it to advantage, while all who wanted to borrow money were enabled to procure it on far easier terms than usual. Augustus then celebrated his "triple Triumph" during three successive days:‖ on the first of which were commemorated the victories gained either by himself or his Lieutenants over the Dalmatians, Pannonians, and various other barbarian tribes of Germany and the northern extremity of Gaul;¶ on the second, his naval victory at Actium; and on the third, his conquest of Egypt. No mention was made of Antonius, nor was the late contest represented in any other light than as a struggle between the Senate and People of Rome and the Queen of Egypt. A figure of Cleopatra lying on a couch, intended to display the manner of her death, was carried in the procession; and two of her children by Antonius, Alexander and Cleopatra, were exhibited among the prisoners. One striking change of the forms practised under the old Constitution was remarked on this occasion. The Consuls and other Magistrates of the Commonwealth, were accustomed to walk before the chariot of the victorious General; but now they followed in his train, in company with those Senators who had served with him in his late campaigns, and were now sharing in the honours of his Triumph.

His three Triumphs.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

The consecration of a Temple, dedicated to Julius Cæsar as a Demigod, soon furnished Augustus with an opportunity of further gratifying the people by an exhibition of different kinds of sports and combats. It is mentioned, that the hippopotamus and rhinoceros were on this occasion first hunted and killed in a Roman amphitheatre; and that large bodies of the Suevi and the Dacians, the former one of the most powerful of the German tribes, and the latter a people who occupied both banks of the Danube, in the lower part of the course of that river, were matched against each other, and practised each their national mode of fighting in real battle, for the entertainment of the spectators.

Conspiracy of Lepidus.

It was a little before this time, apparently, that M. Lepidus, the son of the late Triumvir, and the nephew of M. Brutus, formed a design to destroy Augustus.* The particulars of this attempt are not recorded; Paterculus charges him with intending to assassinate Augustus as soon as he should return to Rome, while the *Epitomizer* of Livy says that he was meditating an open attack upon his power, possibly by endeavouring to draw away some of the legions from his service. But whatever his plans were, they were discovered by C. Mæcenas, to whom Augustus had intrusted the government of the Capital during his absence, and Lepidus was arrested and put to death. His wife, Servilia, is said to have killed herself in consequence of his loss, by swallowing fire.

In the midst of his Triumph, and when the Sovereignty which he had so dearly purchased lay at length securely within his grasp, Augustus is said to have meditated an entire resignation of his power, and the restoration of the old Constitution. This report, which is mentioned by Suetonius, became embellished in process of time with additional circumstances; and Dion Cassius, in the true style of a Greek rhetorician, represents Augustus as consulting his two friends, Agrippa and Mæcenas, on this important question: and ascribes to these two Counsellors two speeches of immense length, in one of which Agrippa repeats all the old common place arguments in favour of a Republic, and urges Augustus to restore the authority of the Senate and People; while in the other, Mæcenas, in a strain equally trite, recounts the advantages of Monarchy, and presses his friend to retain the power which fortune had put into his hands. It is most improbable that Augustus should ever have entertained a serious thought of sacrificing the prize which he had led a life of such surpassing wickedness to gain; although it is perfectly consistent with his character that he should have wished to spread such a

* Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 458. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iv. c. 37.
† Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 458. ‡ Ibid.
§ Ibid. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 41.
‖ *At Cæsar*, triplici *invectus Romana* Triumpho.
Mœnia, &c. Virgil, *Æneid.* viii. v. 714.
¶ Dion Cassius, and Virgil, ibid. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxxiii. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 22.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxxiii. Seneca, *de Clementiâ*, c. 9. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 19.

belief among the people, and should appear to be reluctantly induced to bear the weight of government, from a compassion for the disordered state of the Commonwealth. We may more readily believe that Mæcenas suggested to him many of the measures which he now began to carry into execution, for establishing the new order of things.* He first turned his attention to the Senate, which he proposed to reduce in its numbers, and to remove all those members who seemed unfit for their station, from their deficiencies in rank, fortune, or character; particularly those individuals who had procured their admission after Cæsar's death, by purchasing from Antonius a pretended grant of that honour by the late Dictator, at the time when Antonius was availing himself of the possession of Cæsar's papers to gratify his own rapacity and ambition. In this review of the Senate, Augustus chose M. Agrippa as his colleague; and after a considerable number of Senators had resigned their rank of their own accord, to avoid the disgrace of expulsion, each remaining Senator was directed to name one other whom he considered as most worthy to remain on the rolls. All those whose names found no place on this list, and all others whom the Censors judged it expedient to remove, were then marked down, and obliged, it is said, to withdraw of themselves, although they were not allowed, like those who had resigned before the examination, to retain the dress of Senators, nor their seats amongst those reserved for the Senate at the public spectacles. Whilst carrying on this scrutiny, Augustus is said to have worn armour under his clothes,† to have been constantly surrounded by ten of the Senators, on whose personal strength and attachment he could most fully rely; and to have admitted no other Senator into his presence without causing him to be previously searched, lest he should carry about him any concealed weapon. It is added also, that he deposed one Q. Statilius from the office of Tribune,‡ that he raised two Senators to the privileges of the Consular rank, although they had never held that Magistracy, and that, following the precedent set by his uncle, he conferred on several noble families the dignity of Patricians. But his jealousy of the Nobility was shown by an order which he issued, forbidding any Senator to leave Italy at any time without his permission, as if fearful of their escaping from his superintendence. In this policy also he trod, as we have seen, in the steps of his uncle, Julius Cæsar.

Augustus remodels the Senate.

Salutary and popular measures of Augustus. U. C. 725.

The ensuing year, in which Augustus held the office of Consul for the sixth time himself, and chose M. Agrippa as his colleague, was marked by a variety of acts, all tending to render the new Government generally popular, and thus preparing the way for the scene which was soon to follow. In the first place Augustus affected to revive the appearance of the old Consulship,§ by treating his colleague entirely as his own equal. He amused the people with magnificent Games of various kinds; he formed and opened, for public use, a voluminous Library of Greek and Roman literature on the Palatine Hill; he is said to have borrowed money to enable him to make a large contribution to the public Treasury; he issued four times the amount of the allowance of corn usually given to the poorer citizens at the public expense; he gave sums of money to the poorer Senators, to enable them to bear the burden of the Ædileship, and other expensive public offices; he burnt the accounts of all debts of long standing which were due to the Commonwealth; and made over to the possessors the full property of all ground in the Capital to which the State maintained a doubtful claim.* It is mentioned besides, that he not only liberally repaired all the Temples in Rome which needed it,† but that he was careful not to efface the names of the original founders, nor to substitute his own as the restorer of their work. He also stopped the proceedings against all persons who had been long exposed to criminal prosecutions, and whose cases had never yet been decided; ordaining, that if the prosecutors were resolved to continue their suits, they should themselves be liable, if the accused were acquitted, to suffer the same punishment which he would have undergone had he been found guilty. Above all, this year is mentioned as the period in which most of the disorders and abuses introduced in the course of the civil wars,‡ were corrected or removed. Three of the most flagrant of these are particularly noticed.§ The unsettled state of the times had introduced the practice of wearing arms for self-defence even in the streets and neighbourhood of Rome; and whole bands of ruffians, pretending to be armed only for their own protection, carried on their outrages with impunity. These were suppressed by a vigorous exertion of military force. By a similar system of violence, travellers of all descriptions were continually kidnapped on the roads,‖ and carried off to private workhouses, where they were confined as slaves, and treated with the most excessive cruelty; but this evil was remedied by submitting all these workhouses to a vigorous search, and delivering all who were unlawfully detained in them. A third mischief was the formation of a vast number of Societies or Clubs,¶ one of the worst aggravations of the miseries of revolutions. These professed to resemble the old Companies belonging to the several trades in Rome; but they were in reality mere combinations for the purposes of corruption or violence; and it was therefore a general benefit when Augustus dissolved all associations except those that were ancient and agreeable to law. When these salutary measures had won the favour of all classes of people, Augustus continued himself and Agrippa in the Consulship for the following year, and then proceeded to execute the trick on which he designed to found the permanent establishment of his Government.

* Dion Cassius, lib. lii. p. 494. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 35.
† Suetonius, *ubi supra*.
‡ Dion Cassius, *ubi supra*. § Ibid. lib. liii. p. 496.

* Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 32. "*Loca in urbe publica Juris ambigui possessoribus adjudicavit.*"
† Livy, lib. iv. c. 20. "*Augustum Cæsarem, Templorum omnium conditorem aut restitutorem.*" Dion Cassius, lib. liii. p. 497.
‡ Dion Cassius, ibid.
§ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 32.
‖ See the story of Atilius, given in the account of the Proscription under the Triumvirate, in the first part of our Life of AUGUSTUS, p. 320.
¶ Similar Societies were frequent in Greece, and are described by Thucydides as the ready instruments of violence, and particularly of assassination in all political disturbances. Their object was to support their members when engaged in any civil or criminal causes in the courts of law, and to further their election when canvassing for any public office. See Thucydides, lib. viii. c. 54. 65. and his character of such Societies, lib. iii. c. 82. in that admirable passage on the seditions of Greece, which is a lesson to every age and nation.

It is said by Dion Cassius,* that several of the Senators had been prepared beforehand for the scene which was to take place, and these would not fail to suggest to the other members the behaviour which they were wished to adopt. Augustus then came to the Senate, and read a speech, composed for the occasion, in which he expressed his intention of resigning all his power, and restoring the old Constitution of the Commonwealth. We may suppose that such a declaration was heard by the majority with extreme surprise; many at once perceived its insincerity; but there were others, we are told, who, dreading above all things the restoration of the Republic,† were led by their fears to suspect that Augustus was in earnest; and these joined most zealously with the Senators who were already in the secret, in deprecating a resignation, which they said would be fatal to the Empire. The Senators who most regretted their ancient independence, joined perhaps the more eagerly in the general cry, lest they might betray their real feelings; and thus the proposal of Augustus was received exactly as he had hoped; and in consenting to be the despot of his country, he seemed to be only yielding to the national wish, and to accept a painful burden, which no other citizen but himself was able to bear. Yet that he might not lay aside the mask altogether, he refused to undertake the Administration of all the Provinces; and selected only those which were considered as requiring the most vigilant superintendence, and in which the presence of a military force was most necessary.‡ The portion of the Empire which he thus consented immediately to govern, consisted of the whole of Spain, with the exception of Bætica, the limits of which correspond nearly with those of the modern Province of Andalusia, the whole of Transalpine Gaul, Cœle-Syria, Phœnicia, Cilicia, and Egypt. The other Provinces were to be governed, as formerly, by Proconsuls annually appointed by lot from among the Senators: and even that part of the Empire which was given up to Augustus, he declared that he would only retain for ten years, within which period he hoped that every necessity for such an extraordinary power would be at an end; and he added, that he would gladly restore his Provinces earlier to the Senate and the people, if circumstances should render it practicable.

He offers to resign the Government U. C. 726.

But is prevailed upon to retain it.

He divides the Administration of the Provinces with the Senate.

The Monarchy was thus established, and the Senate laboured to invent yet additional honours to heap upon their new master. It was ordered that laurels should be planted at the gates of his residence on the Palatine Hill, and a wreath of oak should be for ever hung up over them;§ the first denoting that he was ever victorious, and the oaken wreath, or civic crown, implying that he was the perpetual saviour of the lives of his fellow citizens. It was debated also, what title of distinction should be conferred upon him; and it was then that L. Munatius Plancus suggested the name of Augustus,‖ an epithet which was ordinarily applied to places set apart for religious purposes, and containing any thing consecrated by augury; and which was now offered to the new Sovereign, as signifying that a more than human sacredness and majesty existed in his person.

He receives additional honours, and the surname of Augustus.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

In this manner, at the age of six and thirty, did Augustus regularly commence his reign over the Roman Empire. He retained his power during forty years, a period of general peace and prosperity, during which the wounds inflicted by the long continuance of the Civil wars were gradually and effectually healed. To write the annals of such a reign, especially with our present scanty materials, would be but a meagre and unprofitable labour. We shall rather attempt to give a general picture of the whole of it, and without pretending to detail the events of every successive year, to present a view of the external and internal state of the Empire; of its relations with foreign powers; of the nature of the Imperial Government; of the condition of Italy and the Provinces; of the physical, moral, and intellectual state of the Roman world during this most memorable period. Some notice of the family of Augustus, and of the person likely to become his successor, may then properly precede our account of his death, and serve to connect the present portion of our task with the lives hereafter to be given of the Emperors who followed him.

Sketch of the contents of the remainder of this Memoir.

Of the foreign relations of Rome.

The extent of the Roman dominion in the reign of Augustus was still below the point which it afterwards attained under Claudius and Trajan. Britain was as yet unsubdued, and a large tract of country between the mountains of Hæmus and the Danube was not yet tributary to Rome. But the Empire embraced within its limits the whole of the Mediterranean; its eastern frontier reached the Euphrates; the conquest of Egypt extended its southern boundary to the cataracts of the Nile; while in Europe it possessed Spain and Gaul, together with all that portion of modern Germany which is situated between the Alps and the Danube. It is of little importance however, to ascertain the exact line which separated the Roman Provinces from the possessions of the independent barbarians. Even within the limits of the Empire, the more recently conquered tribes might create occasional disturbance, and afford some employment for the Roman arms. But as far as the knowledge of geography then attainable enabled them to cast their eyes around the world, the Romans could discover only two nations capable of offering an effectual resistance to their power; the Parthians in Asia, and the Germans in Europe.

1. With Parthia. Origin of the Parthians.

The Parthians, a rude tribe of mountaineers from the eastern shores of the Caspian sea, wearing large loose caps upon their heads,* and armed with short javelins and bows of cane, marched in company with the neighbouring tribes of the Chorasmians and Sogdians, amidst that countless multitude of nations whom Xerxes led with him on his memorable expedition against Greece. Such is the earliest notice of the Parthian name which is to be found in history; the later fortunes of the nation, their subjection to the Greek Kings of Syria, the foundation of their Monarchy by Arsaces, and its subsequent progress down to the invasion and defeat of the Roman army under Crassus, have been related in a former part of the present Work. We have also mentioned the attack

* Lib. liii. p. 497. † Dion Cassius, p. 502.
‡ Dion Cassius, ibid Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 47. Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 25. edit. Siebenkees.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. liii. p. 507. Valerius Maximus, lib. ii. c. 8.
‖ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 7. Festus, *in voce* "*Augustus*."

* Herodotus, *Polymnia*, c. 66. 64. 62. 61.

made by the Parthians on Syria and Asia Minor, when T. Labienus, a Roman exile, conducted their armies; and have briefly noticed their rapid successes and equally rapid reverses; the victory gained by P. Ventidius over Pacorus, the son of their King; and, lastly, the disastrous attempt of M. Antonius to invade their country, in revenge for the assistance which they had rendered to the party of Brutus and Cassius. Their Empire, which had thus contended against Rome with more than equal fortune, now embraced the whole of Asia eastward of the Euphrates,* to the most remote of those countries which were within the knowledge of the Romans. They numbered among their Provinces the once mighty names of Media and Assyria;† and even Persia itself, the seat of the Empire of the Great King, although it still had Princes of its own, was no more than a vassal kingdom dependant on the Sovereign power of Parthia.‡ There were two Capitals of the Monarchy, Ecbatana and Seleucia.§ The first, the ancient metropolis of Media, founded by Deioces the earliest of the Median Princes, was the summer residence of the King of Parthia. His winters were passed in the lower and milder country on the banks of the Tigris, where stood Seleucia, the former Capital of the Macedonian Kings of Syria. But Seleucia still retained a shadow of independence; its inhabitants proud of their Greek extraction, language, and manners, would have associated ill with the guards and attendants of a barbarian Sovereign; and in order to save the city from the burden of their presence,‖ the Court was accustomed to reside at the neighbouring village of Ctesiphon, which was situated at the distance of about three miles from Seleucia, on the opposite bank of the Tigris. In later times, when the citizens of Selcucia were become obnoxious to the Parthian Government, from having betrayed an impatience of its dominion, Ctesiphon was studiously favoured as a rival city, which might be made a national Capital of the Empire;¶ and thus it gradually increased in wealth and greatness, while Seleucia as gradually declined, and went to ruin.

Their internal state.

Our knowledge of the internal state of Parthia is confined to one or two isolated facts. Strabo expressly omits all notice of the subject in his geographical work, referring his readers to the information concerning it which he had given in some of his other writings;** and as these are now lost, his reference to them only excites our curiosity in vain. We can only discern in Parthia the existence of two orders, of the Nobility and Priesthood;†† each of which formed a distinct member of the great national Council, and from either of them indifferently the Kings might be selected. There was also that striking characteristic of the Sclavonic tribes, a powerful Nobility, with the rest of the population consisting almost entirely of slaves. In time of war the Nobles attended the King's standard, each bringing with him a large body of his dependants. These were not freemen, like the feudal vassals of Europe, but slaves;* they were however all carefully armed and trained as cavalry, for this constituted the whole strength of the Parthian armies; and the greatness of the Chiefs was measured by the number of slaves which they brought into the field. The growth of an intermediate class of freemen between the Nobles and their slaves, was checked by the law of the country, which forbade any master to give a slave his liberty; so that the highest and lowest classes of society seemed destined to exist alone, and in perpetual contact with each other. Probably, indeed, the evils of slavery were softened by the interposition of such wide distinctions between the slave and the freeman; as they must, on the other hand, appear more intolerable where the line of division is merely arbitrary; and the slave sees around him a number of freemen who appear neither in wealth, or birth, or condition, elevated above his own level. But when freedom was identified with riches and power and high Nobility, it seemed placed completely out of his reach, and the absence of it was so natural, as hardly to excite a murmur. Those revolts and mutinies therefore, of which we have seen such bloody instances among the slaves in the Roman Empire, appear to have been unknown in Parthia. None would have dared in Greece or Rome to enlist slaves into the army, much less to give them the same arms which were intrusted to free citizens; but the Parthian Chiefs armed their dependants like themselves, and instead of trembling at any symptoms which they might display of courage and activity, they trained them carefully in all martial exercises,† and beheld their proficiency with the same pleasure as that of their own children.

Transactions between them and the Romans.

At the period with which we are now engaged, a Prince, whom the Greek and Roman writers call Phraates, was seated on the Parthian Throne.‡ Having been chosen by his father as his successor, he is said to have secured an earlier enjoyment of the Crown, by murdering both him and thirty of his other sons; and committing additional cruelties after his repulse of the Roman invasion under Antonius, he was driven from the Throne by the indignation of his subjects, and a successor named Tiridates was appointed in his room. After some time, however, Phraates, by the aid of some of the rude Scythian tribes which bordered upon Parthia, recovered his kingdom, and drove his competitor into exile in his turn. Tiridates fled into the dominions of Rome, carrying with him the youngest son of Phraates, whom he had contrived to get in his power; and offering this young Prince as a hostage to Augustus, he requested his assistance to restore him to his Throne, promising him to extend the influence of Rome over Parthia, if he were re-

* Strabo, lib. xi. c. 9. sec. 2. edit. Siebenkees.
† Ibid. lib. xvi. c. 1. sec. 19. edit. Siebenkees.
‡ Ibid. lib. xv. c. 3. sec. 3. 24.
§ Ibid. lib. xvi. c. 1. sec. 16.
‖ Ibid. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. vi. c. 42.
¶ Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. vi. c. 26.
** Strabo, lib. xi. c. 9. sec. 3. edit. Siebenkees.
†† Ibid. *τῶν Παρθυαίων συνέδριον φησι Ποσειδώνιος εἶναι διττὸν τὸ μὲν, συγγενῶν, τὸ δὲ σοφῶν καὶ μάγων, ἐξ ὧν ἀμφοῖν τὰς βασιλεῖας καθίστησιν.* We have translated *συγγενῶν* by the word "Nobility," supposing it to signify an extended clan or caste, all the members of which claimed a sort of affinity with one another, as being all derived originally from the same stock, perhaps the traditional founder of the nation. The Achæmenidæ in Persia seem to have been an instance of a smaller class on a more limited scale.

* Justin, lib. xli. c. 2. This account of the Parthians seems to be copied from some trust-worthy authority, and is consistent and sensible.
† Ibid. He says that the army which repulsed Antonius, consisted of fifty thousand cavalry; in which number there were only four hundred freemen, all Nobles; the rest was made up entirely of slaves.
‡ Ibid. lib. xlii. c. 5.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

instated by Roman aid. Phraates, on the other hand, solicited Augustus to release his son, and to give up Tiridates as a rebel.* Augustus, more disposed to consolidate than to extend his Empire, sent back the son of Phraates, and refused to assist the attempts of Tiridates, while at the same time he allowed him to live quietly in the Roman dominions. Phraates, thus finding that he had nothing to fear from Rome, and still suspecting danger from his own subjects, resolved to commit four of his sons to the care of Augustus, partly as hostages, and partly, we are told, to prevent them from being raised to the Throne in his place;† knowing that the Parthians would set up no competitor against him, unless he were of the Royal stock of the Arsacidæ. Augustus received the Parthian Princes, and treated them with the greatest kindness, bringing them up in the customs of the Romans, and instructing them in the arts and superior knowledge of Europe; he availed himself also of his friendly connection with Phraates, to procure from him the restoration of all the Roman standards and prisoners which had been taken in the expeditions of Crassus and Antonius.‡ This supposed reparation of the greatest disasters sustained for many years by the Roman arms, was especially grateful to Augustus; and there is no foreign transaction of his reign on which the panegyrists of those times have dwelt with greater complacency.

II. Relation of Rome with the Germans. Progress of the Roman conquests in Illyricum.

Nearly a century had now elapsed since the invasion of Italy by the Cimbri and Teutones; and notwithstanding the final destruction of the invaders, the Romans could not forget that several Consular armies had been overthrown before Marius had been able to stem the torrent. When Cæsar first took possession of his Government in Gaul, he found that the Gauls regarded the Germans with the greatest terror, as a people far more warlike than themselves; and although he destroyed the army of Ariovistus, and made a short expedition beyond the Rhine, yet the conquest of Gaul afforded him sufficient employment, and the Roman arms had as yet made no serious impression upon Germany. During the thirteen years which elapsed between the death of Cæsar and the battle of Actium, we read of a second expedition made by the Romans beyond the Rhine in the year 716, under the command of M. Agrippa;§ but this had probably no other object than to chastise some of the German tribes, who had assisted the Gauls in a fruitless attempt to recover their independence. A more regular hostility seems to have been carried on against those numerous tribes who were included under the general name of Illyrians,‖ and who occupied the whole country between the Alps and the Danube; together with the whole of the eastern side of the Adriatic, extending southwards to the very confines of Greece. Some parts of this extensive tract had indeed been conquered by the Romans at a much earlier period: a King of the most southern extremity of it had taken part with Perseus in the last struggle made by the Macedonian Monarchy, and had paid for his offence by the forfeiture of his dominions; whilst the Dalmatians, who were thus brought into contact with the Roman frontier, were attacked twelve years afterwards, merely in order to find some employment for the Roman arms.* Accordingly several victories were gained over them, which were the occasion of a Triumph to several Roman Generals; and the bounds of the Roman Provinces of Illyricum were gradually extended. Yet the Dalmatians were persevering enemies; even in the Civil war between Pompey and Cæsar, they inflicted a signal defeat on Cæsar's officer, the notorious A. Gabinius; and after the establishment of Cæsar's power, we find P. Vatinius the successor of Gabinius, complaining, in a letter to Cicero,† of the tedious nature of the contest against them, and of the injustice of Cæsar, who seemed to expect that he should go through the endless labour of conquering the whole people, before he would reward him with the honour of a Triumph. The Triumvirs, however, were more indulgent than Cæsar, for Vatinius obtained his Triumph, through their favour, in the year after the Proscription,‡ although the Dalmatians were still unconquered; and only three years afterwards C. Asinius Pollio obtained another Triumph over the same people,§ and Horace could speak of the "eternal renown" which "the laurel of his Dalmatian Triumph had won for him." Again the contest was renewed by Augustus himself; who only four years after the victories of Pollio, engaged personally in the Illyrian war; and is said to have been wounded in an attack upon one of the fortresses of Dalmatia.‖ Under his command Pannonia was invaded, and conquered; and as the Roman arms continued to advance towards the Danube, the countries bordering on the Adriatic appear to have been at last more effectually subdued; and victories became less frequent in Dalmatia and Liburnia, when they began to be won on the frontiers of Vindelicia and Noricum. After Augustus was established in the full possession of the Empire, his sons-in-law, Tiberius Nero and Claudius Drusus, carried the Roman conquests into Rhætia;¶ and whatever occasional disturbances might still arise within that limit, the Danube became now regarded as the frontier of the Empire, at least during the whole of its course through Germany.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

Expedition of Drusus and Tib. Nero beyond the Rhine.

While the Romans were thus extending their conquests from the Alps to the Danube, they attempted to penetrate in another quarter into the very heart of Germany, and to advance their frontier from the Rhine to the Elbe. Claudius Drusus was first employed in this service, and afterwards his elder brother, Tiberius Nero. In the course of these wars more than fifty Roman fortresses were built on the banks of the Rhine,** many of which were the first germ of towns still existing; and amongst these are to be numbered Mentz, Bingen, Coblentz, Andernach, and

* Justin, lib. xlii. c. 5.
† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. ii. c. 1, 2. Strabo, lib. xvi. c. 1. sec. 28.
‡ Strabo, and Justin, *locis citatis.* Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxxix.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. xlviii. p. 389. edit. Leunclavii.
‖ Cluverius, *Vindelicia et Noricum*, c. 1. forming an Appendix to his *Germania Antiqua.* To the authorities there quoted, may be added Appian, *Illyrica*, c. 6.

* Polybius, lib. xxxii. c. 19.
† *Epist. ad Familiares*, lib. v. epist. x.
‡ *Fasti Consulares et Triumphi, a* Sigonio *editi.*
§ Ibid. *et* Horace, *Carm.* lib. ii.

Cui laurus æternos honores
Dalmatico peperit triumpho.

‖ Dion Cassius, lib. xlix. p. 412. Florus, lib. iv. c. 12. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 20.
¶ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. cxxxvi. Florus, lib. iv. c. 12. Suetonius, *in Tiberio*, c. 9.
** Florus, lib. iv. c. 12.

Bonn. A fleet also cooperated with the army, sailing round from the ports of Gaul to the mouth of the Elbe; and the country was so far overrun, that Drusus had established military posts along the course of that river, as well as of the Weser. Had these successes been unchecked, the Romans would have permanently occupied the greatest part of Germany; the Latin language and the manners of Italy might have prevailed as entirely over the language and manners of the Germans, as they did over those of the Gauls and Spaniards; whilst the Teutonic tribes, pressed by the Romans on the Elbe, and by the Sclavonic nations on the Oder and the Vistula, would have been either gradually overpowered and lost, or at any rate would never have been able to spread that regenerating influence over the best portion of Europe, to which the excellence of our modern institutions may in great measure be referred. If this be so, the victory of Arminius deserves to be reckoned among those signal deliverances which have affected for centuries the happiness of mankind; and we may regard the destruction of Quintilius Varus, and his three legions, on the banks of the Lippe, as second only in the benefits derived from it to the victory of Charles Martel at Tours, over the invading host of the Mohammedans.

It was in the year 744 that M. Claudius Drusus died in Germany;* and his brother, Tiberius Nero, was appointed to succeed him in his command. Tiberius is said to have conducted the war with extraordinary success; to have overrun again the whole country between the Rhine and the Elbe; and to have reduced it almost to the condition of a Roman Province. But when he returned to Rome to enjoy a Triumph, and to receive the Consulship, the effects of his victories began to wear away; and the Germans soon renewed the contest. Ten years afterwards, when Tiberius had been adopted by Augustus as his son,† he repaired for the second time to Germany, and employed two summers in retracing the ground of his former conquests, and in again terrifying rather than subduing the Germans into submission. On this occasion too, the Roman fleet cooperated with the army, and again sailed round to the mouth of the Elbe, and advanced some way up the river.‡ A succession of such campaigns must have produced a permanent effect; and the Germans would have been conquered as completely as the Gauls; for the Gauls had maintained an eight years' struggle against Cæsar, and none of their efforts had been so formidable as the last, when Vercingetorix had roused all the force of his country to contend with the Romans at Alesia. But as Tiberius was on the point of commencing his third campaign, a general revolt of all the Pannonian and Dalmatian tribes interrupted his career, and gave at this most critical moment a breathing time to Germany.§ The main force of the Empire was engaged between the Danube and the Alps; and the recent conquests of Tiberius between the Rhine and the Elbe, were committed to the charge of P. Quintilius Varus, with an army of three legions. Varus had already been intrusted with the Government of Syria;‖ and in that station had made himself known by his exactions, and was said to have transferred to himself the riches of the Province. In his command in Germany he seemed to consider himself again in Syria; he introduced the Roman jurisdiction into the conquered territories, and irritated the rude minds of the barbarians, by subjecting them to a discipline the most alien from their habits and character. But it is said, that in order to lull him into a false security, the German Chiefs pretended to receive with gratitude the institutions which he was introducing among them. They concerted quarrels amongst themselves, and solicited the arbitration of Varus to decide them, professing to admire the superior knowledge of the Romans, which taught them to settle their differences by the rules of equity instead of by the sword. Varus, by constitution and habit, possessed little of the activity of a soldier; the imaginary dignity of his situation, as the lawgiver and instructor of Germany, flattered at once his vanity and his indolence; and the licentious and rapacious passions which the Roman Magistrates were so often accustomed to indulge in the Provinces, began now also to look for gratification. Those profligacies which Varus might have committed in safety amidst the general relaxation of morals in Syria, were considered as the most intolerable outrages by the severe chastity of the Germans, who looked upon adultery with abhorrence, and regarded their wives as the chosen partners of all the dangers and labours of their lives. It is likely that the Romans, believing themselves securely established in the dominion of the country, began to offer without restraint, those insults to the wives and daughters of their subjects for which the armies of southern climates have ever been infamous; and which in ancient days, from the low standard of morals everywhere existing, were committed with peculiar indifference.

Quintilius Varus commands the Roman army in Germany.

In this state of things, the plan of surprising and cutting off the whole Roman army is said to have been first conceived by a young German Chief, whose name the Roman writers have corrupted into Arminius, but to whom we may more properly give his true appellation of Herman. He had served in the late campaigns amongst the auxiliaries of Rome;* and had been admitted not only to the privileges of Roman citizenship, but also to the rank of the Equestrian order. He now concerted his measures with his countrymen with the utmost secrecy; while at the same time he did every thing in his power to increase the confidence of Varus, and to lead him into the snare which he was preparing. The Roman General had been persuaded to weaken his forces by sending detachments into various parts of the country, at the request of the German Chiefs themselves, in order, as they said, to maintain tranquillity, and to secure the safe arrival of his convoys of provisions;† and on a stated day, the insurrection broke out at a point most remote from his head-quarters; and he received intelligence that the people of the country had risen and massacred the troops which they had asked him to send among them. Upon this he instantly put his army in motion to chastise the insurgents; while Herman and the other Chiefs of the conspiracy still professed the most

Conspiracy of Arminius, or Herman.

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 121.
† Ibid. c. 126. ‡ Ibid. c. 129.
§ Ibid. c. 133.
‖ Tacitus, *Histor. Natural.* lib. v. c. 9. Velleius Paterculus, c. 142. Dion Cassius, lib. lvi. p. 582.

* Velleius Paterculus, c. 143.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lvi. p. 583.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

entire attachment to Rome, and promised to join him with their own forces at a certain point on his line of march, that they might assist him in putting down the rebellion. Varus, we are told, had been previously warned of the treachery of Herman by another German Chief, whom the Romans call Segestes.* Herman had married the daughter of this Chief against his wishes, and this private injury, added to his own attachment to the Romans, made Segestes disposed to save them from the destruction with which they were threatened. When he found that all his warnings had been slighted, he addressed Varus immediately before he commenced his march, and while Herman and the other conspirators were yet in the Roman camp; and implored him that he would at once arrest Herman, himself, and all the other German Chiefs who were present, as the only means of defeating their treachery. But Varus was obstinate in his incredulity; and Herman and his associates were allowed to depart, and put themselves at the head of their forces.

Varus sets out with his army from his camp.

The Roman army was impeded by an immense train of waggons laden with their baggage, and by a crowd of women and children belonging to the soldiers, who were permitted to follow the march, as the General would not allow himself to apprehend any danger. The way ran through an extensive forest, called by the Romans the Forest of Teutoburg,† which spread over a considerable tract of country between the Lippe and the Ems. In the intervals, between the woods, the ground was broken and boggy; and the Romans had to undergo the labour of forming for themselves a practicable road, by clearing away the trees, and constructing a sort of causeway through the worst parts of the morasses. When they were already wearied by their exertions, and perfectly unprepared for any attack, the troops of Herman and his associates, who were to join them at this place, suddenly appeared; and rushing out from the woods on every side assailed them with a heavy discharge of their missile weapons. The Romans, encumbered by their heavy baggage, and by the nature of the ground, were unable to form in any regular order to repel the enemy; they thus sustained a heavy loss without being able to retaliate; and having made little or no progress in their march, they encamped for the night on one of the most open and level spots that they could find amidst the forest. Here they destroyed or abandoned a great part of their heavy baggage, and the next morning again renewed their march. But they still had to contend with the same natural difficulties of woods and bogs; and while their own numbers were decreasing every hour, the confidence of success was swelling the force of the Germans; and many, who had at first dreaded to take any part in the conspiracy, came now to share in the anticipated spoils of the Roman army. It is said too, that the weather was exceedingly tempestuous; and that violent squalls of wind and rain impeded the movements of the Romans, and so drenched their clothing and their wooden shields, that they could not stir themselves, or wield their arms. The result was the total destruction of the Roman army. Varus himself, and his principal officers, most of them having been already wounded, fell upon their own swords, that they might not be taken alive by the enemy;* and the wreck of his army, having attempted in vain to secure themselves at the approach of night by forming a camp, and to shelter themselves behind the ditch and rampart, were persuaded by one of their surviving Commanders to lay down their arms, and to try the mercy of the conqueror. But there is little humanity to be expected from barbarians when they feel that the moment is arrived for taking vengeance for a long series of insults and injuries. The military Tribunes and principal Centurions among the prisoners were slaughtered by the Germans as victims to their Gods, before some altars raised in the adjoining woods; the common soldiers were hanged upon the trees, or stifled in the morasses; and the heads of many of those who had perished were fastened to the trunks of the trees as a trophy of the victory. Above all, it is said, the Germans felt a peculiar delight in torturing those of their prisoners who had practised as lawyers in the courts established by Varus;† they put out their eyes, or cut off their hands; and one man, we are told, cut out the tongue of his victim, and then sewed up his mouth, exclaiming, "Now, viper, cease thy hissing!" In the defeat of the army, the standards of the legions, and two of the eagles were also taken, and these trophies were exhibited by Herman to his soldiers, and treated with every mark of contempt and mockery. The third eagle was saved by the standard bearer, who pulled it off from its staff, and kept it concealed under his girdle; he then hid himself in a bog till the enemy had left the spot, and effected his escape in safety to the Rhine. In the meantime other detachments of the Roman army were attacked in different quarters; and although some succeeded in cutting their way through the assailants, and escaping into Gaul, yet the triumph of the Germans was every where complete;‡ the Romans fled beyond the Rhine, and all the conquests which they had made between the river and the Elbe were totally and irrecoverably lost.§

He is surprised on his march by the Germans.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

His army is destroyed, and he kills himself.

The Romans are driven out of Germany.

The accounts of the consternation produced at Rome by the defeat of Varus, describe it as so excessive, that unless they came from the Romans themselves, we should regard them as the mere exaggerations of national pride in the conquerors, exalting the effects of their own success. We are told that Augustus posted guards in different parts of Rome;‖ that he continued all the Governors of the Provinces in their several Commands, as if the crisis required only officers of tried ability and experience; and that he followed a precedent which had been set during the invasion of Italy by the Cimbri, and repeated in the war with the Italian allies, of vowing solemn Games to Jupiter, "If he would be pleased to bring the Commonwealth into a better condition." Augustus himself is said to have felt the calamity so deeply, that for some months he let his beard and hair grow, and would strike his head from time to time against

Consternation felt at Rome.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 55. Velleius Paterculus, c. 143.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lvi. p. 583, *et seq.*

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 61.
† Florus, lib. iv. c. 12. ‡ Velleius Paterculus, c. 145.
§ *Hâc clade factum, ut Imperium quod in litore oceani non steterat, in ripâ Rheni fluminis staret.* Florus, lib. iv. c. 12.
‖ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 23

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

the doors of his apartments, exclaiming aloud, "Quintilius Varus! give me back my legions." Had the Germans, indeed, united their efforts with those of the Pannonians and Dalmatians, and formed any connected plan for the invasion of the Roman frontiers, the danger of an invasion of Italy might not have been imaginary. But the revolt of Pannonia had been already quelled,* and Tiberius Nero was at leisure to march with his veteran legions towards Germany, and to maintain the usual policy of Rome, by acting at once on the offensive, and carrying the war into the enemy's country. The Germans were unable to meet him in the field, and his caution secured him against every attempt at surprise; he accordingly overran and laid waste a district of considerable extent beyond the Rhine, and led back his army into winter quarters on the banks of that river,† pretending to have retrieved the honour of the Roman arms, and to have restored them to their accustomed superiority. But the frontier had receded to the Rhine, and Tiberius could not again advance it. Four years afterwards he succeeded to the Sovereignty of the Empire on the death of Augustus; and his jealous temper made him by no means inclined to see any of his officers obtain the glory of effectually conquering Germany. The Rhine thus became the permanent limit of the Roman dominions, and that great river formed so natural a boundary line, that all attempts to penetrate beyond it, were renounced as inexpedient; so that the Germans remaining unconquered, had leisure to grow in power and numbers, till they crossed the Rhine in their turn as conquerors.

Expedition of Tiberius Nero into Germany.

But the Roman frontier never advances beyond the Rhine.

State of Britain.

We have said that Britain was not subdued by the Romans till a period later than the reign of Augustus. But although it was not yet become a Province, yet the petty Chiefs of the island were glad to propitiate the favour of Augustus,‡ by sending offerings to be presented to the Temple of Jupiter in the Capitol, and by paying a small tax or duty on all the articles which they imported from Gaul, or exported thither in return. However, as these duties were probably only levied in the ports of Gaul, the payment of them did not necessarily imply a state of dependence, inasmuch as it was only a voluntary compliance with the terms on which the Roman Government chose to allow them to trade with its subjects. But the eagerness of the Britons for the toys and trinkets which they procured from the Roman Empire, made them purchase them without complaining of the duty; and Augustus found it cheaper and easier to levy this tax upon their fondness for finery, than to incur the expense of maintaining an army in the island in order to reduce them to the condition of tributaries.

Having thus dwelt somewhat longer than we are accustomed to do on the foreign relations of the Empire, we shall now return within the frontiers, and proceed to describe the nature of the Imperial Government, and the general condition of the people under its dominion.

Whoever has traced the character of the Roman Constitution through the successive periods of the Commonwealth, must have observed in it a number of points which are entirely congenial to despotism. In fact, the powers of the Magistrates were to a high degree tyrannical; and were only counteracted by the mutual check which they severally found in the equally tyrannical powers of the rest. For instance, the authority of the Consul seems in itself to have been absolute, although its exercise was restrained within the walls of Rome, by the protecting power of the Tribunes, and by the right of appeal to the People; abroad, by the particular provisions of the Porcian Law. Till that Law was enacted, the Consul, when without the city commanding the armies of the Commonwealth, was altogether the master of the life of every citizen. Nor was this confined to points of military discipline; for we read that Q. Fabius Maximus threatened with death a citizen who had been just elected to the Consulship for the ensuing year, because he had maintained the validity of his own election which Fabius wished to overthrow,* and to recal the Centuries to give their votes over again. The Censors might degrade any individual from his rank in the Commonwealth at their sole discretion: the Tribunes, or even any single number of their College, might stop the proceedings of every department of the Government, and seem to have possessed an arbitrary power of committing any one to prison who opposed their measures. If from the ordinary Magistrates of the Commonwealth we turn to the Senate itself, we shall see that body, although properly only a single member of the Legislature, assuming to itself the right of dispensing with the Laws, or of annulling them altogether; and claiming and exercising an unlimited despotism, whenever it thought proper to declare the Country in danger, and to give the Consuls charge to provide for its safety. Above all, the Romans were familiarized to arbitrary power in the authority possessed by the members of the various special Commissions which were from time to time appointed. The Commission of ten Senators, who were usually empowered to settle the state of a newly-conquered country at the close of a war, was accustomed indeed to act only in the Provinces; but the Commissioners for planting colonies, for superintending the distribution of national lands under an Agrarian Law, for providing for the supply of the Roman markets, or for instituting an inquiry into any alleged misdemeanours and malversations, exercised their power towards citizens, and seem to have enjoyed an ample discretion which might be moderated only by the fear of future impeachment at the expiration of their office. In later times the practice of appointing extraordinary officers had become almost equivalent to the formation of a temporary Monarchy. Twice had Pompey been invested with sovereign power over a large portion of the Empire; first, when he was intrusted with the supreme direction of the war with the Pirates, and again when he was sent to finish the long-contested struggle with Mithridates. On a third occasion, when he was named Comptroller of the markets, allowed to appoint his Lieutenants to act under him in the different Provinces, and intrusted with the discretionary employment of a large sum of the

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

Despotic tendency of the Constitution of the Roman Commonwealth.

* Velleius Paterculus, c. 141.

† Ibid. lib. ii. c. 145.

‡ Strabo, lib. iv. c. 5. sec. 3. edit. Siebenkees.

* Livy, lib. xxiv. c. 9. *Quum T. Otacilius ferociter vociferaretur atque obstreperet, Lictores ad eum accedere Consul jussit; et, quia in urbem non inierat, admonuit, cum securibus sibi fasces præferri.*

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

public money, his power seemed far to exceed the level of a citizen of a free Commonwealth. When therefore that atrocious Commission of Three for regulating and settling the affairs of the Republic, was instituted in the persons of Augustus, Antonius, and Lepidus, it was a measure not altogether unprecedented, and certainly analogous to the less absolute but yet very extensive powers which had been often given to special Commissioners under circumstances of less general disorder. And the Imperial power of Augustus was only an enlarged special Commission of the same nature. It was limited in its duration, as it was to expire at the end of ten years; it was conferred by the Senate on the most distinguished citizen in the Commonwealth, for the avowed purpose of remedying the evils which had grown up during a period of unparalleled confusion. That it was in the highest degree arbitrary, was conformable to the general spirit of similar Commissions which had been conferred by the Senate and People in former times; and in this manner the Government was made gradually to slide into a Monarchy, merely by a dexterous application and enlargement of precedents, which had occurred repeatedly through the successive periods of the duration of the Commonwealth.

The People have in every age tolerated a despotic power which has professed to derive itself from their appointment, and to be exercised in their names and for their benefit. Such was the power of the Roman Emperors; which therefore differed most widely in its avowed principle from the Monarchies of Asia, and from those also which have been established on its ruins among the nations of modern Europe. It is true that in the eastern Provinces of the Empire, the people, unacquainted with the forms of the Roman Government, and regarding only the absolute authority with which the Emperors were invested, early began to bestow on them the title of Kings, and to look upon them in the same light as they had been accustomed to view the Successors of Alexander. But in Italy the name of King, or Sovereign Lord, would have seemed a degradation which the Roman People could not endure; and the gross flattery which was offered to the Cæsars, was by no means characteristic of the new state of the Commonwealth, but arose out of those strongly marked distinctions by which the Aristocracy were separated from the bulk of the People. It is plain from many passages in Cicero's letters, that the ordinary language of citizens of humble, or merely of inferior rank, when addressing the Nobility, was in a tone of deference approaching almost to servility. Nay, even men of rank themselves when writing to those who were still above them in power and dignity, used a style of compliment which strikes our ears as offensive; so that it was no sudden influx of servility, but the mere operation of the ordinary feelings of the people, which produced that style of flattery so observable in the writers of the Augustan age, as well as in the decrees of the Senate, and the speeches of its members. In process of time, as the Imperial power became more firmly established, and as the families of the old Aristocracy gradually dropped off, this servile language came to be addressed more exclusively to the Emperors; and as the Government continued to be wielded by a single hand, the People felt more and more that strong distinction between themselves and their Ruler, which marks the relation of Sovereign and subject, as opposed to that of citizens and their chief Magistrate. Hence, in later times, the Roman Government became a Monarchy in the oriental and modern sense of the term, and its laws and titles were transferred with perfect fitness to the Kingdoms of Italy, France, and Germany.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

Augustus possessed a power entirely despotic, by the mere union of the ordinary Magistracies of the Commonwealth in his person, with some few especial enlargements of their privileges and authority. He was invested with Proconsular power in all the Provinces in Italy, and even within the walls of Rome; and his authority in the Provinces was to be paramount to that of the ordinary governors. In the same manner Pompey the Great had received Proconsular power in all the Provinces of the Empire within fifty miles of the sea, when he was intrusted with the command of the war against the Cilician Pirates; and still more recently, when Cicero proposed to confer on C. Cassius the conduct of the war against P. Dolabella, the tenour of his commission allowed him to enter any Province in pursuit of the enemy, and gave him superior power in that Province to the Magistrate by whom it was actually governed. The authority of the Proconsuls in the Provinces was entirely absolute under the old Constitution; as they exercised supreme controul over the military force, over the revenue, and over the criminal and civil jurisdiction; and by extending this power to Italy, and even to Rome itself, a virtual Sovereignty was in fact bestowed. Whatever might be wanting in the Proconsular power, was at all events given in the title of *Imperator*, which was prefixed to the name of Augustus as it had been to that of his uncle, and seems to have been equivalent to the name of "General of the Forces of the Commonwealth." By attaching a perpetual military command to the person of the Emperor, and by allowing him to hold it in Rome as well as in the Provinces, all the people were in effect subjected to martial law; and it is well known that the power exercised by Roman Generals over their soldiers was ever most arbitrary; insomuch that, according to Cicero, "the Roman People in war obeyed their General as a King."* Yet further, in addition to the powers of *Proconsul* and *Imperator*, Augustus enjoyed also all the authority formerly possessed by the Censors. He would not, indeed, take the name of Censor; but he received a title and power similar to that which had been bestowed on his uncle; and which Suetonius calls, "*Morum Legumque reginen*," the controul of the manners and laws of the Commonwealth. With regard to his controul of the laws, it must be understood probably to regard those laws which concerned the objects of the Censor's jurisdiction, such as the Sumptuary Laws, and those which related to marriage. His controul of manners rendered him absolute master of the rank of every citizen; as it enabled him to choose members into the Senate, and to degrade them; to raise any plebeian to the Equestrian Order, or again to deprive him even of the political privileges of a simple citizen.† There was hardly any point of

Extent of the Imperial power

* *Noster Populus * * in bello sic paret ut Regi.* Cicero, *de Republicâ*, lib. i. c. 40.

† The "*Ærarii*," or persons expelled by the Censors from their Tribes, lost their right of voting in the *Comitia*, because it could only be exercised by those who belonged to some one of

Biography. From U. C. 723. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

private life which did not fall under the Censor's cognizance. Not only might a man be questioned for any intemperance in eating and drinking; or for any scandalous irregularities of conduct; but any excessive sumptuousness in his establishment, and even, it is said, any neglect of his property, such as omitting to cultivate or improve his land,* subjected him often to the loss of the most distinguished rights of citizenship. For this reason, according to tradition, the duration of the Censor's power had been reduced from five years to eighteen months;† as so great an authority could not be safely intrusted to any one for more than a very limited period; and now that it was conferred on Augustus for life, it was by no means one of the least of his Imperial prerogatives. To the powers of Proconsul, Imperator, and Censor, was added, moreover, that of Tribune. By this Augustus was not only enabled to stop at once, by his negative, any measure of the Senate or People which he disapproved, but his person was rendered sacred; and any violation of its sacredness, either in word or deed, exposed the offender to a complete religious and political excommunication, in which state he was devoted to some particular God,‡ as if peculiarly marked out for his vengeance, and might be killed by any man with impunity. Last of all must be mentioned the exemption from the authority of the laws, which Dion Cassius tells us was bestowed on the Emperors.§ According to his account, Augustus was rendered absolutely despotic, inasmuch as he might dispense with any part of the code at his pleasure; and this prerogative he instances as one of those few which were not borrowed from the usages of the old Constitution. But it has been reasonably supposed, that the Latin expression "*Legibus solutus*," which was applied to persons enjoying a dispensation from some particular laws, combined with the real exemption from all the laws which was possessed by the later Emperors, has misled Dion Cassius; and that the exemption was, in fact, less comprehensive than he imagined. A dispensing power had been long exercised by the Senate; and we find that it was one of the measures of the patriotic Tribune, C. Cornelius,‖ in the year of Rome 686, to remove the abuses with which it was attended; and to enact that no dispensation should pass the Senate, or, according to the legal phrase, "that no one should be released from the laws, *Legibus solveretur*," unless two hundred Senators were present. Still later in the year 709, M. Brutus had been dispensed by the Senate from continually residing in Rome during his Prætorship, as required by law; and he is accordingly said by Cicero to have been "*Legibus solutus*."¶ We may conclude that the same exemption, from a compliance with the injunctions of many of the old laws, was also granted to Augustus; and, indeed, if the fragments of what is called the *Lex Regia* are to be considered as genuine and authentic, it is evident that the exemption was not universal.*

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

It becomes here a natural question to ask, whether the right of appeal to the People was not altogether extinct; and how the provisions of the Porcian Law were evaded, which made it highly criminal to scourge or put to death any Roman citizen? With regard to the first, we will endeavour to give the reader some notion of its nature, and of the cases in which it was allowed. In the earliest times it was no more than a part of the wild habits of savage life; where government being ill understood, and therefore apt to be rudely exercised, each man might appeal from the authority of the Chief to that of the society at large; the power of capital punishment, as distinguished from the taking away life in a quarrel or in anger, being one of the rights which the community did not choose to intrust out of their own hands. The Appeal to the People was the first simple form in which a man was tried by his Country; and before the establishment of independent Judges, it was the only security against the arbitrary sentence of the Magistrate. But as such an appeal could not be made on every occasion, the People deputed their power to Judges specially appointed by themselves,† (as in the case of the *Questores Parricidii*,) or chosen at the beginning of every year by the Prætors out of a whole Order of citizens, sometimes out of the Senate alone, and sometimes from the Senate, the Equites, and the richer Plebeians, according to the various enactments successively made on this subject. When an independent judicial power was established, the right of Appeal to the People at large could only be needless or mischievous, and therefore it gradually fell into disuse; nay, we doubt whether there was legally any appeal from the sentence of the select Judges who sat with the Prætor in criminal causes; for Cicero attacks Antonius for proposing a law by which criminals condemned for rioting or treason by the ordinary Tribunals were allowed to appeal to the People;‡ and he complains that such an appeal was equivalent to the total subversion of all justice. Nor do we remember any instance in the later times of the Commonwealth of a trial removed by appeal from the regular Courts to the popular Assembly, except in the case of C. Rabirius, U. C. 690: and Rabirius appealed not from the decision of the Prætor and the select Judges, but from that of two special Commissioners, appointed by the Prætor instead of the People, contrary to the usual practice, to try the case by themselves. The right of appeal was thus become obsolete, if it were not actually done away; but at any rate it was rendered useless by the military power which the title of *Imperator* conferred on Augustus. It was an old maxim of the Roman law, that from the sentence of a General in the actual service there was no appeal;§

Right of Appeal to the People.

the thirty-five Tribes. Their private rights, and personal liberties were not at all affected by their degradation. See Niebuhr's *Romische Geschichte*, vol. i. p. 384, &c. and vol. ii. p. 179.

* Aulus Gellius, lib. iv. c. 12.

† Livy, lib. iv.

‡ Festus, *in Vocibus* "*Sacer*," *et* "*Sacratæ Leges*."

§ Lib. liii. p. 509.

‖ Asconius, *Argumentum in Ciceronis Orationem pro C. Cornelio primam.*

¶ Cicero, *Philippic.* ii. c. 13.

* *Utique quibus legibus, plebeive scitis scriptum fuit ne Divus Augustus, * * * teneretur, iis, &c. Imperator Cæsar Vespasianus solutus sit. Apud* Heineccium, *Antiq. Roman. Syntagma*, lib. i. tit. 2. c. 67. edit. Haubold.

† Pomponius, *de Orig. Juris*, quoted by Creuzer, *Romische Antiquitaten*, p. 165, and Heineccius, lib. iv. tit. 18. c. 11. edit. Haubold. See also the expression of Cicero, *de Legibus*, lib. iii. c. 12. *Magistratibus judicia dantur, ut esset Populi potestas, ad quam provocaretur.*

‡ *Philippic.* i. c. 9. *Altera promulgata Lex est, ut et de Vi et de Majestate damnati ad Populum provocent, si velint.*

§ Cicero, *de Legibus*, lib. iii. c. 3, 4. *Militiæ, ab eo, qui imperabit, provocatio ne esto; quodque is, qui bellum geret, im-*

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

and in this consisted the plenitude of his power, for even if he might be questioned afterwards for an abuse of it, yet at the time there was nothing to check or limit it, and there is a wide difference between present protection, and contingent future redress. As Augustus, therefore, was invested with military power both within and without the city, the right of appeal from his authority became extinct of course. Still, however, Roman citizens in the Provinces, when not actually serving in the army, might appeal to Rome from the sentence of a provincial Governor; but Augustus himself, if we may believe Dion Cassius,* was constituted Judge of all such appeals; and we know, from a much higher authority,† that in the reign of Claudius they were regularly made to the Emperor, without any allusion to the old constitutional power of the people.

Of the Porcian Laws, and the nature of capital punishments under Augustus.

A remarkable obscurity hangs over the origin of the Porcian Laws; for it is not known with certainty by whom they were proposed, nor at what period they were enacted. It appears from Cicero that they were three in number, brought forward by three different members of the Porcian family;‡ but whether of the family of Porcius Læca, or Porcius Cato, is still undecided. However, it is sufficiently known that these laws confirmed the right of appeal to the people, and forbade, under heavy penalties, that any Roman citizen should be scourged or put to death, of whatever crime he might have been guilty, if we except, perhaps, the wilful murder of a parent.§ Thus the greatest punishment that could be legally inflicted at Rome, was simple banishment, till Cæsar, in his Dictatorship, added the forfeiture of all property in the case of those convicted of wilful murder, and of the half of it for all other offences.|| Nay, even the punishment denounced by the Pedian law, passed U. C. 710, against the assassins of Cæsar, was no more than banishment from Italy; so completely were Roman citizens exempted by law from suffering the penalty of death. It is generally thought, however, that the provisions of the Porcian law did not extend to citizens actually serving in the army; but this must be understood with considerable limitations. The old ignominious method of punishment, by which criminals were first scourged with rods, and then beheaded with an axe, (*Virgis cæsi et securi percussi,*) could never be inflicted upon a Roman citizen under any circumstances. This is plain from the fact mentioned by Sallust,¶ that Q. Metellus Numidicus, in the Jugurthine war, punished one of his officers in this manner, because, adds the historian, the offender was a Latin citizen. That is, he could not have so punished him, had he been a Roman. We believe further, that a Roman soldier could not even be flogged on actual service; and we are inclined to think that this was one of the provisions of the Sempronian Law, *De Militum Commodis,* carried by C. Gracchus in his Tribuneship; for we are told by Plutarch,* that M. Livius Drusus, one of his colleagues in order to outdo him in proposing popular measures, brought forward a law to exempt the Latins from the liability to be flogged when serving as soldiers; and although the passage in Sallust, already quoted, shows either that this law was soon after repealed, or that Plutarch, as we rather believe, has assigned to it a wrong date, and ascribed it to a wrong author; yet its being proposed at all clearly proves that the Roman soldiers already enjoyed a similar exemption, as no one would ever have thought of granting to the Latins immunities which were not possessed by the Romans themselves. Nor is our position refuted by the instances recorded in later times, of soldiers suffering death by running the gauntlet;† (*fuste cæsi,*) for this was a punishment inflicted not by the General's Lictors, but by the hands of the soldiers themselves, and was expressive of the feelings of the army at large towards those who were guilty of cowardice, or of any other flagrant breach of military duty. In cases of mutiny, or any other crime which required an instant and terrifying example, a General would have ordered the offenders to be executed; there being no appeal at the time from his sentence, and if ever he was afterwards questioned for his conduct, he would have urged the plea of necessity or public expediency, which was ever admitted as an excuse for any departure from the ordinary laws. And thus only can we reconcile the extreme bloodiness of the Proscriptions and occasional executions of the Romans, with the excessive mildness, or rather weakness, of the letter of the Constitution. When soon after Cæsar's death a disorderly multitude used to assemble round his altar in the Forum, and committed several outrages on the property of different citizens, P. Dolabella, who was then Consul, attacked the rioters in a summary manner, and put numbers of them to death without any sort of trial, crucifying the slaves, and throwing the free citizens from the Tarpeian rock. This behaviour was applauded by Cicero as an act of salutary vigour;‡ yet had the meanest of the citizens thus executed been brought to a legal trial under the severest of the existing statutes for the punishment of riots, he could have received no heavier sentence than that of exile.

A system like this, in which the laws were so frequently superseded by acts of summary violence, was admirably calculated to serve the purposes of despotism. The Porcian Laws existed unrepealed, but equally unregarded whenever it suited the interest of the Sovereign to violate them. How, indeed, could they be more signally violated by the Emperors than they had been in innumerable instances under the old Constitution; not only in the Proscriptions, but in the suppression of less alarming disorders, in the executions ordered by the Senate after the deaths of the two Gracchi, in the punishment of the accomplices of Catiline, and in the severity which we have just noticed of P. Dolabella! So much respect was shown to the forms of the Constitution, while its spirit was violated, that in the infliction of the punishment of death some

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

perassit, jus ratumque esto. Although these words are a part of the code devised by Cicero for his Utopian Commonwealth; yet this code is confessedly borrowed almost entirely from that which actually existed at Rome.—*Omnium Magistratuum descriptio; sed ea pœne nostræ civitatis,* c. 5.

* Lib. li. p. 457.

† *Acts of the Apostles,* ch. xxv. ver. 10, 11.

‡ *De Republicâ,* lib. ii. c. 31.

§ See Cicero, *pro Roscio Amerino,* c. 25.

|| Suetonius, *in Cæsare,* c. 42.

¶ *De Bello Jugurthino,* c. 69.

* *In C. Graccho,* c. 9.

† *Auctor de Bell. Hispaniensi apud Cæsaris Commentar.* c. 27. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 103.

‡ *Philippic.* i. c. 12. *Epist. ad Atticum,* lib. xiv. epist. xv. xvi. xvii.

pains were taken to deprive it of the appearance of an execution, and to give it the character of an irregular but necessary act of policy or vengeance; a sort of capital Ostracism, in which the sufferer was treated more as an enemy than a criminal, and his life was taken without any accompanying circumstances of degradation. Hence a party of soldiers were so often employed as the ministers of death, instead of a regular executioner; and the sword instead of the axe was the weapon used; a distinction which continued to exist to a much later period; insomuch that when beheading by the sword was recognized as a legal punishment, still beheading by the axe was looked upon as degrading and illegal.* Hence the sufferers were so often allowed to choose their own mode of death, and were constantly permitted to be their own executioners. For all these acts, committed by the Sovereign power on the alleged ground of public expediency, the practice of the old Constitution furnished precedent and apology; and the Porcian Law still availed to save Roman citizens from the rods and axe of the Lictor, from those cruel and ignominious scourgings which were inflicted so often by the Roman Magistrates in the Provinces,† sometimes as a punishment, and at other times as an instrument of torture to extort a confession from a prisoner before his trial. In process of time, as was natural, the infliction of capital punishment grew to be considered as legal and regular; it began to assume the character of an execution; and as the Government became more decidedly Monarchical, the cruel and degrading punishments, so congenial to tyranny, were ingrafted upon the law of the Empire. But, for the period with which we are now engaged, it is important to observe how an excessive mildness in the laws defeats its own object, no less than excessive severity. Because the Roman Constitution provided no adequate legal punishment for enormous crimes, men became reconciled to irregular inflictions of vengeance on the plea of necessity; and thus exemplified the danger of looking with indifference upon any departure from the written law, when necessity was as easily pleaded by their tyrants for the murder of Cicero, as for those of Saturninus, Cethegus, or Lentulus.

Amongst the prerogatives possessed by Augustus, Dion Cassius mentions the right of making war or peace with whatever nation he thought proper.‡ This arose out of the Proconsular power which had been conferred on him, and from the immediate command which he exercised in all the frontier Provinces of the Empire. Wherever the dominions of the Commonwealth came in contact with any foreign nations, there the whole civil and military authority belonged to Augustus as Proconsul; and if he possessed the power of making war or peace with the people who bordered upon his Provinces, it was no more than had been commonly practised by the Proconsuls of former times; nor could Augustus act with a less restrained discretion than his uncle had done in Gaul during the whole term of his command there, or than Crassus had exercised in his government of Syria, when he commenced his unprovoked attack upon the Parthian Empire.

It is further stated by Dion Cassius, that Augustus was the absolute master of the revenue, and that he was enabled to levy money for the public service by his sole authority. And here, perhaps, we may fitly lay before the reader some notice of the pecuniary resources of the Roman Empire; of the taxes paid by the people; and of the general administration of the Treasury. In doing this, we shall frequently go back to the history of an earlier period; but the calm of the reign of Augustus allows us to turn our attention to many points connected with the internal state of Rome, which we have passed over amidst the press of wars and internal disturbances, through which our narrative has hitherto had to struggle. Once for all, however, we must remind the reader of the extreme difficulty of this part of our task, and request his indulgence for the faults or omissions which we fear he will not fail to discover. We must draw our facts from scattered and scanty sources; and it may often happen that some passage has escaped our notice, which, had we known it, might have taught us to qualify or to amend much that we had advanced. We have said this, indeed, nearly in the same words on a former occasion; but we deem it not superfluous to repeat it again, not only to disclaim for ourselves pretensions to a more perfect knowledge than we possess, but to impress upon the reader the unsatisfactory nature of many of those disquisitions in which historians, endowed with more eloquence than industry, have permitted themselves to indulge. As the lessons of history are the most valuable part of that wisdom which concerns our earthly welfare, so it is most important that they should not be rashly offered, but that they may be at once so full and so uncorrupted, as to furnish us with a trust-worthy guide. And he who feels the deficiencies of his own performance may at least render some service to his readers, if he shows them how far they may safely rely on him, and does not attempt to mislead them by assuming that tone of self-satisfied confidence which will always impose upon the mass of mankind, however much the wiser few may detect and despise it.

Of the Roman revenue.

The revenue of the Roman people before their dominion embraced so many dependent Provinces, arose chiefly out of three sources: 1st, a Property Tax (*Tributum*) levied directly upon every citizen, and proportioned to the amount of the property which he possessed;* 2dly, the Rents or Payments of whatever kind which were received from the National Domains; using this last term in its most extensive sense, as including not only lands in cultivation, whether arable or pasture, but also forests, mines, and buildings; 3dly, the Customs, including the duties levied at the different ports on all imported goods, and the tolls paid at all public Ferries. Of these three, the Property Tax, or *Tributum*, is said to have been discontinued after the conquest of Macedon by L. Æmilius Paulus, in the year of Rome 584;† that is, the revenue which the State received thenceforward from its conquered Provinces, enabled it to relieve its own

* Heineccius, *Antiquitat. Roman. Syntagma*, lib. iv. tit. 18. c. 10. edit. Haubold.

† *St. Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 26. *Acts of the Apostles*, ch. xxii. ver. 24. 29.

‡ Lib. liii. p. 508.

* Livy, lib. i. c. 43.

† Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. ii. c. 22.

and in this consisted the plenitude of his power, for even if he might be questioned afterwards for an abuse of it, yet at the time there was nothing to check or limit it, and there is a wide difference between present protection, and contingent future redress. As Augustus, therefore, was invested with military power both within and without the city, the right of appeal from his authority became extinct of course. Still, however, Roman citizens in the Provinces, when not actually serving in the army, might appeal to Rome from the sentence of a provincial Governor; but Augustus himself, if we may believe Dion Cassius,* was constituted Judge of all such appeals; and we know, from a much higher authority,† that in the reign of Claudius they were regularly made to the Emperor, without any allusion to the old constitutional power of the people.

Of the Porcian Laws, and the nature of capital punishments under Augustus.

A remarkable obscurity hangs over the origin of the Porcian Laws; for it is not known with certainty by whom they were proposed, nor at what period they were enacted. It appears from Cicero that they were three in number, brought forward by three different members of the Porcian family;‡ but whether of the family of Porcius Læca, or Porcius Cato, is still undecided. However, it is sufficiently known that these laws confirmed the right of appeal to the people, and forbade, under heavy penalties, that any Roman citizen should be scourged or put to death, of whatever crime he might have been guilty, if we except, perhaps, the wilful murder of a parent.§ Thus the greatest punishment that could be legally inflicted at Rome, was simple banishment, till Cæsar, in his Dictatorship, added the forfeiture of all property in the case of those convicted of wilful murder, and of the half of it for all other offences.‖ Nay, even the punishment denounced by the Pedian law, passed U. C. 710, against the assassins of Cæsar, was no more than banishment from Italy; so completely were Roman citizens exempted by law from suffering the penalty of death. It is generally thought, however, that the provisions of the Porcian law did not extend to citizens actually serving in the army; but this must be understood with considerable limitations. The old ignominious method of punishment, by which criminals were first scourged with rods, and then beheaded with an axe, (*Virgis cæsi et securi percussi,*) could never be inflicted upon a Roman citizen under any circumstances. This is plain from the fact mentioned by Sallust,¶ that Q. Metellus Numidicus, in the Jugurthine war, punished one of his officers in this manner, because, adds the historian, the offender was a Latin citizen. That is, he could not have so punished him, had he been a Roman. We believe further, that a Roman soldier could not even be flogged on actual service; and we are inclined to think that this was one of the provisions of the Sempronian Law, *De Militum Commodis,* carried by C. Gracchus in his Tribuneship; for we are told by Plutarch,* that M. Livius Drusus, one of his colleagues in order to outdo him in proposing popular measures, brought forward a law to exempt the Latins from the liability to be flogged when serving as soldiers; and although the passage in Sallust, already quoted, shows either that this law was soon after repealed, or that Plutarch, as we rather believe, has assigned to it a wrong date, and ascribed it to a wrong author; yet its being proposed at all clearly proves that the Roman soldiers already enjoyed a similar exemption, as no one would ever have thought of granting to the Latins immunities which were not possessed by the Romans themselves. Nor is our position refuted by the instances recorded in later times, of soldiers suffering death by running the gauntlet;† (*fuste cæsi,*) for this was a punishment inflicted not by the General's Lictors, but by the hands of the soldiers themselves, and was expressive of the feelings of the army at large towards those who were guilty of cowardice, or of any other flagrant breach of military duty. In cases of mutiny, or any other crime which required an instant and terrifying example, a General would have ordered the offenders to be executed; there being no appeal at the time from his sentence, and if ever he was afterwards questioned for his conduct, he would have urged the plea of necessity or public expediency, which was ever admitted as an excuse for any departure from the ordinary laws. And thus only can we reconcile the extreme bloodiness of the Proscriptions and occasional executions of the Romans, with the excessive mildness, or rather weakness, of the letter of the Constitution. When soon after Cæsar's death a disorderly multitude used to assemble round his altar in the Forum, and committed several outrages on the property of different citizens, P. Dolabella, who was then Consul, attacked the rioters in a summary manner, and put numbers of them to death without any sort of trial, crucifying the slaves, and throwing the free citizens from the Tarpeian rock. This behaviour was applauded by Cicero as an act of salutary vigour;‡ yet had the meanest of the citizens thus executed been brought to a legal trial under the severest of the existing statutes for the punishment of riots, he could have received no heavier sentence than that of exile.

A system like this, in which the laws were so frequently superseded by acts of summary violence, was admirably calculated to serve the purposes of despotism. The Porcian Laws existed unrepealed, but equally unregarded whenever it suited the interest of the Sovereign to violate them. How, indeed, could they be more signally violated by the Emperors than they had been in innumerable instances under the old Constitution; not only in the Proscriptions, but in the suppression of less alarming disorders, in the executions ordered by the Senate after the deaths of the two Gracchi, in the punishment of the accomplices of Catiline, and in the severity which we have just noticed of P. Dolabella! So much respect was shown to the forms of the Constitution, while its spirit was violated, that in the infliction of the punishment of death some

perassit, jus ratumque esto. Although these words are a part of the code devised by Cicero for his Utopian Commonwealth; yet this code is confessedly borrowed almost entirely from that which actually existed at Rome.—*Omnium Magistratuum descriptio; sed ea pæne nostræ civitatis,* c. 5.

* Lib. li. p. 457.

† *Acts of the Apostles,* ch. xxv. ver. 10, 11.

‡ *De Republicâ,* lib. ii. c. 31.

§ See Cicero, *pro Roscio Amerino,* c. 25.

‖ Suetonius, *in Cæsare,* c. 42.

¶ *De Bello Jugurthino,* c. 69.

* *In C. Graccho,* c. 9.

† *Auctor de Bell. Hispaniensi apud Cæsaris Commentar.* c. 27. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 103.

‡ *Philippic.* i. c. 12. *Epist. ad Atticum,* lib. xiv. epist. xv. xvi. xvii.

pains were taken to deprive it of the appearance of an execution, and to give it the character of an irregular but necessary act of policy or vengeance; a sort of capital Ostracism, in which the sufferer was treated more as an enemy than a criminal, and his life was taken without any accompanying circumstances of degradation. Hence a party of soldiers were so often employed as the ministers of death, instead of a regular executioner; and the sword instead of the axe was the weapon used; a distinction which continued to exist to a much later period; insomuch that when beheading by the sword was recognized as a legal punishment, still beheading by the axe was looked upon as degrading and illegal.* Hence the sufferers were so often allowed to choose their own mode of death, and were constantly permitted to be their own executioners. For all these acts, committed by the Sovereign power on the alleged ground of public expediency, the practice of the old Constitution furnished precedent and apology; and the Porcian Law still availed to save Roman citizens from the rods and axe of the Lictor, from those cruel and ignominious scourgings which were inflicted so often by the Roman Magistrates in the Provinces,† sometimes as a punishment, and at other times as an instrument of torture to extort a confession from a prisoner before his trial. In process of time, as was natural, the infliction of capital punishment grew to be considered as legal and regular; it began to assume the character of an execution; and as the Government became more decidedly Monarchical, the cruel and degrading punishments, so congenial to tyranny, were ingrafted upon the law of the Empire. But, for the period with which we are now engaged, it is important to observe how an excessive mildness in the laws defeats its own object, no less than excessive severity. Because the Roman Constitution provided no adequate legal punishment for enormous crimes, men became reconciled to irregular inflictions of vengeance on the plea of necessity; and thus exemplified the danger of looking with indifference upon any departure from the written law, when necessity was as easily pleaded by their tyrants for the murder of Cicero, as for those of Saturninus, Cethegus, or Lentulus.

Amongst the prerogatives possessed by Augustus, Dion Cassius mentions the right of making war or peace with whatever nation he thought proper.‡ This arose out of the Proconsular power which had been conferred on him, and from the immediate command which he exercised in all the frontier Provinces of the Empire. Wherever the dominions of the Commonwealth came in contact with any foreign nations, there the whole civil and military authority belonged to Augustus as Proconsul; and if he possessed the power of making war or peace with the people who bordered upon his Provinces, it was no more than had been commonly practised by the Proconsuls of former times; nor could Augustus act with a less restrained discretion than his uncle had done in Gaul during the whole term of his command there, or than Crassus had exercised in his government of Syria, when he commenced his unprovoked attack upon the Parthian Empire.

It is further stated by Dion Cassius, that Augustus was the absolute master of the revenue, and that he was enabled to levy money for the public service by his sole authority. And here, perhaps, we may fitly lay before the reader some notice of the pecuniary resources of the Roman Empire; of the taxes paid by the people; and of the general administration of the Treasury. In doing this, we shall frequently go back to the history of an earlier period; but the calm of the reign of Augustus allows us to turn our attention to many points connected with the internal state of Rome, which we have passed over amidst the press of wars and internal disturbances, through which our narrative has hitherto had to struggle. Once for all, however, we must remind the reader of the extreme difficulty of this part of our task, and request his indulgence for the faults or omissions which we fear he will not fail to discover. We must draw our facts from scattered and scanty sources; and it may often happen that some passage has escaped our notice, which, had we known it, might have taught us to qualify or to amend much that we had advanced. We have said this, indeed, nearly in the same words on a former occasion; but we deem it not superfluous to repeat it again, not only to disclaim for ourselves pretensions to a more perfect knowledge than we possess, but to impress upon the reader the unsatisfactory nature of many of those disquisitions in which historians, endowed with more eloquence than industry, have permitted themselves to indulge. As the lessons of history are the most valuable part of that wisdom which concerns our earthly welfare, so it is most important that they should not be rashly offered, but that they may be at once so full and so uncorrupted, as to furnish us with a trust-worthy guide. And he who feels the deficiencies of his own performance may at least render some service to his readers, if he shows them how far they may safely rely on him, and does not attempt to mislead them by assuming that tone of self-satisfied confidence which will always impose upon the mass of mankind, however much the wiser few may detect and despise it.

Of the Roman revenue.

The revenue of the Roman people before their dominion embraced so many dependent Provinces, arose chiefly out of three sources: 1st, a Property Tax (*Tributum*) levied directly upon every citizen, and proportioned to the amount of the property which he possessed;* 2dly, the Rents or Payments of whatever kind which were received from the National Domains; using this last term in its most extensive sense, as including not only lands in cultivation, whether arable or pasture, but also forests, mines, and buildings; 3dly, the Customs, including the duties levied at the different ports on all imported goods, and the tolls paid at all public Ferries. Of these three, the Property Tax, or *Tributum*, is said to have been discontinued after the conquest of Macedon by L. Æmilius Paulus, in the year of Rome 584;† that is, the revenue which the State received thenceforward from its conquered Provinces, enabled it to relieve its own

* Heineccius, *Antiquitat. Roman. Syntagma*, lib. iv. tit. 18. c. 10. edit. Haubold.

† *St. Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 26. *Acts of the Apostles*, ch. xxii. ver. 24. 29.

‡ Lib. liii. p. 508.

* Livy, lib. i. c. 43.

† Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. ii. c. 22.

and in this consisted the plenitude of his power, for even if he might be questioned afterwards for an abuse of it, yet at the time there was nothing to check or limit it, and there is a wide difference between present protection, and contingent future redress. As Augustus, therefore, was invested with military power both within and without the city, the right of appeal from his authority became extinct of course. Still, however, Roman citizens in the Provinces, when not actually serving in the army, might appeal to Rome from the sentence of a provincial Governor; but Augustus himself, if we may believe Dion Cassius,* was constituted Judge of all such appeals; and we know, from a much higher authority,† that in the reign of Claudius they were regularly made to the Emperor, without any allusion to the old constitutional power of the people.

Of the Porcian Laws, and the nature of capital punishments under Augustus.

A remarkable obscurity hangs over the origin of the Porcian Laws; for it is not known with certainty by whom they were proposed, nor at what period they were enacted. It appears from Cicero that they were three in number, brought forward by three different members of the Porcian family;‡ but whether of the family of Porcius Læca, or Porcius Cato, is still undecided. However, it is sufficiently known that these laws confirmed the right of appeal to the people, and forbade, under heavy penalties, that any Roman citizen should be scourged or put to death, of whatever crime he might have been guilty, if we except, perhaps, the wilful murder of a parent.§ Thus the greatest punishment that could be legally inflicted at Rome, was simple banishment, till Cæsar, in his Dictatorship, added the forfeiture of all property in the case of those convicted of wilful murder, and of the half of it for all other offences.‖ Nay, even the punishment denounced by the Pedian law, passed U. C. 710, against the assassins of Cæsar, was no more than banishment from Italy; so completely were Roman citizens exempted by law from suffering the penalty of death. It is generally thought, however, that the provisions of the Porcian law did not extend to citizens actually serving in the army; but this must be understood with considerable limitations. The old ignominious method of punishment, by which criminals were first scourged with rods, and then beheaded with an axe, (*Virgis cæsi et securi percussi,*) could never be inflicted upon a Roman citizen under any circumstances. This is plain from the fact mentioned by Sallust,¶ that Q. Metellus Numidicus, in the Jugurthine war, punished one of his officers in this manner, because, adds the historian, the offender was a Latin citizen. That is, he could not have so punished him, had he been a Roman. We believe further, that a Roman soldier could not even be flogged on actual service; and we are inclined to think that this was one of the provisions of the Sempronian Law, *De Militum Commodis,* carried by C. Gracchus in his Tribuneship; for we are told by Plutarch,* that M. Livius Drusus, one of his colleagues in order to outdo him in proposing popular measures, brought forward a law to exempt the Latins from the liability to be flogged when serving as soldiers; and although the passage in Sallust, already quoted, shows either that this law was soon after repealed, or that Plutarch, as we rather believe, has assigned to it a wrong date, and ascribed it to a wrong author; yet its being proposed at all clearly proves that the Roman soldiers already enjoyed a similar exemption, as no one would ever have thought of granting to the Latins immunities which were not possessed by the Romans themselves. Nor is our position refuted by the instances recorded in later times, of soldiers suffering death by running the gauntlet;† (*fuste cæsi,*) for this was a punishment inflicted not by the General's Lictors, but by the hands of the soldiers themselves, and was expressive of the feelings of the army at large towards those who were guilty of cowardice, or of any other flagrant breach of military duty. In cases of mutiny, or any other crime which required an instant and terrifying example, a General would have ordered the offenders to be executed; there being no appeal at the time from his sentence, and if ever he was afterwards questioned for his conduct, he would have urged the plea of necessity or public expediency, which was ever admitted as an excuse for any departure from the ordinary laws. And thus only can we reconcile the extreme bloodiness of the Proscriptions and occasional executions of the Romans, with the excessive mildness, or rather weakness, of the letter of the Constitution. When soon after Cæsar's death a disorderly multitude used to assemble round his altar in the Forum, and committed several outrages on the property of different citizens, P. Dolabella, who was then Consul, attacked the rioters in a summary manner, and put numbers of them to death without any sort of trial, crucifying the slaves, and throwing the free citizens from the Tarpeian rock. This behaviour was applauded by Cicero as an act of salutary vigour;‡ yet had the meanest of the citizens thus executed been brought to a legal trial under the severest of the existing statutes for the punishment of riots, he could have received no heavier sentence than that of exile.

A system like this, in which the laws were so frequently superseded by acts of summary violence, was admirably calculated to serve the purposes of despotism. The Porcian Laws existed unrepealed, but equally unregarded whenever it suited the interest of the Sovereign to violate them. How, indeed, could they be more signally violated by the Emperors than they had been in innumerable instances under the old Constitution; not only in the Proscriptions, but in the suppression of less alarming disorders, in the executions ordered by the Senate after the deaths of the two Gracchi, in the punishment of the accomplices of Catiline, and in the severity which we have just noticed of P. Dolabella! So much respect was shown to the forms of the Constitution, while its spirit was violated, that in the infliction of the punishment of death some

perassit, jus ratumque esto. Although these words are a part of the code devised by Cicero for his Utopian Commonwealth; yet this code is confessedly borrowed almost entirely from that which actually existed at Rome.—*Omnium Magistratuum descriptio; sed ea pæne nostræ civitatis,* c. 5.

* Lib. li. p. 457.

† *Acts of the Apostles,* ch. xxv. ver. 10, 11.

‡ *De Republicâ,* lib. ii. c. 31.

§ See Cicero, *pro Roscio Amerino,* c. 25.

‖ Suetonius, *in Cæsare,* c. 42.

¶ *De Bello Jugurthino,* c. 69.

* *In C. Graccho,* c. 9.

† *Auctor de Bell. Hispaniensi apud Cæsaris Commentar.* c. 27. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 103.

‡ *Philippic.* i. c. 12. *Epist. ad Atticum,* lib. xiv. epist. xv. xvi. xvii.

pains were taken to deprive it of the appearance of an execution, and to give it the character of an irregular but necessary act of policy or vengeance; a sort of capital Ostracism, in which the sufferer was treated more as an enemy than a criminal, and his life was taken without any accompanying circumstances of degradation. Hence a party of soldiers were so often employed as the ministers of death, instead of a regular executioner; and the sword instead of the axe was the weapon used; a distinction which continued to exist to a much later period; insomuch that when beheading by the sword was recognized as a legal punishment, still beheading by the axe was looked upon as degrading and illegal.* Hence the sufferers were so often allowed to choose their own mode of death, and were constantly permitted to be their own executioners. For all these acts, committed by the Sovereign power on the alleged ground of public expediency, the practice of the old Constitution furnished precedent and apology; and the Porcian Law still availed to save Roman citizens from the rods and axe of the Lictor, from those cruel and ignominious scourgings which were inflicted so often by the Roman Magistrates in the Provinces,† sometimes as a punishment, and at other times as an instrument of torture to extort a confession from a prisoner before his trial. In process of time, as was natural, the infliction of capital punishment grew to be considered as legal and regular; it began to assume the character of an execution; and as the Government became more decidedly Monarchical, the cruel and degrading punishments, so congenial to tyranny, were ingrafted upon the law of the Empire. But, for the period with which we are now engaged, it is important to observe how an excessive mildness in the laws defeats its own object, no less than excessive severity. Because the Roman Constitution provided no adequate legal punishment for enormous crimes, men became reconciled to irregular inflictions of vengeance on the plea of necessity; and thus exemplified the danger of looking with indifference upon any departure from the written law, when necessity was as easily pleaded by their tyrants for the murder of Cicero, as for those of Saturninus, Cethegus, or Lentulus.

Imperial prerogatives of war and peace.

Amongst the prerogatives possessed by Augustus, Dion Cassius mentions the right of making war or peace with whatever nation he thought proper.‡ This arose out of the Proconsular power which had been conferred on him, and from the immediate command which he exercised in all the frontier Provinces of the Empire. Wherever the dominions of the Commonwealth came in contact with any foreign nations, there the whole civil and military authority belonged to Augustus as Proconsul; and if he possessed the power of making war or peace with the people who bordered upon his Provinces, it was no more than had been commonly practised by the Proconsuls of former times; nor could Augustus act with a less restrained discretion than his uncle had done in Gaul during the whole term of his command there, or than Crassus had exercised in his government of Syria, when he commenced his unprovoked attack upon the Parthian Empire.

It is further stated by Dion Cassius, that Augustus was the absolute master of the revenue, and that he was enabled to levy money for the public service by his sole authority. And here, perhaps, we may fitly lay before the reader some notice of the pecuniary resources of the Roman Empire; of the taxes paid by the people; and of the general administration of the Treasury. In doing this, we shall frequently go back to the history of an earlier period; but the calm of the reign of Augustus allows us to turn our attention to many points connected with the internal state of Rome, which we have passed over amidst the press of wars and internal disturbances, through which our narrative has hitherto had to struggle. Once for all, however, we must remind the reader of the extreme difficulty of this part of our task, and request his indulgence for the faults or omissions which we fear he will not fail to discover. We must draw our facts from scattered and scanty sources; and it may often happen that some passage has escaped our notice, which, had we known it, might have taught us to qualify or to amend much that we had advanced. We have said this, indeed, nearly in the same words on a former occasion; but we deem it not superfluous to repeat it again, not only to disclaim for ourselves pretensions to a more perfect knowledge than we possess, but to impress upon the reader the unsatisfactory nature of many of those disquisitions in which historians, endowed with more eloquence than industry, have permitted themselves to indulge. As the lessons of history are the most valuable part of that wisdom which concerns our earthly welfare, so it is most important that they should not be rashly offered, but that they may be at once so full and so uncorrupted, as to furnish us with a trust-worthy guide. And he who feels the deficiencies of his own performance may at least render some service to his readers, if he shows them how far they may safely rely on him, and does not attempt to mislead them by assuming that tone of self-satisfied confidence which will always impose upon the mass of mankind, however much the wiser few may detect and despise it.

Of the Roman revenue.

The revenue of the Roman people before their dominion embraced so many dependent Provinces, arose chiefly out of three sources: 1st, a Property Tax (*Tributum*) levied directly upon every citizen, and proportioned to the amount of the property which he possessed;* 2dly, the Rents or Payments of whatever kind which were received from the National Domains; using this last term in its most extensive sense, as including not only lands in cultivation, whether arable or pasture, but also forests, mines, and buildings; 3dly, the Customs, including the duties levied at the different ports on all imported goods, and the tolls paid at all public Ferries. Of these three, the Property Tax, or *Tributum*, is said to have been discontinued after the conquest of Macedon by L. Æmilius Paulus, in the year of Rome 584;† that is, the revenue which the State received thenceforward from its conquered Provinces, enabled it to relieve its own

* Heineccius, *Antiquitat. Roman. Syntagma*, lib. iv. tit. 18. c. 10. edit. Haubold.

† *St. Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 26. *Acts of the Apostles*, ch. xxii. ver. 24. 29.

‡ Lib. liii. p. 508.

* Livy, lib. i. c. 43.

† Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. ii. c. 22.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

citizens from that species of impost which is ever most galling to the popular feeling. The second source of revenue, namely, the National Domains, cannot be fully understood, without touching upon a field of inquiry, at once most interesting and most laborious; and which neither our limits nor our ability enable us fully to explore.* All lands conquered in war, surrendered by the inhabitants, or ceded by treaty, became the property of the conquering people, who thus were not only the sovereign, but the landlord of the territories which they acquired. Sometimes this right was so far mitigated in practice, that the old inhabitants were allowed to retain their lands, as tenants, on payment of a rent to the conquering people as their landlord; but sometimes, also, it was exercised in its widest extent,—the old proprietors were expelled altogether, and the land was disposed of according to the pleasure of its new masters. In Grecian History there is an instance of the first of these methods of proceeding in the behaviour of the Athenians, after their conquest of Mitylene, in the Peloponnesian war. The territory of the Mitylenæans was divided into a certain number of lots, on each of which a certain rent was levied, and the former proprietors continued to occupy their estates as before, but in the character of tenants instead of landlords. On the other hand, when Ægina was conquered, the inhabitants were suffered to remain undisturbed for a time in their old homes; but on the breaking out of the Peloponnesian war, the Athenians thought proper to act upon their right of conquest more rigorously; they expelled the Æginetans accordingly, altogether, from the island, and divided the lands amongst a certain number of Athenian colonists, who became its inhabitants for several years, till they were, in their turn, driven out by the Lacedæmonians after the battle of Ægospotami. The Romans, in the same manner, made a difference in the treatment of the different nations whom they conquered; but in all cases they claimed a sovereignty over the soil; and in all cases, therefore, they derived from it a revenue. The peculiar mark of this sovereignty was the reservation of a right to a certain portion of the produce of the land, and this portion was generally the tenth or tithe. Even when the lands of a conquered country were restored, as it was expressed, to the old proprietors, (for by the act of conquest they were held to be instantly forfeited to the conquering people, and the right of the old inhabitants was immediately lost,) still the tithe of the produce was reserved. When they were not restored, they were either sold by the Quæstors in lots of a certain size; or divided out among a certain number of the citizens; or not being regularly disposed of by the Government, were occupied by individuals without any particular title, as they severally happened to take possession; or, 4thly, were let on leases for terms of different length to farmers who had the power of underletting them again either entire or in lots. In the second of these cases, and in that only, the full sovereignty of the land appears to have been granted together with the occupation or enjoyment of it. When a colony was planted in a conquered country, and a division of lands made amongst the new settlers, according to the solemn forms transmitted through a long succession of ages from the Priests of Etruria, then the State resigned all its rights, and the lots thus given to each colonist became, in the fullest sense of the word, his freehold.* But every other mode of alienation was made with a reservation of the State's Sovereignty; a tenure more or less favourable was granted to the individual; but the Government retained its right to the tithes of the produce, and its power of planting colonies at a future period in the domains over which it did not think proper to exercise at present its full authority. Now as the whole territory of Rome, to speak generally, had been gained by conquest, the Sovereignty of it was vested in the Roman People; and with the exception of such portions as had been divided out into colonies, it was all subject to the payment of tithes. In process of time the whole of Italy became exempted from this burden by the gradual division of every part of the public land amongst the inhabitants of its various colonies; and when the Italians successively acquired the rights of Roman citizens, all the land which had been given back after conquest to its old possessors,† as well as that which had been sold by the

Of the nature of the National Domains.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

* For the groundwork of what follows on the subject of the National Domains, the writer has great pleasure in acknowledging his obligations to the masterly work of Niebuhr; and particularly to the excellent chapter on the Nature of the Agrarian Laws, vol. ii. p. 349, *et seq.* He is indebted to Niebuhr also for his first acquaintance with the collection of writers, *De Re Agrarid*, published by Goesius at Amsterdam, in 1674, and which is so little known in England, that he has found no allusion to it in any English writer on the Roman History, whose works have fallen under his notice. Niebuhr's *Roman History* is one of those great works of genius which throw at once a blaze of light over subjects before obscure, and which, by the clearness and justness of the views which they communicate, make us full of surprise that the same discoveries had never been made before. Niebuhr carries some hypotheses perhaps too far, and in some of his opinions may be led away by a fondness for novelty; but these are faults which succeeding writers may easily correct; while they and the world in general derive perpetual benefit from the great excellencies of his work; its surprising knowledge, and the eminent ability with which detached notices of facts are brought together and made to illustrate each other; and the penetration with which he has discovered principles of Civil and Religious law amidst an apparent chaos of anomalous and unconnected particulars.

* In the collection of writers, *De Re Agrarid*, to which we have before alluded, there is a very remarkable fragment, ascribed to Vegoia, and which is evidently translated from an Etruscan original of the highest antiquity. It is so curious that the reader may not be displeased to see a part of it here transcribed.

Scias Mare ex Æthere remotum. Cum autem Juppiter Terram Hetruriæ sibi vindicavit, constituit jussitque metiri Campos, signarique Agros, sciens Hominum Avaritiam vel terrenam Cupidinem, Terminis omnia scita esse voluit, quos quandoque ob Avaritiam prope novissimi octavi Sæculi datos sibi Homines Dolo malo violabunt, contingentque atque movebunt. Sed qui contigerit moveritque Possessionem, promovendo suam, alterius minuendo, ob hoc Scelus damnabitur a Diis, &c. p. 258.

How exactly does this agree with the very words of the Mosaic Law, that "cursed is he who removeth his neighbour's landmark."

† Hyginus says expressly, *Agri qui redditi sunt non obligantur Vectigalibus, quoniam scilicet prioribus Dominis redditi sunt.* But Cicero says as positively, that the conquered lands in Sicily, which had been restored to their old inhabitants, were regularly let by the Censors; that is, the tithes which they paid, were regularly farmed, (Cicero, *in Verrem*, lib. iii. c. 6.) And Aggenus Urbicus lays it down as a general rule, that in the Provinces, *omnes etiam privati Agri Tributa atque Vectigalia persolvunt. Commentar. in Frontin.* p. 47. edit. Goesii. We suppose, therefore, that so long as the Italians were foreigners to Rome, the lands given back to them were subject to the same burden as those which were restored to the States of Sicily. With regard to the lands sold by the Quæstors, Niebuhr classes them with those divided amongst

Quæstors, assumed the character of the private property of Roman citizens, and thus was placed on a level with that divided out amongst the settlers of a colony, and became altogether freehold. But in the Provinces all land, except that which belonged to any Roman colony, was subject to some payment to the Government. In some instances a general land tax was levied over the whole Province, as a sort of fine paid by the inhabitants for the renewal of their term of possession, after their rights, as freehold proprietors, had been forfeited by the conquest of their country. But in other cases, where the Province had been peaceably ceded or bequeathed to the Romans by its former Sovereign, as in the instance of the Province of Asia, the inhabitants retained their former rights, and the Roman people only acquired the sovereignty or superiority over the country; (if we may borrow a nearly analogous term from the Scottish law,) which was signified by the reservation of the tenth part of the produce, as the invariable property of the Government. This claim upon the tithes existed, we believe, quite distinctly from the general land tax or fine levied upon some particular Provinces; and where that land tax was paid, the tithes were nevertheless paid also. In some instances we find that the provincial lands paid a seventh, and sometimes a fifth part of their produce to the Government;* and here it may be difficult to decide, whether this payment was still independent of the tithes, or whether it was made as an equivalent both for the tithes and the land tax or tribute. But in addition to all these burdens, we have a long list of others which were imposed by the provincial Governors when their own avarice or the alleged exigencies of the public service required any extraordinary resources.† First, there was a general levy of money inforced over the whole Province,‡ corresponding perhaps to the feudal aids, and raised, we may suppose, by a per centage upon property. Then followed the most odious of all imposts, a poll tax, demanded alike of slaves and freemen; and, besides this, other taxes upon houses or house doors,§ and upon the columns which were so much used in the more expensive architecture of the ancients. Finally, there was a general impressment of soldiers, seamen, and carriages, for the military and naval service, additional requisitions of corn for the maintenance of the troops, and of arms and military engines. Under these multiplied exactions, besides a charge altogether indefinite made by the Proconsul or Proprætor for the maintenance of himself and all his inferior officers, it is no wonder that the Provinces were overwhelmed with debt; for the necessity of paying the taxes being immediate, the people were reduced to borrow money at an exorbitant interest, and there were always wealthy Romans of the Equestrian Order at hand who carried on a regular traffic in the distress of the Provinces, and who were accustomed to lay out their money in loans of this kind, as they thus gained not only a very high rate of interest, but also an extensive influence over the individuals or communities who were indebted to them.

In the dealings between the Government and its subjects, the intervention of a third party was generally employed. The revenues of every Province were commonly farmed by wealthy individuals of the Equestrian Order, called by the well known name of *Publicani*. As the Senators were not allowed to engage in any sort of traffic, the Equestrian Order, consisting of all citizens not being Senators, who possessed property beyond a certain amount, embraced almost the whole commercial interest of the Empire; and a favourite branch of their speculations was that of farming the revenues. As soon as a Province fell under the dominion of Rome, a number of these adventurers proceeded to settle themselves in it, and to acquaint themselves with the extent of its resources. They then purchased of the Censors the different taxes claimed by the Government; the land tax, the tithes, the poll tax, and the other subordinate imposts; and thus took upon themselves the whole risk and trouble of collecting them. In doing this they were armed with the full authority of the Government, by the officer who commanded in the Province; unless he happened to have some quarrel with their Order, in which case they probably found their business sufficiently difficult, and were losers rather than gainers by their contracts.* But in ordinary cases the Governor of the Province and the *Publicani* were well disposed to gratify one another; for the Equestrian Order, after the Sempronian Law had placed the whole judicial power in their hands, was a body not lightly to be offended; and the condemnation of P. Rutilius, whose upright administration had checked the exactions of the *Publicani* in Asia, was a lesson to future Magistrates rather to share in the plunder of the farmers of the revenue, than to endeavour to repress it.

Of the Publicani.

Under the old Constitution the revenues were under the controul of the Senate; to which body the Quæstors, who acted as treasurers both at Rome and in the Provinces, were obliged to submit their accounts. But the Civil wars had created so large a military force throughout the Empire, and had so dangerously taught the soldiers to know their own power, that it became most important to provide for them by regular means, lest they should again be tempted to listen to some new adventurer, and to renew the disorders which had prevailed for the last twenty years.

---

the settlers of a colony, and considers them as entirely freehold. *Römische Geschichte*, vol. ii. p. 379. It is with the utmost diffidence that we differ from so great an authority; but Hyginus says that the tenure of the *Agri Quæstorii* was the same with that of the other lands of the Roman people; and Siculus Flaccus gives it as a definition of "land belonging to the Roman people," that its revenue belongs to the Treasury. Edit. Goesii, p. 2. However, as the lands sold by the Quæstors were not very extensive, it is of the less consequence to ascertain minutely, whether it was a sale of the sovereignty, or only of the possession of the land for ever, subject to the payment of its tithes to the Government.

* Hyginus, *de Limitib. constituend.* p. 198. edit. Goesii. Creuzer distinguishes these payments of the fifth or seventh parts of the produce, both from the tithes and from the land tax, *Römische Antiquitäten*, p. 265. But we know not on what authority this statement arose, and it seems to us somewhat doubtful.

† Cæsar, *de Bello Civil.* lib. iii. c. 31, 32

‡ *Imperata Pecunia.*

§ *Ostiaria, Columnaria.* The poll tax and house tax seem not to have been peculiarly confined to periods of great public exigency; for both are mentioned by Cicero as having been levied in Cilicia in the year 701; and by the manner in which they are spoken of, they appear to have been ordinarily levied there. *Epist. Familiares*, lib. iii. epist. viii.

* Cicero, *de Provinciis Consularibus*, c. 5.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13

Augustus therefore instituted a military Treasury,* over which he possessed supreme authority, as *Imperator* or Commander in Chief of the army; and for the support of this Treasury he invented some new taxes; particularly a sort of excise duty of one per cent. on all articles exposed to sale.† He enjoyed also the entire revenues of those Provinces which were immediately subjected to his jurisdiction; and even in those which were under the controul of the Senate, he had a Treasury of his own, distinguished by the name of *Fiscus* from the *Ærarium* or Treasury of the People, into which probably were paid those taxes which had been created for the especial support of the *Ærarium militare*. In all the Provinces alike, the revenues which belonged to Augustus were received in his name by officers called *Procuratores*;‡ a class of persons who at first were hardly considered as more than the agents or stewards of a wealthy individual, and who were accordingly selected not only from the Equestrian Order, but also from among the freedmen; while the regular Governors of the Provinces, whether Proconsuls or Lieutenants of the Emperor, were, with the sole exception of the Governor of Egypt, appointed exclusively from the Senate.

State of Italy and the Provinces.

Italy.

We here propose to notice, separately, the state of Italy and of the different Provinces of the Empire, under the Government of Augustus, as far as we have been able to collect materials for the picture. The name of Italy was now at last applied to the whole peninsula from the Alps to the Straits of Messina;§ and the inhabitants of the whole of this district had obtained the rights of Roman citizens. Their votes, however, were no longer to be given in the *Comitia* at Rome;‖ but the Magistrates of the different Italian colonies were to collect the votes of their fellow citizens in their respective towns, and send them sealed up to Rome, there to be opened on the day of election in the *Campus Martius*. These colonies, it must be remembered, occupied at this time nearly all the surface of Italy. It was the boast of Augustus that he had himself planted no fewer than eight and twenty; a strange subject of exultation, when we consider that they were formed out of the soldiers of his army, and were planted in spots left desolate by the extirpation of their old inhabitants, who had suffered either under the first Proscription of the Triumvirs, or under that fatal establishment of military tyranny which was created by the reduction of Perusia. The soldiers of a mercenary army are miserable elements out of which to form a Civil society; and thus, instead of a people inheriting the soil from time immemorial, and blending, in one well organized Commonwealth, Nobility and wealth and honest industry, the new possessors of Italy were an ill cemented horde of dissolute adventurers, with no natural connection with the spots on which they were settled, and with habits the most alien from those of good husbands, good fathers, or good citizens. We are told accordingly that the free population of many parts of Italy was reduced to a very low point,* whilst the slaves were numerous, and the Capital itself was overburthened with the crowd of needy citizens, whom each successive Civil war threw upon that common shore of nations. The north of Italy, however, was in a more flourishing condition; there the military colonies had been far less numerous, and the inhabitants having lately acquired the rights of Roman citizens, and possessing natural advantages of the highest order in their soil and climate, were perhaps the most fortunately circumstanced of any people throughout the Empire. In Patavium or Padua there were five hundred citizens rich enough to be ranked among the Equestrian Order.† The town carried on a great trade with Rome, supplying the Capital with clothing, with the finest carpets, and with other articles of similar kinds to an immense amount, probably from its own manufactories. The woods of this part of Italy maintained also large droves of swine,‡ which supplied the population of Rome with the largest proportion of their food; and the vine was cultivated with great success, in proof of which Strabo instances the prodigious size of the wine vats, rivalling, it seems, those of our London brewers, for they are described as being larger than houses. The coarser woollen cloths, which formed the dress of the households of most of the people of Italy, were chiefly manufactured in Liguria and its neighbourhood; whilst the softest and finest wool was produced by the pastures of Mutina and Scultenna. Above all, it is said, that here was to be found a numerous free population,§ which provided the State with its best supply of soldiers, whilst the rest of Italy was left exhausted and desolate, and Augustus was endeavouring to force its inhabitants to marry and rear families by the penalties and encouragements of the law.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.

The island of Sicily had been the seat of one of the latest Civil wars, that between Augustus and Sex. Pompeius, and it is said to have suffered not only during the contest, but during its previous occupation by Pompeius; the plundering and disorderly habits of his numerous seamen having proved, we may suppose, very mischievous to the inhabitants.‖ Since that time, Augustus had sent a colony of veterans to Syracuse, and a small portion of the former site of that famous city was again occupied and fortified. But the cities of Sicily were now become few and inconsiderable; its population was small; and almost the whole of its abundant produce was regularly sent to Rome for the maintenance of the people of the Capital. A great part of the surface of the island was devoted to pasture for sheep, oxen, and horses;¶ and the slaves, who were employed in taking care of them, had formerly, as we have seen, carried on a long and obstinate struggle against the Roman power. In the reign of Augustus they still infested the country, and particularly the neighbourhood of Ætna, with their robberies; and Strabo mentions a robber chief, whom he himself saw torn to pieces by wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome, and who, before he was taken, had been at the head of a considerable force. The mountains of Corsica and Sardinia were in like man-

* Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 49.
† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 78.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. liii. p. 506. Conf. Creuzer, *Romische Antiquitaten*, p. 218, 219.
§ Strabo, lib. v. c. 1.
‖ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 46.

* Livy, lib. vi. c. 12.
† Strabo, lib. v. c. 1. sec. 7.
‡ Ibid. c. 1. sec. 12.
§ Ibid. c. 1. sec. 11.
‖ Ibid. lib. vi. c. 2. sec. 4.
¶ Ibid. c. 2. sec. 6.

ner occupied by wild tribes of barbarians who kept up a constant system of plunder against the inhabitants of the more level country; those of Corsica are described as so inveterately brutish,* that when taken and carried to the Roman slave market, their purchasers always repented of their bargain, however trifling the price they had paid for them; while the Sardinian robbers did not confine their depredations to their own island, but frequently made excursions to the opposite coast of Italy; and were enabled, in great measure, to defy the Roman Governors in their own haunts, from the impossibility of keeping a military force exposed to the pestilential atmosphere of the wilder parts of the country. Amongst the Alpine tribes, to the north of Italy, the same plundering habits had formerly prevailed, and even the Roman armies, which were stationed in their neighbourhood, had frequently suffered from their desultory attacks;† but Augustus, judging it most important to keep up a secure communication between Italy and the Transalpine Provinces, and having himself, on one occasion, lost his baggage and several of his soldiers when crossing the mountains which they inhabited, determined to put an effectual stop to their incursions. He accordingly employed such vigorous measures against them, that he extirpated the nation of the *Salassi* altogether, selling no fewer than forty-four thousand of them for slaves, eight thousand of whom were the warriors of the tribe. Three thousand Roman settlers were then sent to colonize the town of *Augusta*, or Aosta, at the very head of the valley of the Dorea Baltea; from which place two roads were carried across the Alps, the one over the Little Saint Bernard, which was made practicable for carriages, and the other over the Great Saint Bernard, which could be travelled only by mules. In consequence of these exertions, the whole neighbourhood was reduced to a state of perfect tranquillity, and the communication with Gaul was carried on without molestation.‡

Gaul. The condition of the important Province of Gaul itself will be regarded with more curiosity. Its "Cocatrice" must still "have looked raw and red after the Roman sword," when Augustus first became the Sovereign of the Empire; for scarcely more than twenty years had elapsed since his uncle had for the first time completed its conquest. Yet in the reign of Tiberius, Strabo describes the inhabitants as already settled into habits of peaceful submission to the Roman power;§ and he attributes it to their national character, which long retained the remembrance of a defeat, and if vanquished in one general contest was cowed for ever. But the fact is, that the Gauls, when first attacked by Cæsar, were by no means a nation of savages. They had regular Governments,‖ were perfectly familiar with agriculture, and were accustomed to pay the greatest veneration to their Druids, who professed, with whatever success, the study of moral and natural philosophy. Such a state of society, combined with the natural features of the country, which then, as now, was by no means favourable to the maintenance of a desultory and harassing warfare, ensured the permanence of the conquest of Gaul as soon as it was once effected. The people were able to appreciate the value of the Arts, and the commercial advantages which they derived from their conquerors. Even before the invasion of Cæsar, traders were in the habit of visiting almost every part of the country,* and had familiarized the people with many even of the luxuries of civilized life. But the Roman conquest must have greatly increased this traffic, by enabling merchants to transport their goods from one end of Gaul to the other with perfect security, and by bringing the whole country into direct communication with the wealth and commercial enterprise of the Roman Empire. The great rivers with which France abounds were successfully employed to expedite this intercourse;† and goods from all parts of the Mediterranean were conveyed by water up the Rhone and Saone, and from thence, after a short interval of land carriage, were again embarked on the Seine, and thus transported either to Britain, or to all the districts on the northern coast of Gaul, bordering on the British Channel; while the Loire and the Garonne afforded an equally convenient communication with the western parts of Gaul, and with the shores of the Bay of Biscay. In another point also, the Gauls felt the benefit of their connection with Rome. Great quantities of oxen, sheep, and pigs, were reared in all parts of the country;‡ and we are told that not only Rome itself, but most other districts of Italy were supplied with coarse cloaks manufactured of Gaulish wool, and with Gaulish bacon of most excellent quality, particularly from the hogs fed in Burgundy, Franche Comté, and Lorraine. There were also some favoured spots in Gaul, to which the Romans had communicated their own political privileges. Narbo, Vienna, and Lugdunum were Roman colonies, and enjoyed the advantages of the *Jus Italicum* in its full extent;§ that is, they were governed by their own Laws and Magistrates, and were not subject to the authority of the Proconsul of the Province; and their land was considered private and freehold property in the full Roman sense of the term; it was therefore not liable to pay land-tax or tithes; and it might be alienated by *Mancipatio*, that is, it might be sold in full sovereignty, and with an indisputable title;—a privilege which was peculiarly confined to the soil of Italy,‖ and to those places in the Provinces which, by possessing the *Jus Italicum*, were placed on the same footing as if they were situated in Italy. The lower privilege of the *Jus Latii* was conferred on the inhabitants of *Nemausus*, or Nismes;¶ and on the *Convenæ* and *Ausci* in *Aquitania*; by which they also enjoyed an exemption from the authority of the Proconsul of the Province; and those who held any Magistracy among them

* Strabo, lib. v. c. 2. sec. 7.
† Ibid. lib. iv. c. 6. sec. 7.
‡ Ibid. and Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. iii. c. 20.
§ Lib. iv. c. 1. sec. 2. c. 4. sec. 2.
‖ Cæsar, *de Bell. Gallico*, lib. vi. c. 11, &c.

* Cæsar, *de Bell. Gallico*, lib. vi. c. 23.
† Strabo, lib. iv. c. 1. sec. 14.
‡ Ibid. c. 1. sec. 2. c. 4. sec. 3. Cæsar, *de Bell. Gallico*, lib. iv. c. 2.
§ See Haubold, *Epicrisis Heineccii*, lib. i. Adpend, sec. 97, 98. and Creuzer, *Romische Antiquitaten*, p. 253. This account of the *Jus Italicum* was first given by Savigny, in his Dissertation *Ueber das Jus Italicum* published among the *Memoirs*, and read by him before the Academy of Berlin, in 1814 and 1815.
‖ See *Liber Simplici*, *apud Scriptores de Re Agrariâ*, p. 76. edit. Goesii.
¶ Strabo, lib. iv. c. 1. sec. 12. and c. 2. sec. 2.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

became *ipso facto* entitled to the full rights of Roman citizens. These, however, were in the time of Augustus, rare exceptions; and the great majority of the inhabitants of Gaul, shared largely in the miseries, as well as in the benefits, of subjection to the Roman Empire. They were oppressed by all the burdens ordinarily imposed on the Provinces, and suffered not only from direct taxation, but from that still heavier evil, to which we have before alluded, the frequent necessity of borrowing money at an exorbitant interest from the wealthy Roman citizens who were settled amongst them. Accordingly we find, as early as the reign of Tiberius,* that the whole of Gaul was overwhelmed with debt, and their sufferings from this cause led to the unsuccessful insurrection against the Roman power, which took place, about eight years after the death of Augustus, under Julius Florus and Julius Sacrovir.

Change of language.

The total extirpation of the Celtic language, which was effected throughout the whole of Gaul, during the continuance of the Roman dominion, could not have taken place till long after the reign of Augustus. But an earnest of the charge was already exhibited in *Gallia Narbonensis*, which had been now a Roman Province for more than a century; for Strabo tells us,† that the inhabitants of the left or eastern bank of the Rhone, were even in his time, no longer to be considered barbarians, but were become Romans, both in their customs and in their language. Several important steps had also been taken towards the civilisation of the more recently conquered Provinces. Human sacrifices,‡ and all rites of the Celtic worship, which were at variance with the practices of the Roman religion, were strictly prohibited; nor was more toleration shown to the barbarous custom of carrying about the skulls of their enemies whom they had slain, and fastening them up as a trophy over their gates. Besides, the Romans found the Gauls already disposed, in some measure, to adopt their institutions, from the popularity which the arts and literature of Greece had obtained amongst them. Their knowledge of these was derived from the famous Ionian colony of *Massilia*, or Marseilles; a city which was at this time the Athens of the western part of the Empire;§ and not only served as a school of instruction to the Gauls, but was frequented by many Romans of the highest distinction, who resorted thither, instead of to Greece, to devote themselves to literature and philosophy. So strong an effect had been produced by the Massilians upon the Gauls in general, that the Greek Sophists found in most parts of Gaul a liberal reception, and were often engaged, by particular cities, to open schools of public instruction for their citizens; while the Greek character began to be adopted wherever there was occasion for writing.‖ The Celtic, it appears, was not a written language; and the Druids refused to commit to writing any of the learning which they possessed and taught, giving their instructions only by word of mouth, and obliging their scholars to trust to their memories alone for retaining them. This circumstance, doubtless, contributed to the gradual adoption of the Roman language throughout Gaul. As soon as a fondness for literature was introduced, the Gauls, finding nothing to gratify it in their own language, applied themselves of necessity to that of their conquerors. This cooperating with the influence which Latin necessarily enjoyed from political causes, introduced it universally, in time, amongst the higher classes; while the existence of domestic slavery made it much more necessary for the lower orders to acquire the language of the higher, than is the case in Modern Europe. Thus the Negroes in the West Indies learn, universally, the language of their masters, whilst in Wales and Ireland the gentleman often accommodates himself to his poorer neighbours, and consents to address them in Welch or in Erse, because they choose to continue ignorant of English.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13

The different parts of the neighbouring country of Spain presented a striking contrast to each other. The whole Peninsula was at this time divided into three Provinces,* known by the names of *Bætica*, *Lusitania*, and *Hispania Tarraconensis*; the first of which was governed by a Proconsul appointed by the Senate, and the two latter by the Lieutenants of Augustus. *Bætica* comprised nearly the same extent of country which is at present included within the limits of Andalusia and Grenada. It had been already conquered by the Carthaginians before the second Punic war, and in the course of that war was made a part of the Roman dominion by P. Scipio Africanus, after the expulsion of its former masters. The Romans had thus possessed it for about two hundred years, and it was now one of the most flourishing portions of their Empire. Its inhabitants had almost lost their original language,† and in their speech, and dress, and manners were become assimilated to their conquerors. The valley of the Bætis, or Guadalquiver, is described by Strabo, as rivalling in richness and fertility, the most favoured countries in the Empire; its trade with Rome was exceedingly great, and carried on directly with Ostia and Puteoli, the ports in the immediate neighbourhood of the Capital; the ships employed in this commerce were of the largest size of any that frequented the Mediterranean; and the articles exported in them were numerous and valuable; consisting of corn, wine, oil, of the finest quality, wax, honey, salt fish in immense quantities; pitch, *minium* or cinnabar,‡ and *coccus ilicis*, an insect of the cochineal species, and used by the ancients for their best scarlet dyes, as we now use the cochineal of Mexico. The Spanish wool then enjoyed the same high reputation which it still does to this day; great quantities of it both in the raw and manufactured state were exported to Rome; and so highly was the Spanish breed of sheep esteemed, that the rams were ordinarily sold for a talent,§ or

Spain.

Bætica.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iii. c. 40. *Galliarum Civitates, ob magnitudinem Æris alieni, rebellionem cœptavere.*
† Lib. iv. c. 1. sec. 12. ‡ Ibid. c. 4. sec. 5.
§ Ibid. c. 1. sec. 5.
‖ Strabo, ibid. Cæsar, *de Bell. Gallico*, lib. vi. c. 13.

* Dion Cassius, lib. liii. p. 503. Strabo, lib. iii. c. 4. p. 444. edit. Siebenkees.
† Strabo, lib. iii. c. 2. p. 404. 390. 389. &c.
‡ The *minium* (sulphuret of quicksilver,) belonged to the Government, and, with other productions of the mines, was farmed by the *Publicani*. The price, however, at which it was to be sold; was fixed by the Government at 15s. 8d. the pound, avoirdupois; but the *Publicani* made a large profit by adulterating it. The *coccus ilicis* was found so plentifully on the evergreen oak, (*Quercus coccifera*,) that Pliny says the poorer Spaniards were enabled to pay half their tribute by the money which they got from the sale of this insect. See Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. xvi. c. 8. and lib. xxxiii. c. 7.
§ Strabo, ibid.

Biography. From U. C. 732. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

£193. 15s. of our money. Above all, we should notice the mineral riches of Spain, which exceeded, in value and in quantity, all that were known to exist in any part of the world. We read of gold obtained partly from the mines, but more brought down in small particles by the streams from the mountains, and extracted by carefully washing the sand and gravel in which it was contained: and mention is made also of mines of silver, lead, tin, iron, and copper. Of the towns of *Bætica*, the most distinguished were the Roman Colonies of *Corduba* and *Hispalis*, (Cordova and Seville,) and *Gades*, or Cadiz. This place had been founded at a very remote period, by a colony from Tyre;* their Phœnician extraction however did not induce the inhabitants to bear the Carthaginian dominion with willingness; but, on the contrary, they took an early opportunity to conclude an alliance with Rome,† even before the downfall of the Carthaginian power in Spain, and became thus, according to the usual nature of alliances between a stronger and a weaker State in the ancient world, a dependency of the Roman people. In the Civil war, provoked by Cæsar's rebellion, the people of *Gades* espoused his cause with zeal, and expelled Pompey's officer from their town;‡ in return for which, if we may believe Dion Cassius,§ Cæsar bestowed upon them the privileges of Roman citizenship. They found at any rate an effectual patron in their countryman L. Cornelius Balbus, the nephew of that Balbus who had been presented with the freedom of Rome, by Pompey, for his services in the contest with Sertorius, and who has been mentioned before as one of the most confidential friends of Cæsar, and as one of the first instances of a man, by birth a foreigner, rising to the rank of Consul at Rome. Balbus enlarged the city of *Gades*,‖ and built a dock-yard on the main land immediately opposite to the island in which the town is situated. In the reign of Tiberius, *Gades* was one of the most flourishing cities in the Empire; and it is said to have rivalled *Patavium* or Padua, in containing five hundred citizens, rich enough to be reckoned amongst the Equestrian Order. It carried on an extensive trade both in the Mediterranean, and in the Atlantic, and the size and number of its merchant vessels are both especially noticed.

Lusitania and Hispania Tarraconensis.

The two remaining Provinces of Spain were far from being in so advanced a state as *Bætica*. The Celtiberians indeed, who inhabited the central and eastern parts of the Peninsula, were partially becoming more civilized;¶ and some of them, like the people of *Bætica*, had learnt to wear the Roman dress, and to adopt the Roman manner of living. But the tribes which bordered on the Atlantic and on the Bay of Biscay still retained in great measure their original wildness. The *Cantabri*, whose territory corresponded with the modern Provinces of Biscay and Asturias, had been only lately attacked by Augustus in person,** in the year 728; and being then partially conquered, had soon afterwards renewed the contest, and had been more effectually subdued by L. Æmilius, in the year following, and again by M. Agrippa, in the year 734. In the reign of Tiberius,* the continued presence of a large Roman army in their country, (for out of three Roman legions stationed in Spain, two were quartered amongst the Asturians and Cantabrians,) had produced a partial effect upon them: some of them had entered into the service of Rome, and some of the tribes were learning the first elements of civil society. But the existence of the Basque language to this very day, undestroyed by the revolutions of eighteen centuries, sufficiently proves that in these remote districts the language and manners of Rome were unable to take deep root; and therefore, at the period of which we are writing, no more had probably been done than to reduce the hostilities of the natives to mere acts of robbery in the mountains and forests, and by quartering Roman soldiers among them to set before them a view of more civilized institutions. The coast of the Mediterranean presented naturally a different picture.† Here were cultivated the vine, the fig, and the olive; and here were the famous cities of *Carthago*, or Carthagena, and *Tarraco*, or Tarragona, both Roman colonies. On this coast also there grew in great luxuriance a species of broom, which was largely used in rope-making, and which was exported for that purpose to all parts of the Empire. In the interior may be noticed the recently planted colonies of *Augusta Emerita*, or Merida, *Pax Augusta*, or Badajoz, and *Cæsar-augusta*, or Zaragoza, which Strabo instances as a proof of the improved condition of the countries in which they were situated.‡

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 732. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

Mauritania

The northern coast of Africa from the Atlantic Ocean to the Harbour of Saldas,§ which lies a few miles to the eastward of Algiers, was known by the general name of *Mauritania*, and was at this time governed by an African Prince, on whom Augustus had conferred the Sovereignty; this was Juba, the son of that Juba who had so zealously supported the Constitutional party in the Civil war between Cæsar and Pompey, and the husband of one of the daughters of Antonius and Cleopatra. But notwithstanding these connections, Juba had served Augustus in the Civil wars,‖ and had acquired his favour; and as the greatest part of his father's dominions now formed part of the Roman Province of Africa, he received the Sovereignty of *Mauritania* as a sort of compensation. From the Port of Saldas to the borders of *Cyrenaica* the whole country which had been formerly possessed by the Kings of Numidia and the Republic of Carthage, was now united under one Government, and was called the Province of Africa.¶ It was one of the Provinces assigned to the Senate and People, and was governed by a Proconsul, with a military establishment of two legions;** and it is known to have been one of the countries which sent the greatest quantity of corn to the Roman market.†† But of the

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. i. c. 3.
† Cicero, *pro Balbo*, c. 15, 16. The language of the Treaty ran, "*Majestatem populi Romani comiter conservato.*" (*Scil. populus Gaditanus.*)
‡ Cæsar, *de Bell. Civili*, lib. ii. c. 18.
§ Lib. xli. p. 164. edit. Leunclav.
‖ Strabo, lib. iii. c. 5. p. 451. edit. Siebenkees.
¶ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 2. p. 404. and c. 4. p. 446.
** Dion Cassius, lib. liii. p. 513, 516. 528. Horace, *Carm.* lib. iii. *Ode* 14. and *Epistolar.* lib. i. *Epist.* 12.

* Strabo, lib. iii. c. 3. p. 416. c. 4. p. 445. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iv. c. 5
† Ibid. lib. iii. c. 4. p. 437. 429. ‡ Lib. iii. c. 2. p. 404.
§ Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 3. 5. 7. 12. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iv. c. 5.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. li. p. 454. lib. liii. p. 514.
¶ Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 3. sec. 25.
** Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iv. c. 5.
†† Ibid. lib. xii. c. 43. See also several passages in Horace; for instance, *Sat.* lib. ii. *Sat.* iii. ver. 87. *Carm.* lib. i. *Ode* i. ver. 40. lib. iii. *Ode* xvi. ver. 31.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

details of its condition very little is recorded. We find by the *Fasti Triumphales*, that the Proconsuls of this Province frequently laid claim to the insignia of a triumph, on account of victories gained over the Barbarians of the interior: we hear of a Roman colony,* lately founded by Augustus, close to the site of the ancient Carthage; and we are told that private individuals possessed here immense estates,† chiefly woodland and pasture, on which many villages were built, and a numerous population was maintained around the villa of the proprietor or Lord. Perhaps from this very cause the towns in Africa were few and unimportant; the old ones had been mostly destroyed, either in the Jugurthine war, or in the contest between Cæsar and the Constitutional party, under Scipio and Cato: and as the land seems mostly to have been granted or sold away to individuals, there was less room for those military colonies, which in other parts of the Empire were laying the foundations of so many cities, famous in after generations. Still we know that Africa carried on a considerable trade; for Strabo,‡ when wishing to represent the great number of the merchant vessels employed in the commerce between Italy and the south of Spain, observes that it almost rivalled the number of the vessels engaged in the commerce of Africa.

Of the Eastern or Greek Provinces. Cyrenaica.

In proceeding eastward to the small Province of *Cyrenaica*, we enter upon a new division of the Empire, and one most strongly distinguished from all the countries which we have hitherto noticed, by the general use of the Greek language. The Greek Provinces, if we may so call them, were in a very different condition from those of the West, which, owing their civilisation to the Romans, borrowed from them alone their language and their institutions: But in the East, society had long since assumed a settled form, which in its internal details was but little affected by the conquests of Rome. *Cyrene*, originally a colony from the little Island of *Thera*, in the Ægæan,§ after enjoying some centuries of independence and prosperity, was conquered by Ptolemy,‖ the son of Lagus, the first of the Macedonian Kings of Egypt, about the year of Rome 430. It was afterwards, like Cyprus, conferred from time to time, as a separate Principality, on some member of the Royal Family; and a Prince, named Ptolemy Apion,¶ who had obtained it in this manner, bequeathed it by his will to the Roman People, in the year of Rome 657. The lands which had belonged to him as King,** thus became the demesne of the Roman People; and not being divided out amongst a certain number of citizens, as was the case when a Colony was planted, they were farmed in the mass by the *Publicani*, mostly as grazing lands, and were encroached upon from time to time, like the other national lands throughout the Empire, by the proprietors of the surrounding estates. In the time of Augustus, *Cyrenaica* was united with Crete,* under the government of the same officer, and the two countries together formed one of the Prætorian Provinces which had been assigned to the jurisdiction of the Senate and People. It may be remarked, as a proof that *Cyrenaica* was the western limit of the Greek Provinces, that the Jews, who had spread themselves over all the eastern part of the Empire, are known to have been very numerous at *Cyrene*,† but are not mentioned as having established themselves in the adjacent Provinces of Africa, or in any of the Provinces westward of Italy. To *Cyrene* itself, its connection with Egypt would naturally have led them; and they formed there a body so considerable as to have a synagogue, specially appropriated to them in Jerusalem.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13

Egypt.

We have already mentioned some of the precautions taken by Augustus, to prevent the great resources of Egypt from being placed at the disposal of any one who might use them for the views of his own ambition. The Governor of Egypt was always selected from the Equestrian Order; that is, from a class of citizens who enjoyed the comforts of an affluent private station, without taking any part in Civil or military offices. Next under the Governor was an officer invested with the administration of justice;‡ and after him came the Procurator of the Emperor, whose business was simply to receive and collect all sums which were due to the Imperial Treasury. The military establishment consisted at first of three legions, besides nine cohorts, employed on permanent garrison duty at particular points of the country; but as it was soon found that nothing was to be dreaded either from any disposition to revolt in the Egyptians themselves, or from the power of the yet unconquered neighbouring nations, it was thought safer to intrust the Governor of so wealthy a Province with the least possible military force, and the army in Egypt was consequently reduced to two legions.§ So wretched had been the condition of the country under some of its recent Kings, that the Romans are said to have introduced many beneficial reforms; and the trade with India, which was carried on by way of the Red Sea, increased prodigiously under their dominion, notwithstanding the heavy duties which they took care to impose on all articles imported into, or exported from, Alexandria.‖ There were two modes of communication between Egypt and the Red Sea; one was by that famous canal, which had been begun in the

* Strabo, lib. xvii. c. iii. sec. 15. Appian, *Punica*, c. 136.

† Aggenus Urbicus, *de Controversiis Agrorum, apud Scriptores de Re Agrariâ*, edit. Goesii, p. 71.

‡ Lib. iii. c. 2. p. 387.

§ Herodotus, *Melpomene*, c. 175, *et seq.*

‖ Diodorus Siculus, lib. xviii. p. 602, *et seq.* edit. Rhodoman.

¶ Livy, *Epitome*, lib. lxx.

** Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xiv. c. 18. Pliny, *Histor. Natural* lib. xix. c. 3. Hyginus, *de Limitibus constituend*, p. 210. *Script. Rei Agrar.* edit. Goesii.

* Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 2. sec. 25.

† *Acts of the Apostles*, ch. ii. ver. 10. ch. vi. ver. 9. Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. p. 786.

‡ Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 1. sec. 12. ὁ διοικοδότης. The Procurator was called ἴδιος λόγος, or "private account," which seems almost like a cant term bestowed on him by the Egyptians. The separation of the judicial power from the supreme, Civil, and military administration of the Province, appears to be another proof of the excessive jealousy with which the power and wealth of Egypt were regarded by the Emperor.

§ We thus attempt to reconcile the different statements of Strabo, who states the troops in Egypt to have consisted of three legions and nine cohorts, (lib. xvii. c. 1. sec. 12.) and of Tacitus, who rates them only at two legions, (*Annal.* lib. iv. c. 5.) Unless indeed Tacitus spoke only of the number of Roman soldiers, and Strabo meant to include the auxiliaries; a supposition which seems supported by his distinguishing the nine cohorts which were employed in garrison duty, by the epithet "Roman," as if all the troops of the three legions were not entitled to that appellation.

‖ Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 1. sec. 13. 25. 45

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

remotest times by Pharaoh Necho, again resumed by Darius, the son of Hystaspes, and finally completed under the Government of the Ptolemies; and which leaving the Nile near the southern point of the Delta, after a somewhat circuitous course, joined the Red Sea at the town of *Arsinoe*, close to the modern town of Suez. The other was by land, across the Desert, from *Coptos* on the Nile, situated a few miles to the north of Thebes, to the ports of *Berenice* and *Myos Hormos*; and the route was now supplied with water, partly by digging wells, and partly by reservoirs, which preserved the occasional supply from the clouds. All the goods which were introduced into Egypt from the East by either of these channels, were necessarily conveyed to Alexandria, where they were again reshipped and exported to Italy and the rest of the Empire. It may be observed, that two out of the three ships in which the Apostle Paul performed his voyage from Palestine to Rome,* were ships of Alexandria, which seems to indicate that vessels from that place sailing direct to Italy were more easily to be found than from any other port in the Eastern Provinces. Besides the various commodities of the East, Egypt exported to Rome great quantities of corn,† together with the best writing materials then known in the world, the famous *papyrus*, the two finest sorts of which were named the Augustan, and the Livian,‡ in compliment to the Emperor and his wife. Alexandria, having been long the Capital of a great Monarchy, and now becoming the seat of a commerce so extensive, was probably the second city in the Roman Empire. But of all its buildings and institutions, the Museum deserves most particular notice. It formed a part of that large division of the city which the successive Kings of Egypt had enclosed within what may be called the precincts of their Court;§ a space equal to nearly a third of the whole of Alexandria; and which may be compared to the Parks of London, and to that quarter of the town in which our Palaces, our Public Offices, and our Courts of Justice are concentered together. The Museum comprised within it the great library of Alexandria, an ornamented walk, and a large building, which served as a refectory or College hall to the literary men who belonged to the institution. It may perhaps surprise some of our readers to hear that there was a society at Alexandria, which very closely resembled the Colleges of our English Universities. There was a head or master of the Museum, who was also a priest, appointed by the Government; and there was an endowment for the maintenance of the members of the College, who lived at the Museum, and were accustomed to have their meals together, as we have seen, in their common hall. A similar assemblage of literary and scientific men had formerly existed at *Heliopolis*; and Strabo was shown the apartments in which, according to the tradition of the guides, Plato and Eudoxus had resided for several years, to learn wisdom from the sages of Egypt.‖ But this institution was gone to decay in the time of Augustus, and the buildings were occupied only by the persons engaged in the care of the sacrifices, and by those who instructed strangers in the forms which they were to observe when they came there to worship. In another point however Egypt had undergone little change since the days of Herodotus. The scandalous licentiousness of some of the festivals was still faithfully preserved; and the canals which led from Alexandria to the famous Temple of Serapis, at *Canopus*,* were thronged day and night during the period of the festival with an innumerable concourse of people, indulging themselves without restraint in the worst excesses of debauchery.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

From Egypt to the Ægæan Sea, the countries included under the general names of *Asia Minor* and *Syria*, were in the time of Augustus portioned out into a number of divisions and subdivisions, which it would be of little importance to enumerate minutely. The principal of these were the two great Provinces of *Syria* and *Asia*; the former governed by the Lieutenants of the Emperor,† the latter by Proconsuls, in the name of the Senate and People. Next to these in importance were the united Provinces of *Pontus* and *Bithynia*, which also belonged to the Senate and People: *Galatia* with *Pisidia* and *Lycaonia*,‡ which belonged to Augustus, and *Cilicia* which also was governed by a Lieutenant of the Emperor. *Cappadocia* still retained a nominal independence,§ under its King Archelaus, till about four years after the death of Augustus; as did *Judæa* under Herod, till a somewhat earlier period. *Lycia* enjoyed its own laws,‖ and a free municipal Government; and there were a great many detached and subordinate districts, which were governed by petty Kings, Dynasts, Tetrarchs, and rulers of various designations, but which were all subject in fact to the controul of the Romans; and the condition of which was altered from time to time at the pleasure of the Emperor, as it was understood that all countries of this description were under his especial authority.¶ Throughout the whole of this part of the Empire, Greek was commonly spoken and understood by the higher orders in all the large towns; but there was a great variety of native languages and dialects which still maintained their ground,** and an almost equal variety of manners prevailing amongst the different people and tribes. Many of the mountain districts were infested by robbers, who made frequent inroads upon the lowland country in their neighbourhood; while many of the cities, such as Antioch, Tyre, and Tarsus, in *Syria* and *Cilicia*, together with most of those in the Province of *Asia*, were in a state of high civilisation, cultivating the arts of peace successfully. But the Roman colonies were few, and few of the cities, in comparison with the western Provinces, enjoyed the rights of Roman or of Latin citizenship. The burden of taxation was moreover great,†† and much was often suffered besides from the tyranny and exactions of the Provincial governors. On the other hand, the evils of war were no longer felt or dreaded; four legions only were stationed in the whole of *Asia Minor* and *Syria*,‡‡ and most of

Syria and Asia.

* *Acts*, ch. xxvii. ver. 6. ch. xxviii. ver. 11.
† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 43. *Histor.* lib. iii. c. 8. 48.
‡ Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. xiii. c. 12.
§ Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 1. sec. 8.
‖ Lib. xvii. c. 1. sec. 29.

* Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 1. sec. 16, 17.
† Dion Cassius, lib. liii. p. 504. Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 2. sec. 25,
‡ Ibid. lib. 53. p. 514. Strabo, lib. xii. c. 5. sec. 1.
§ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. ii. c. 42.
‖ Strabo, lib. xiv. c. 2. sec. 3.
¶ Ibid. lib. xvii. c. 2. sec. 25.
** See *Acts*, ch. ii. ver. 9. &c.
†† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. ii. c. 42. 54.
‡‡ Ibid. lib. iv. c. 5.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

these were placed near the Euphrates, to guard the frontiers on the side of *Parthia*. The internal communications between different parts of the country were mostly become secure and easy; and the piracy, which had been once so great an evil on the coasts of *Cilicia* and *Pamphylia*, was now so reduced as to offer no obstacles to the trade or general intercourse which was carried on by sea.

Greece, Macedonia and Achaia.

The condition of Greece was apparently one of great desolation and distress. It was divided in its widest extent into the two Provinces of *Macedonia* and *Achaia*, both belonging to the jurisdiction of the Senate and People. Both had suffered severely by being the seat of the successive civil wars between Cæsar and Pompey, between the Triumvirs, and Brutus, and Cassius, and lastly between Augustus and Antonius. Besides the country had never recovered the long series of miseries which had preceded and accompanied its conquest by the Romans; and between those times and the Civil contest between Pompey and Cæsar, it had again been exposed to all the evils of war when Sylla was disputing the possession of it with the Generals of Mithridates. In the time of Augustus therefore it presented a mournful picture of ruin. If we go through *Peloponnesus*, and inquire what was now the fate of cities and States once so memorable, we shall find that *Messenia* and *Arcadia* * were almost reduced to a desert, and that *Laconia* was greatly decreased in population, although its Capital, *Lacedæmon*, enjoyed the title of a free state,† and the Laconians, or inhabitants of the country, and even the Helots, had been long relieved from that abject dependence upon the Spartans, to which they were in the old times subjected. The most flourishing towns were *Corinth* and *Patræ*,‡ both of them Roman colonies, recently founded; the former by Cæsar, who peopled it with a number of freedmen; and the latter, one of the military colonies of Augustus, planted after the battle of *Actium*. Northward of the Isthmus the scene was equally melancholy. It was from a view of the ruins of the once famous cities of the Saronic Gulf, of *Ægina*, and *Piræus*, and *Megara*, that Ser. Sulpicius derived that lesson of patience under domestic calamities with which he attempted to console Cicero for the loss of his daughter Tullia.§ *Ætolia* and *Acarnania* were become wastes,‖ and the soil was devoted to pasture for the rearing of horses. Thebes was hardly better than a village,¶ and all the other towns of *Bœotia*, except *Tanagra* and *Thespiæ*, were reduced to the same condition. *Epirus* was depopulated,** and occupied by Roman soldiers; *Macedonia* had lost the benefit of its mines, which the Roman Government had appropriated to itself, and was suffering from the weight of its taxation; but it appears not to have undergone so great a desolation as the neighbouring Province of *Achaia*. Of the burden of taxation imposed on this part of the Empire, there are two remarkable proofs on record. Strabo himself happened once to touch at the little island of *Gyarus*,†† which he describes as a place containing no town, and inhabited merely by fishermen. When the vessel was again putting to sea, one of the fishermen came on board, and took his passage to Corinth, telling Strabo and his fellow-passengers that he was going on a deputation from his countrymen to Augustus, who happened to be in Greece at that time, to request some relief from taxation; for the inhabitants of *Gyarus* paid, he said, an hundred and fifty drachmæ, (£4. 16s. 10½d.) annually, one hundred of which would be more than they were able to spare. It appears also that the Provinces of *Macedonia* and *Achaia*,* when they petitioned for a diminution of their burdens, in the early part of the reign of Tiberius, were considered so deserving of compassion, that they were transferred for a time from the jurisdiction of the Senate to that of the Emperor; a change which tended to relieve them, by subjecting them only to the exactions of the Imperial Procurator, instead of the joint demands of the Procurator and Proconsul; for the Emperor's *fiscus* or private treasury received a portion of the revenues in the Provinces belonging to the Senate, but in those which were particularly under himself, there was no officer employed by the Senate to collect taxes for the public treasury or *ærarium*. Meanwhile the change of circumstances had rendered Greece far less capable of affording a large revenue than in the days of her early greatness. Then the naval power of the Greeks, the uncommercial habits of the Persians, and the general barbarism of the west of Europe, bestowed upon Greece an extensive trade, with all parts of the Mediterranean; and vessels from the coasts of Ionia found their way not only to the Adriatic,† to Sicily, and to Italy, but also to the ports of Gaul and Spain, and even through the Straits of Gibraltar to the riches of *Tartessus* and *Gades*. Besides, the high military character of the Greeks procured them constant employment in the service of the Persian Satraps of Asia; and there were many officers who there amassed, like Xenophon, a considerable fortune; and returned with it in the decline of life to settle in their own country. This was particularly a resource for the Arcadians;‡ and money was thus poured into that wild and barren district of *Peloponnesus*, which the poverty of its soil and its inland situation would never have allowed it to gain from agriculture or trade. But now the commerce of the Mediterranean had passed into other hands, and the power of Rome had transferred to Italy the reputation of being the best school of soldiers. In literature and philosophy Greece, it is true, still retained her preeminence; and in these respects her excellence was appreciated over a greater portion of the world than ever, as we have seen the cities of Gaul eager to secure the services of Greek philosophers for the education of their people. But, although the honour of this general celebrity was reflected chiefly upon Greece properly so called, yet it was far otherwise with the profit of it. *Massilia*, *Tarsus*, and *Alexandria* sent out over the Roman

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

* Strabo, lib. viii. c. 4. sec. 11. c. 8. sec. 1.
† Ibid. c. 5. sec. 5.
‡ Ibid. c. 6. sec. 23. c. 7. sec. 5.
§ Cicero, *ad Familiares*, lib. iv. epist. 5.
‖ Strabo, lib. viii. c. 8. sec. 1.
¶ Ibid. lib. ix. c. 2. sec. 5.
** Ibid. lib. vii. c. 7. sec. 3.
†† Lib. x. c. 5. sec. 3.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 76.
† Herodotus, *Clio*. c. 163. *Melpomene*, c. 152.
‡ Thucydides, lib. vii. c. 57. Of the Greeks who served under the younger Cyrus, in his attempt to dethrone his brother, more than half were Arcadians and Achaians; and of these the Arcadians formed by far the greatest portion. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, lib. v. c. 10. lib. i. c. 1, 2.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

world as many public and private instructors as proceeded from the schools of Athens; and if we run over the list of Greek writers of the times of the early Emperors,* we shall find very few of them to have been natives of Greece itself. In this manner Greece was left without any adequate means of repairing the devastations of war, or the exactions of the Roman Government; and was thus already fallen into decay, while most other parts of the Empire were as yet flourishing in unbroken vigour.

General state of the Roman Empire.

While we have thus attempted to lead our readers step by step through most of the countries which were now subject to Rome, our task has been little else than to collect together some of the scattered notices of their condition preserved by the writers of the times, and to repeat them as we have found them recorded. But we naturally aspire to something more than this; the Augustan age is so famous in the history of mankind, that we wish to form to ourselves some general impression of it; we would fain compare it with that state of society which we ourselves are witnessing, and examine to what degree of physical and moral improvement it had attained. It requires also our especial attention, because this splendid period was succeeded in the course of a few generations by a very general and remarkable decline; and many centuries elapsed before the tide of civilisation began again steadily to flow, after having been so long upon the ebb. It can be only by an attentive observation of the Augustan age itself, that we can at all hope to discover the causes of the phenomena which followed it: and so perhaps to learn whether there is any just reason to dread their recurrence: whether the great improvements of our own days may at some future period be again cut short, and the full stream of knowledge forced back once more to its original and scanty channel.

No physical condition.

In order to arrive at any just notions of the physical condition of a People, our attention must mainly be directed to the state of property. Where the means of creating wealth are wanting, there must be general wretchedness; where it is inadequately secured, the means of creating it are crippled; where it is very unequally divided, the splendour of individual fortunes may often make us forget the poverty of the great bulk of the People. The physical means of creating wealth were abundantly enjoyed in the Roman Empire; as it possessed some of the most productive soils and favourable climates known in the world, with excellent water communication from one extremity of it to the other. The moral means of industry and skill were to be found in very different perfection in different parts of the Empire; but we know that all the useful arts were successfully cultivated; and that the luxuries as well as the comforts of life were to be procured by any one who was rich enough to purchase them. In some districts, in several Provinces, property was liable to very frequent assaults from the robber tribes who inhabited the neighbouring mountains; and in most of the Provinces, perhaps, the weight of taxation was felt as a serious evil; but on the other hand, the miseries of war were removed; and although the Government and its officers interfered greatly with the profits of property, yet the actual right of possession was secured by regular laws, and was rarely disturbed by the violence of power. But the great misfortune of the Roman Empire was the excessive inequality with which wealth was divided. We know enough of the splendid villas and magnificent establishments of the Nobility, and of the wealthier members of the Equestrian Order; but the lower classes of free citizens at Rome, were in the mean time supported, in great measure, by the largesses of the Emperor;* and after all, from the decay of agriculture in Italy, any continuance of stormy weather which detained the usual supplies of corn from Africa, Spain, or Egypt, threatened the Capital with a scarcity of bread. The fortune necessary to qualify a man for the Equestrian Order, was 400 *sestertia*,† (£3229.) and in the time of Augustus there were not four thousand citizens in Rome, exclusive of the Senators, whose property amounted to this sum; and there were only two towns in the Empire, *Gades* and *Patavium*, which could produce five hundred citizens who possessed it. And this is rendered credible by a speech ascribed to L. Philippus, who was Consul in the year of Rome 662, and who declared that there were not, at that time, two thousand citizens in the Commonwealth worth any thing.‡ In fact, when we read of the enormous riches possessed by some individuals in ancient history, by the Kings of Babylon and Persia at an earlier period, and afterwards by the Emperors and some of the great Nobility of Rome, we could not reasonably credit the statements which are given, if we did not consider that this splendour was produced by the vast concentration of wealth in a few hands, and that it is in no respect an index of the general prosperity of the People at large. The great number of slaves kept in opulent families, and the practice of employing them in various trades for the supply of many of the common articles of life, was a great injury to the class of shopkeepers, and even in the liberal Arts and professions, such as Architecture and Medicine, the high Nobility were so much in the habit of having Architects and Physicians among their own slaves, that the respectability, as well as the profits of the free citizens of those and similar professions were necessarily lessened. The miseries of one immense portion of the whole population, the slaves themselves, need not to be particularly dwelt upon. Where the slave market was so abundantly supplied as it was in Rome, the value of a slave, as an article of property, could not be considered very highly; and nothing but this selfish motive was likely to restrain masters in general from ill usage and cruelty; for the tendency of our nature to abuse absolute power, was aggravated in Rome by the utter indifference felt with regard to the fate of a slave, and by the want of some restraining and humanizing principles of morals. Something of this same indifference extended itself also to the condition of the people of the Provinces, and subjected them

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

* Strabo was a native of *Amasea*, in *Pontus*; Dionysius was of *Halicarnassus*, in *Caria*; Appian, of *Alexandria*; Lucian, of *Samosata*, in *Comagene*; Diodorus, of *Sicily*. We hardly remember, indeed, any of the later Greek writers, except Plutarch, who was properly a native of Greece.

* Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 41, 42. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. ii. c. 87. lib. iv. c. 6. *Histor.* lib. iv. c. 38.

† Pliny, *Histor. Natural.* lib. xxxiii. c. 1, 2. Horace, *Epist.* lib. i. epist. i. ver. 58.

‡ Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. ii. c. 21.

often to a tyranny as insulting as it was oppressive. It is mentioned indeed, to the praise of Augustus and of the early part of the reign of Tiberius, * that the cruelties and exactions of the Provincial Magistrates were greatly checked by them; that the subjects of Rome were protected from the rods of the Lictors, and from confiscations of their Property. And Augustus was the author of one most important reform, by assigning to the Governors of Provinces a certain fixed salary,† instead of allowing them, according to the old practice, to lay an arbitrary charge upon the inhabitants for the maintenance of themselves and their establishment. Yet the mere ordinary administration of justice towards the provincials was, at the best, harsh and summary;‡ and it was, perhaps, rendered more so by the strong contrast between their condition and that of a Roman citizen, whose liberty even yet was fenced round against all subordinate tyranny by the jealous laws of the old Commonwealth.

If we regard the effects of the political Constitution of the Empire in another light, it will lead us by an easy transition from the physical to the moral condition of the People. It may be doubted, whether all the improvements of modern civilisation could diffuse life and activity through so vast a body as was now united under the government of Augustus. Much less was this actually accomplished, without an established conveyance for letters, without public carriages for travellers, and without circulation of newspapers. The Romans had excellent roads, it is true, as the Persians had had before them; and, like the Persians, they had relays of horses placed at certain distances, for the convenience of forwarding couriers, or other officers of the Government. But these were of no benefit to the common traveller, who was obliged to find the means of conveyance for himself,§ and who was forced to limit his day's journey by the distance which could be performed by the same horses. Add to this, that the difference of language between the eastern and western Provinces, created a barrier between them, which at all times was an obstacle to their perfect union, and at a later period rendered their separation easy and natural. Those countries which were most remote from the Capital, lost all the advantages of independent Government, and their inhabitants were brought up to a condition of unavoidable helplessness; while at the same time their imperfect intercourse with the heart of the Empire, prevented them from deriving from it their due portion of nourishment; or from receiving any adequate return for the wealth and industry which were continually drawn from them to Rome.

Of the intellectual state of the Empire.

Meanwhile a taste for literature was becoming fashionable in the western Provinces, as it had been long in the eastern; and we have seen that the cities of Gaul were in the habit of hiring Greek Sophists for the public instruction of their people. But the expensiveness and consequent rarity of books was an invincible obstacle to the general diffusion of knowledge. It is mentioned of one of the literary men of these times,* that he had read in the Province of *Syria*, a great number of the works of an earlier period, which continued to be known there, because they were not superseded, as at Rome, by the multitude of modern publications. And Horace speaks of his works being carried into Spain and Africa only as wrapping-paper for merchandize,† when they had lost their popularity at Rome. The consequence of this state of things was, that men of literature formed a distinct profession in the Empire, which was followed for the sake of deriving from it a means of subsistence; but that the bulk of the people were left in a very general ignorance. What has been preserved to us of the writings of these times, has proceeded mostly from men who lived by their pen, or by giving instructions to their pupils; not from persons conversant with the business of actual life, from statesmen and soldiers, or men of independent fortune, such as were Cicero, Cæsar, and the elder Cato; or such as was Tacitus a few generations later. Hence the total want of intelligent books of travels, and the low state of experimental philosophy and political economy. The study of words, however dignified by the titles of *Grammatica* and *Rhetorica*, was but a poor education for any man; yet to this an excessive attention was directed, and youth were taught to admire the purity of a writer's style, or the musical arrangement of his sentences, instead of observing the value of his facts, or the wisdom of his opinions. Oratory in particular, which in the best days of Greece and Rome had been far too highly appreciated, was now become a worthless study, and a mere waste of time and ingenuity, since the practical occasions for its exercise were at an end. It is therefore to us no wonder at all, that when all kinds of public disasters assailed the Empire, the fair show of knowledge, which had just gilded the surface of the Augustan age, should have been utterly worn away. Separated as it was from the habits and concerns of the practical part of the community, it died away with the patronage and general tranquillity which had fostered it. It was but a rich man's luxury, which they who were hourly trembling for their lives, had no leisure to care for. For after all, if we look at the most famous writers of the Augustan age, of what description shall we find them? The highest eminence which they attained was in Poetry; yet even in this it is an excellence most suited to an artificial age, and not perhaps the best suited to win the ears of the people at large when literature was no longer in fashion. In History the famous work of Livy is below mediocrity;‡ and the reputation which it has enjoyed is the best

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iv. c. 6.
† Dion Cassius, lib. liii. p. 506.
‡ See *Acts*, ch. xvi. ver. 22. 37. ch. xx. ver. 24.

§ ——— *Nunc mihi curto*
Ire licet Mulo, vel, si libet, usque Tarentum;
Mantica cui lumbos onere ulceret, atque eques armos.
Horace, *Sat.* lib. i. *Sat.* vi. ver. 104.

No man would have talked of going to Tarentum on his dock-tailed mule, carrying saddle-bags, if he could have had the convenience of a good coach, to transport him in half the time, and with infinitely greater ease and comfort.

* Marcus Valerius Probus, of Berytus. Suetonius, *de Illustribus Grammaticis*, c. 24.
† *Epist.* lib. i. epist. xx. ver. 11.
‡ A tolerable specimen of Livy's manifold deficiencies, arranged under the several heads of "Ignorance of the old Constitution," "Ignorance of Military Topography," "Want of Judgment," "Carelessness," &c. with numerous instances of each, is given by Wachsmuth, in his *Early History of the Roman State*, p. 33, *et seq.*

proof of the long continued and pernicious influence of the schools of Grammar and Rhetoric, which taught men to admire eloquent language, and to consider it as a compensation for ignorance and shallowness of judgment. In morals, in political science, in all the various branches of experimental Philosophy, what do we owe to the Augustan age? 'But happily for mankind, the wisdom of Providence was now preparing a knowledge the very opposite to that which we have been considering a knowledge as unpretending and generally useful, as the other was ostentatious and trifling; which was fitted for the real business of life, and was received by persons of every condition; which struck root as deeply as the literature of the Augustan age had been scattered superficially; which continued its substantial benefits through revolutions which laid every thing else in ruins, and which preserves to this day its indestructible power of beneficent activity.

But the mere intellectual advancement of a people is of little importance, in comparison with their moral knowledge of right and wrong; and whether the literature of the Augustan age was generally valuable or not, the Romans might still have possessed a good state of public and private morals, and therefore might have been happily circumstanced with regard to the grand concern of human life. The great questions of the end of all our actions, and the nature of our several duties, were canvassed by the Philosophers of every sect; and in the public lectures of those Philosophers, such subjects formed the principal part. When a parent, well versed in these inquiries, became himself the instructor of his son, he was enabled to give him a moral education of no mean excellence; and the young man who, in addition to the conversation and example of his father, received from him such a guide, as the great work of Cicero, *de Officiis*, addressed by him to his son, possessed, in many respects, a rule of conduct which required little further improvement. But neither were all parents Philosophers, nor were Philosophers the ordinary teachers of the great mass of the community. The common elementary schools of Rome, from which the majority of the people derived their whole education, were schools of reading and of arithmetic,* and of nothing else; for the masters were men of humble station, unacquainted with the writings of the Philosophers, and quite unable to venture by themselves into all the difficulties with which the chief good of man, and the nature of his duties, were then enveloped. Under such circumstances men's characters are formed partly by the influence of the society in which they live, and partly by themselves. Some virtues are always congenial to human nature in theory, however much selfishness may obstruct the practice of them; and these were often beautifully displayed in the lives of men of amiable dispositions, who wished to live up to the best of their knowledge. But unfortunately there are many vices also, of which the practice is far more natural to man than the theory is repugnant; and into these the force of inclination and the sanction of universal custom draw almost every one. It is in such points especially that an authoritative rule of life is wanted; which being once acknowledged, may save common men the trouble of making out their duty for themselves, and may lead them at once to the true practical conclusion without the risks or the difficulties of the previous inquiry. But in the greater parts of the Roman Empire, no such authority was to be found. In this respect the popular religion had utterly failed; superstition, according to the necessary course of things, was closely connected with, and encouraged a complete moral carelessness; and whilst the high and pure doctrines so often inculcated by the oracles and choral songs of an earlier period were neglected or scorned, the follies and sensualities of Polytheism continued to flourish even with increased vigour. The Oracles had lost all their authority;* a loss which Strabo ascribes to the influence of the Romans, who preferred their own national modes of inquiry into futurity, by consulting the Sibylline books, the entrails of victims, the flight of birds, and the phenomena of the atmosphere. But the change probably was greatly for the worse; for when the Oracles were in vogue, they were consulted not only as prophets but as practical directors; and however much we may be resolved to charge their predictions with collusion and imposture, there are yet specimens of their moral doctrine preserved,† which exhibit a purity and a wisdom scarcely to be surpassed. Nor did the Philosophers retain and communicate these sparks of true religion, when they were become extinct elsewhere. On the contrary, notwithstanding their many and great excellencies as expounders of the duties of man to man, they were all agreed in one maxim, which amounts to a complete practical atheism;‡ the opinion, namely, that nothing was to be feared from the anger of God, because it was contrary to the divine attributes that he should be the cause of pain to any one. By this doctrine they removed the greatest check upon wickedness which has been ever devised for it; for to the mass of mankind to say that God could not or would not punish, was the same thing as to say that he did not exist. It was a virtual denial of his moral Government, the only point in his nature which it greatly concerns his creatures to be acquainted with. Thus while Philosophy took away the best sanction of human conduct, and while those who could not be taught by Philosophers, were left to form their principles for themselves, or to pick them up from the opinions of the world, the morals of the people were in a state of great corruption. Of the sensualities which were universally practised, and of the excessive grossness of manners which naturally flowed from them the writings of every author of the times, and still more strikingly, perhaps, the paintings and other embellishments of the houses, which have been discovered at Herculaneum, offer proofs the most incontestible. But it is equally instructive and less disgusting to dwell rather on the entire absence of those virtues and feelings which operate with such extensive usefulness in the countries of Modern Europe. Charity and general philanthropy were so little regarded as duties, that it requires a very extensive acquaintance with the literature of the times to find any allusion to

* Horat. *Satir.* lib. i. sat. vi. ver. 72. *De Arte Poetica*, ver. 325.

* Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 1. sec. 43.

† See particularly, Herodotus, *Clio*, c. 158, 159. and *Erato*, c. 86.

‡ Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. iii. c. 28, 29.

them. There were no public hospitals, no institutions for the relief of the infirm and poor; no Societies for the removal of abuses, or the improvement of the condition of mankind from motives of charity. Nothing was done to promote the instruction of the lower classes; nothing to mitigate the miseries of domestic slavery, and far less to stop altogether the perpetual atrocities of the kidnapper and the slave market. The selfishness of human nature was thus spared its most painful sacrifice; and he who was most largely endowed with the gifts of fortune, was taught only to abstain from doing active injury, and to enjoy the good things which he possessed in a life of social and intellectual gratification.

Of the effect produced in the East by the residence of the Jews, and the Greek translation of the Old Testament.

But there was one part of the Empire in which a better knowledge had been slowly working its way, and must by this time have produced considerable effect. We have already observed that the Jews were widely scattered over the Eastern Provinces; and as they adopted the language which was most prevalent around them, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, commonly known by the name of the Septuagint, was the form in which they were most familiar with their Scriptures. Intercourse with the Jews, and an acquaintance thus gained with the contents of their Law, and of the writings of their Prophets, gave birth, throughout Syria and Asia Minor, to a class of persons who are called in our translation of the *Acts*, by the name of "the Devout;"* and who, without thinking themselves bound to conform to the national peculiarities of the Jewish worship, had yet acquired those true notions of the Divine nature and attributes, and of the duties which God demands of man, which are so largely contained in the Old Testament. The effect of this knowledge, on those who profited by it, was to produce the very virtues in which the world was generally most deficient,—devotion and charity;† and by these means a large portion of the people was in some degree prepared for the doctrines of a still more perfect law, which were a few years afterwards introduced among them by the Christian Apostles.

Here then our review of the state of the Roman world must terminate. Deficient as we well know it to be from the imperfection of our own knowledge, it will yet serve, perhaps, to show what were the most striking differences between the condition of society in those times and in ours; and to point out on how much less firm a foundation civilisation was then built than we may hope is the case now. When, however, we reflect on the point of time at which this sketch terminates, other thoughts, we confess, are foremost in our minds, the expression of which we do not feel called upon entirely to restrain. About fourteen years before the death of Augustus, Jesus Christ was born into the world, and in less than twenty years afterwards the first foundations of the Christian society were laid. Henceforward the Roman Empire acquires, in our eyes, a nearer interest; as a country to which we were before indifferent, becomes at once endeared to us, when we know it to be the abode of those whom we love. In pursuing the story of political crimes and miseries, there will be henceforth a resting place for our imaginations, a consciousness that, amidst all the evil which is most prominent on the records of History, a power of good was silently at work, with an influence continually increasing, and that Virtue and Happiness were daily more and more visiting a portion of mankind, which till now seemed to be in a condition of hopeless suffering. The reader, who has accompanied us through all the painful details presented by the last century of the Roman Commonwealth, will be inclined, perhaps with us, to rejoice in the momentary contemplation of such a scene of moral beauty.

Of the family of Augustus.

It now only remains that we give some account of the family of Augustus, and conclude this Memoir with some particulars of his own private life. We have already mentioned his marriage with Livia, the wife of Tib. Nero, in the year 716; and that he had at that time one daughter, named Julia, the child of his former marriage with Scribonia. As he had no children by Livia, Julia remained his only heiress, and the choice of her husband became a matter of great importance. She was first married to her cousin Claudius Marcellus, the nephew of Augustus by his sister Octavia;* and the person celebrated by Virgil in those famous lines of the sixth Æneid, for which Octavia so largely rewarded him. But Marcellus dying young, and without children, Augustus selected for the second husband of his daughter, his oldest friend and most useful adherent M. Vipsanius Agrippa. This marriage seemed to answer all his wishes, for Julia became the mother of five children, Caius, Lucius, Julia, Agrippina, and Agrippa Postumus, so called, because he was born after his father's death, which took place in the year 741. Caius and Lucius were immediately adopted by their grandfather, and assumed the name of Cæsar; before they arrived at the age of manhood, they were distinguished by the title of "*Principes Juventutis*," or "Chiefs of the Youth;" they were marked out as Consuls elect, to enter upon that office as soon as they arrived at a fit age; they were sent to the different Provinces and presented to the armies, as the heirs of the Emperor; their education was conducted, in great measure, by Augustus himself, and they were his constant companions at table, and on his journies. But all his hopes in them were marred by their successive premature deaths. Lucius Cæsar, when on his way to take the command of the army in Spain, was taken ill, and died at Massilia, about the year 754; and Caius Cæsar, who commanded the army on the frontiers of Parthia, having been wounded in Armenia, and returning slowly homewards towards Italy, died about eighteen months after his brother at the town of Limyra, in Lycia.† Meanwhile their mother, Julia, had been married, for the third time by her father, after the death of Agrippa, to Tiberius Claudius Nero, the son of Livia; but when Caius and Lucius Cæsar were grown up to manhood, and were in the height of their favour with their grandfather, Tiberius, for whatever reasons, thought proper to withdraw from Rome to

* Ch. xvii. ver. 4. 17. See also ch. x. ver. 2. ch. xiii. ver. 50. And the same word is used in the Greek, although it is differently translated in our version, ch. xiii. ver. 43. ch. xvi. ver. 14. ch. xviii. ver. 7.

† See the character of the Centurion Cornelius, *Acts*, ch. x. ver. 2.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 3. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 63, *et seq.*

† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 125.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13

the island of Rhodes; where he lived in the greatest retirement, and during a part of the time in a sort of disgrace, for the space of more than seven years. During his absence, his wife, Julia, was guilty of such gross infidelities to him, that Augustus himself divorced her in the name of his son-in-law, and banished her to the island of Pandataria, off the coast of Campania,* where she was closely confined for some time, and treated with the greatest rigour; nor would Augustus ever forgive her, or receive her into his presence, although he afterwards removed her from Pandataria to Rhegium, and somewhat softened the severity of her treatment. After the deaths of Caius and Lucius Cæsar, Tiberius was adopted by Augustus as his son, in the year 756,† and with him M. Agrippa Postumus, now the only surviving son of M. Agrippa. But Agrippa Postumus is represented as a youth of a brutal and intractable temper;‡ and Livia, to favour her son's interests, so exaggerated his faults, and so prejudiced his grandfather against him, that he too, like his mother, was banished from Rome, and confined in the island of Planasia: Tiberius thus remained the sole heir to the greatness of his father-in-law; but in order to point out the succession even for a more remote period, he was obliged, by Augustus, to adopt as his son his nephew Germanicus, the only surviving child of his brother Drusus, although he had at the same time a son of his own. Accordingly, during the last ten years of the life of Augustus, Tiberius was associated with him in the Tribunician power, and in the general administration of the Empire, and was clearly marked out as his successor; while Drusus and Germanicus, the two sons of Tiberius by birth and by adoption, seemed to ensure the continuance of the sovereign power in his family to the third generation.

Anecdotes of his character and behaviour.

We have said that M. Vipsanius Agrippa died in the year 741. Four years afterwards Augustus lost his other chief counsellor and faithful friend, C. Cilnius Mæcenas, by whose advice he is said to have been greatly assisted in the arrangement of his Government. But his power was now securely settled, and the various conspiracies which were formed against him at different times after the battle of Actium, were the mere efforts of individual revenge or ambition, and were all easily discovered and punished. In the case of L. Cinna,§ who had intended to assassinate him when sacrificing at the altar, he not only forgave his intended murderer, but offered him his friendship, and afterwards raised him to the Consulship; being resolved, it is said, to try the effect of clemency after having indulged so largely in cruelty, or being anxious rather to preserve that character of magnanimity which, since the overthrow of every enemy whom he dreaded, he might counterfeit with little danger. Various other stories of his moderation are recorded; his manners were affable, and courteous to all; he forbade, and probably in sincerity, that any one should address him by the name of *Dominus*, or Master;‖ and when the People wished to force upon him the ominous title of Dictator, he threw himself on his knees, and casting off his robe, and baring his breast, intreated them rather to kill him, than to oblige him to accept it. In these points the example of his uncle always served as a useful warning to him; and he also learned from it to avoid every display of state in the appearance and manners of his family, in the size of his house, and in the regulation of his establishment. Yet it would be unjust to ascribe to a politic premeditation all the popular actions of his reign. Good is in itself so much more delightful than evil, that he was doubtless not insensible to the pleasure of kind and beneficent actions, and perhaps sincerely rejoiced that they were no longer incompatible with his interest. When Valerius Messala was sent to him by the Senate, to confer on him, in the name of the Senate and People of Rome, the title of "Father of his Country,"* he was affected even to tears, and replied, "I have now gained all that I desired, Conscript Fathers; and what have I left to pray for from the Gods, but that I may preserve to the latest day of my life, this same unanimous love of my countrymen." He did preserve it, and even with an increased affection; in proportion as the remembrance of his former cruelties became less lively, and the period of general tranquillity which had commenced under his auspices was continually lengthening. At last, in the seventy-sixth year of his age, when, he was going to accompany Tiberius as far as Beneventum, on the way to Illyricum, he was seized with a dysentery, which at first attacked him but slightly, and did not prevent him from fulfilling the object of his journey, after having spent some days on the coast of Campania, in the hope of recruiting his strength. But on his return from Beneventum, his complaint grew more serious; he stopped at Nola, at the house which had belonged to his father, and in which his father had died; and as he became visibly worse, his wife Livia sent hasty messengers after Tiberius, to recall him instantly to the death-bed of the Emperor. Meantime every thing that passed within the walls was concealed by Livia with the utmost care; insomuch, that although it was given out that Tiberius found his adopted father still alive,† and had a long and affectionate interview with him, yet Tacitus informs us that it was never clearly ascertained whether these stories were not mere fabrications,‡ and whether Augustus was not in reality already dead, when Tiberius arrived at Nola. The same authority which related the conversation of the dying Emperor with his successor, pretended also that he actually expired in the arms of his wife, and that his last words were, "Farewell, Livia, and ever be mindful of our long union." It was said that he died about three o'clock in the afternoon, on the nineteenth of August, in the year of Rome 766,§ and when he had in fact a little more than completed his seventy-sixth year.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

His last sickness.

His death. U. C. 766. — A. D. 15

Augustus was in his stature something below the middle size, but extremely well proportioned:‖ his hair was a little inclined to curl, and of a yellowish brown; his eyes were bright and lively, but the

His character.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 53.
† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 126.
‡ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 3. Suetonius, c. 65.
§ Seneca, *de Clementiâ*, lib. i. c. 9, &c.
‖ Suetonius, c. 53, *et seq.*

* Suetonius, c. 58. † Ibid. c. 97, *et seq.*
‡ See Suetonius, and Velleius Paterculus.
§ He was nominally born on the twenty-third of September, U. c. 690; but owing to the disordered state of the calendar, it was in reality more nearly the twenty-third of July.
‖ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 79.

Biography. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

general expression of his countenance was remarkably calm and mild. His health was throughout his life delicate, yet the constant attention which he paid to it, and his strict temperance in eating and drinking, enabled him, as we have seen, to reach the full age of man. As a seducer and adulterer,* and a man of low sensuality, his character was as profligate as that of his uncle; it is mentioned also, that he was extremely fond of gaming, a propensity which he indulged even when he was advanced in years. In his literary qualifications, without at all rivalling the attainments of Cæsar, he was on a level with most Romans of distinction of his time; and it is said that both in speaking and writing, his style was eminent for its perfect plainness and propriety.† His speeches on any public occasion, were composed beforehand, and recited from memory; nay, so careful was he not to commit himself by any inconsiderate expression, that even when discussing any important subject with his own wife, he wrote down what he had to say, and read it before her. Like his uncle, he was strongly tinged with superstition; he was very much afraid of thunder and lightning,‡ and always carried about with him a seal skin as a charm against its power; notwithstanding which, in any severe storm, he was accustomed to hide himself in a chamber in the centre of his house, to be as much out of the way of it as possible; add to which, he was a great observer of dreams, and of lucky and unlucky days. He was totally destitute of military talent; but in every species of artful policy, in clearly seeing, and steadily and dispassionately following his own interest, and in turning to his own advantage all the weaknesses of others, his ability, if so it may be called, has been rarely equalled. His deliberate cruelty, his repeated treachery, and sacrifice of every duty and every feeling to the purposes of his ambition, have been sufficiently shown in the course of this narrative. But it was his good fortune, for the last forty years of his life, to be placed in circumstances in which he had no longer any temptation to the same kind of wickedness; and thus it has happened that he whose crimes fitted him to rank with Marius or Sylla, with Nero or with Domitian, has been loaded with praises as a benefactor to his species, and his name has passed into a proverb as a promoter of peace, and a general patron of literature and of civilisation.

Caius Octavius Cæsar Augustus. From U. C. 722. to 766. — A. C. 32. to A. D. 13.

* Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 69, 71.
† Ibid. c. 68, *et seq.* ‡ Ibid. c. 90.

HORACE.—LATIN POETRY.

LIVIUS ANDRONICUS .. FLOURISHED ABOUT	U. C.	520.
NÆVIUS	U. C.	
ENNIUS	U. C.	515—585.
PLAUTUS	U. C.	550.
CÆCILIUS	U. C.	580.
AFRANIUS	U. C.	
TERENCE	U. C.	
PACUVIUS	U. C.	534—624.
ATTIUS	U. C.	600.
LUCILIUS	U. C.	630.
LUCRETIUS	U. C.	670.
CATULLUS	U. C.	
THE AUGUSTAN AGE	U. C.	700—766.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

THE history of Latin Poetry presents a phenomenon in literature wholly without parallel. The Romans were, from their origin, a people of activity and intelligence, of strong passions, and romantic patriotism; and their history and early fictions are so crowded with Poetical incident, that some writers have not scrupled to assert that the great Historian who records them, assumed heroic ballads for the basis of his history. Yet, unlike many nations less favourably circumstanced, they remained for five centuries without a Poet. Even when the Muse of Greece had unveiled to them her awful and dazzling beauties, they seemed less to catch the *flame* of Poetry than to learn the *art*, and to consider their compositions excellent, only in proportion as they were excellent imitations. In their admiration of the beautiful picture which the Grecian genius had produced, they lost sight of the great original, Nature; and their compositions accordingly, present, in general, correctness and precision, but are destitute of that life, light, and colouring which the presence of Nature alone can awaken on the canvas. The most original of all their Poets, whose life, as best illustrative of this subject, we have selected to treat more particularly, himself recommends, as indispensable to the Poet, the most unremitting study of the Greek writers, as of perfect and infallible models;* and his own practice abundantly evinces the sincerity of his respect for the precept. Overlooking the real peculiarities of his own original genius, Horace himself entertained no higher idea of originality than to make it consist in the introduction of a new form of Poetry from Greece: and affected on this ground to despise, as a servile herd of imitators, those who only copied for the second or third time.† Indeed an imitator, as the Romans understood the word, only implied one who imitated Latin authors; the imitation of Greek in no way detracting, in their ideas, from the originality of a composition, but rather being, in some respect at least, implied in its excellence.

It is very seldom that we can hope to associate so closely the Biographical and Historical parts of an article as in the present instance. Horace has left us in his writings complete materials for his own Biography; and his life was so entirely passed with Augustus, Mæcenas, and the Poets his contemporaries, that its history is, in itself, the best commentary on the literary transactions of that brilliant period. He is, perhaps, the best Historian also of his country's Poetry; his sketches, it is true, are concise and incidental; but the outline is unbroken, and we have good reason to believe that it is correct. The object, therefore, of the following memoir will be to fill up this outline as accurately as possible, and to trace separately the progress of each department of Poetical literature among the Romans, till the consummation of its perfection in the age of Horace.

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D 13.

The beginnings of the Roman State were unfavourable to literary pursuits of any kind. Plutarch* and Dionysius of Halicarnassus† indeed tell us that Romulus was educated at Gabii in Greek literature and science; but this is extremely improbable; and, independently of the improbability of the story, most certain it is that nothing resembling the effects of education in a Prince was visible either in his own conduct or in the character of his subjects. On the contrary we learn from Dionysius,‡ that he committed the cultivation of sedentary and (what he called) *illiberal* arts to slaves and foreigners; and "such employments," adds the Historian, "were long held in contempt by the Romans, whose only occupations were agriculture and war." Yet a specimen of the Poetry, if it deserve the name, of his day, has descended to us in the Hymn of the *Fratres Arvales;* a College of priests instituted by the founder of Rome for the purpose of perambulating the fields in Spring, and of imploring, with religious ceremonies, a blessing on the harvest. This most curious monument of Roman antiquity was discovered inscribed on a stone in opening the foundations of the sacristy at St. Peter's in the year 1778. It is thus given by Eustace:‖

Hymn of the Fratres Arvales.

* Hor. *Poet.* 268.
† Lib. i. epis. xix. v. 19, *et quæ seq.*

* *In Romulo.* † *Antiquitat. Rom.* lib. i. c. 84.
‡ *Antiquitat. Rom.* lib. ii. c. 28.
‖ *Class. Tour,* 4to. edit. vol. ii. c. 10.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

ENOSLASES IVVATE
NEVE LVER VEMARMAR SINCVRRER EIN PLEORES
SATVR FVFERE MARS LIMEN SALISTA BERBER
SEMVNES ALTERNEI ADVOCAPIT CONCTOS
ENOS MARMOR IVVATO
TRIVMPE TRIVMPE TRIVMPE.

Various arrangements and interpretations of this singular document have been proposed. It appears that the first word should be divided into *Enos Lases*; and "*sincurrer*" into *sin currer*. The interpretations are, as might be expected, unsatisfactory and discordant. We subjoin that of Lanzi: "*Nos, Lares, juvate; neve luerem, Mamars, sinas incurrere in flores. Ador fieri, Mars;* (λύμαν) *pestem maris siste, Mars. Semones alterni advocate cunctos. Nos, Mamuri, juvato. Triumphe, Triumphe, Triumphe.*" Although this interpretation is liable to some objections, it is, perhaps, the most correct that has been given; nor does the subject merit, for itself, any very laborious investigation.

Hymn of the Salii.

The ferocious spirit of the Government of Romulus was, in some degree, mitigated by his pacific successor; still, however, nothing deserving the name of Poetry appeared. The *Salii*, priests appointed by Numa to guard the *ancilia*, or sacred shields, one of which was supposed to have fallen from heaven, and on which the safety of the Roman State was imagined to depend, sang a rude carol, a few words of which have been preserved to us by Varro;* and although, in the time of Horace, antiquaries professed to understand and admire it, the assurance of the Poet that it was unintelligible to him may reasonably console us for its loss,† and may humble our confidence in our ability to decypher the isolated wrecks which time has spared of those barbarous ages.‡ The Triumphal songs, of which frequent mention is made by Livy,§ appear to have been merely the rude, extemporaneous effusions of military licence amidst the hilarity of a Triumph, and never to have been considered in the light of compositions; and the style and nature of the sacred Hymns may be sufficiently gathered from what has just been said concerning those of Romulus and Numa. Cicero informs us,‖ out of Cato's "*Origines*," that it was the custom of the Romans, many ages before the time even of that Philosopher, to commemorate the valiant or virtuous achievements of their countrymen in songs, accompanied on the flute, in their entertainments; and on one occasion he regrets the loss of these ballads. But how far there was any real cause of regret, we may tolerably well estimate from what is actually known of the state of Roman Poetry when it first had any sensible existence, and when it was sufficiently bald, though formed on the perfect models of Greece. So little groundwork is there for the theories of Schlegel and Niebuhr,¶ that the exploits of the Roman worthies were contained in a series of rhapsodies, and much less that they formed the subject of a regular Epic poem. It was, most probably, this rude kind of ballad, sung at harvest homes and other rustic festivals, which gave rise to that law of the twelve tables, which Cicero alludes to in order to show that the early ages of Rome were not so totally destitute of cultivation as was generally believed.* "*Si quis pipulo accentassit, carmenve condiit, quod infamiam faxit flagitiumve alteri, fuste feritor.*" The following is Horace's account of the rise and progress of this species of poetry:†

Horace, Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13. Fescennine carols.

"*Agricolæ prisci, fortes, parvoque beati,*
Condita post frumenta, levantes tempore festo
Corpus, et ipsum animum spe finis dura ferentem,
Cum sociis operum, pueris, et conjuge fidâ,
Tellurem porco, Sylvanum lacte piabant,
Floribus et vino Genium memorem brevis ævi.
Fescennina per hunc inventa licentia morem
Versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit;
Libertasque recurrentes accepta per annos
Lusit amabiliter, donec jam sævus apertam
In rabiem verti cœpit jocus, et per honestas
Ire domos, impunè minax: doluere cruento
Dente lacessiti; fuit intactis quoque cura
Conditione super communi: quinetiam lex
Pœnaque lata, malo quæ nollet carmine quenquam
Describi. Vertere modum, formidine fustis
Ad bene dicendum delectandumque redacti."

In the three hundred and ninety second year of the city, and in the Consulship of C. Sulpitius Peticus and C. Licinius Stolo, a pestilence raged in Rome.‡ The Senate, after exhausting their whole ritual of superstitions without success, had recourse to that nation from which they obtained almost all their sacred rites and all their arts of divination;—Etruria. It was then that scenic entertainments, (*ludi scenici*) for dramatic they could not be called, were first exhibited in Rome. Poetry had so little connection with these, that they did not so much as embrace dumb show, but consisted merely of dances to the flute. The Roman youth were pleased with these exhibitions, and imitated them, accompanying the action with raillery. The Fescennine carols, (so called from *Fescennium*, a town of Etruria) which were, for the most part as scurrilous and obscene as they were rude and inharmonious, and which seem to have borne great analogy to the Greek phallics, sank into disrepute, or were only retained as part of nuptial ceremonies, on which they long remained faithful attendants. Frequent repetition advanced the scenic exercises of the Romans to their first essay towards a regular production, which was called a *Satura*, and was accompanied with appropriate music. Ludi Scenici.

The derivation of this word has been a point of controversy with the learned. Not to mention any other authors who have treated it, the Scaligers are divided on it. The word is written variously in MSS. of authority: *Satura, satyra, satira.* Some derive it from the "*lanx satura*," a dish of various kinds of fruit, and suppose it to mean an olio; and in proof of their etymology they adduce the "*leges saturæ*,"§ which treated on several subjects; *satira*, as they say, being only a more modern orthography of *satura*, as "*maximus*" for the more ancient form "*maximus*."‖ Others, who contend that the true orthography is *satyra*, derive it from σάτυρος, and make it somewhat analogous to the early *satyric* drama of Greece. If this be the true etymology, the early form would have been, most probably, *satura*, which orthography we shall, therefore, adopt. Satura.

Other Hymns.

* *De Ling. Lat.* vi. 1 and 3.
† *Ep. ad Aug.* v. 86.
‡ "*Saliorum carmina vix sacerdotibus suis satis intelligenda.*" Quint. lib. i. c. 6. § Liv. iii. 29. iv. 20. 54. v. 49. vi. 10.
‖ *Tusc. Disp.* i. 2. and iv. 2. *Cf.* Val. Max. ii. 1. 60. Cic. *Brut.* xix.
¶ Schlegel, *Lect.* iii. Nieb. *Romisch. Gesch.* vol. i. p. 178—354, &c.

* *Tusc. Disp.* iv. *Cf.* Hor. lib. ii. *Sat.* i. v. 82.
† *Ep. ad Aug.* v. 139. ‡ Liv. vii. 2.
§ Harris, *Philosophical Arrangements*, ch. 18.
‖ "*Medius est quidam U et I litteræ sonus.*" Quint. i. iv.

Whatever be the etymology of the name, the analogy of the thing to the Greek satyrics does not admit of doubt. We are ready to allow, with the great critics who have treated this subject at more extended length than we can do, that its resemblance to such a drama as the Cyclops of Euripides, must have been very slender: but it seems to have borne a close analogy to the satyric exhibitions of Thespis, and a still greater to the comic σάτυρος of the Greeks. According to Livy, the *saturæ* were dances mingled with raillery, which only differed from the old Fescennine carols in being determinate, in respect both of music and verse. Let us compare with this account what Horace says of the *satyri* of Thespis.*

> "*Carmine qui tragico vilem certavit ob hircum*
> *Mox etiam agrestes satyros nudavit, et asper,*
> *Incolumi gravitate JOCUM tentavit, eo quòd*
> *Illecebris erat et grată novitate morandus*
> *Spectator, functusque sacris, et potus, et exlex.*"

The old scholiast certainly considered these to be the same as the *saturæ*; for, in explaining this passage he observes: "*Ostendit* Saturam *natam esse* è *Tragœdiis.*" One distinction between the *satyri* and *saturæ*, is particularly insisted on; that, in the latter, Satyrs were never introduced; but this is more than can, with certainty, be asserted in a matter of so great obscurity and antiquity. Neither is the point of much consequence, as Satyrs were not always introduced in the Greek *satyri*; the resemblance between which and the Roman *satura* is acknowledged by Eichstaedt, although that author denies their connection, misled by the testimonies of Horace and Quintilian, which, as we have already seen, do not bear upon the question.

After the introduction of the regular drama by Livius Andronicus, the Roman youth, leaving the newly discovered art to its professors, continued their *saturæ*, connected with the Atellane plays, under the name of *exodia*. Ἔξόδιον or ἔξοδος was the name given by the Greeks to the part which followed the last μέλος of a tragedy;† whence these *saturæ* were named *exodia*, from their being brought on the stage after the play. A most striking point of resemblance existed between the *exodia* and the Greek satyric drama.‡ Dacier, who contends against their identity, observes that the actors performed in the same masks and dresses as in the play, and continued their characters; and cites, in proof, the following passage from Juvenal:

Exodia.

> "*Urbicus exodio risum movet Atellanæ*
> *Gentibus Antenoûs.*"

Where it is evident that a serious character was burlesqued. Similarly, where Suetonius says of Domitian,§ "*Occidit et Elvidium filium, quòd quasi scenico exodio sub personâ Paridis et Œnones divortium suum cum uxore tractâsset,*" he evidently refers, by Dacier's admission, to a serious play, in the *exodium* of which the satire alluded to appeared. Now this was precisely the case with the Greek satyric. Even after Tragedy had attained its zenith, it was customary for the poet to complete his τετραλογία with a satyric drama, in which the characters of the previous play were preserved. To this custom Horace alludes in his precepts to the satyric poet:

> "*Ne quicunque Deus, quicunque adhibebitur heros*
> *Regali conspectus in auro* NUPER *et ostro,*
> *Migret in obscuras humili sermone* TABERNAS,
> *Aut dum vitat humum, nubes et inania captet.*"*

And it is obvious that he is here writing to Romans, on a Roman subject; for, independently of the testimony of the scholiast above, he speaks of the *Tabernaria*, a species of *Roman* comedy, and makes a distinction between the *knights* and the plebeians:

> "*Offenduntur enim quibus est* EQUUS, *et pater, et res;*
> *Nec, si quid fricti ciceris probat et nucis emtor,*
> *Æquis accipiunt animis donantve coronâ.*"†

It is hardly possible to bring stronger proof that the Romans had a satyric drama, and that it was taken from the satyric drama of the Greeks; and if this were not the *exodium*, we have no account of what it really was. And thus we should have the paradox, that the Romans, who imitated every other species of Greek poetry, had left this untouched, substituting in its place, a composition perfectly original, and with a name perfectly Roman, although almost the same with the Greek appellation of this same neglected species of poetry.‡

Of the *Atellanæ Fabulæ* which next succeeded, we have spoken in another place, (xviii. 62,) and in the history of these productions and of the Satire, in order to preserve method, we have been obliged to advance very much beyond the time when the Romans first began to have Poets of their own. Before the time of Livius Andronicus, however, the Satire was below criticism, and the *Atellana*, if Poetry at all, was not Latin. Until the end of the fifth century, therefore, the Romans may be said to have been without a Poet, none of the compositions then extant entitling their authors to that lofty name. Cicero, who is as tenacious of the literary excellence of his country as any author can be, will not believe that the refined ears of Romans could have been closed so long against the witcheries of the Pythagorean Philosophy;§ but he can bring no better proofs of the contrary than what we have already mentioned concerning the early lyric poetry of Latium.‖ Indeed, he admits that the Romans *received*¶ the Art of Poetry late; an expression, which, though certainly not intended disrespectfully to the Poetical genius of his countrymen, sufficiently shows how differently the Greeks and Romans considered a Poet; for, were the passage to be literally interpreted, it would run, "It was somewhat late when we were instructed in the art of *original invention*," (ποιητικήν.) Cicero accounts for this dearth of Poets, from the repugnance which the people manifested towards them; and tells us that

* *Poet.* v. 220.

† Arist. *Poet.* Ἔοικε δὲ, μέρος ὅλον τραγῳδίας μεθ' ὁ οἶν ἐστι χόρου μέλος. *De voc.* Ἔοικε *et* ἐξόδιον, *videantur Lexica, præsertim Stephani.*

‡ *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* tom. ii

§ Suet. *Domit.* ix.

* *Art. Poet.* 227. † *Art. Poet.* 248.

‡ We subjoin the titles of the principal works in which the history and nature of the Roman *satura* are investigated or illustrated: Isaaci Casauboni *de Satyricâ Græcorum poësi et Romanorum Satirâ*, Lib. ii. *Dissertation sur les Césars de Julien, et en général sur les ouvrages satyriques des Anciens*, prefixed to Spanheim's French translation Dacier's *Discours sur la Satire*, in the second volume of the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions.* Josephi Scaligeri *Castigationes ad Manilium.* Julii Cæsaris Scaligeri *de Arte Poeticâ*, lib. i. cap. ii. Danielis Heinsii *de Satyrâ Horatianâ tractatio.* Vulpius *de Satyrâ Latinâ naturâ*, &c. Dryden's *Essay on Satire.* Brumoy, *Discours sur le Cyclope d'Euripide et sur le spectacle satyrique des Grecs.* Robortelli *liber de Satyrâ.* Heyne *de Satyricâ poesi Græcorum et satirâ Romanorum.* Eichstaedt *de dramate Græcorum comico-satyrico.* Cons *über die satyre der Römer und über Juvenal.* Flügels *geschichte der komischen Litteratur.* Rupertus *de Satirâ Romanorum*, prefixed to his Juvenal.

§ *Tusc. Disp.* iv. 2. ‖ *Ibid.* i. 1, 2.

¶ "*Seriùs Poëticam nos* accepimus." Similarly Horace, "*Seruş enim Græcis admovit acumina chartis,*" &c.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

even those minstrels above alluded to, who, according to Cato, sang the warlike achievements of their ancestors to the flute, could not have been approved by that stern magistrate, who reproved Marcus Nobilior for taking Poets (meaning only Ennius) with him to Ætolia. But the question really is, what was the cause which excited this feeling against Poetry? The only answer is, the unimaginative character of the people. A neglect of other literature might be accounted for from the political situation of the Romans; but contempt of Poetry is explicable upon no other hypothesis. The Celts and Scandinavians, the tribes of the Arabian deserts, even the Indians of North America, and the savage hordes of Australia, although without other literature, still possessed even regular Poetry. War alone was the Art in which the Romans excelled, and the fact of their inferiority in the Arts of civilisation and literature, is conspicuous through the dazzling veil of Poetic light which Virgil has cast around it, in pourtraying their military glory:*

> "*Excudent alii spirantia mollius æra,*
> *Credo equidem: vivos ducent de marmore vultus:*
> *Orabunt causas melius, cœlique meatûs*
> *Describent radio, et surgentia sidera dicent:*
> *Tu regere imperio populos,* ROMANE, *memento;*
> *Hæ* TIBI *erunt artes: Pacisque imponere morem,*
> *Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos.*"

Etrurian Literature.

The subjugation of Etruria by the Roman arms is considered by many as the primary cause of the civilisation which dawned on the Romans at the beginning of their sixth century. But it does not appear that this event at all familiarized the victors with Etrurian literature, with which, such as it was, even before this conquest they were tolerably well acquainted. Their commerce with the Etruscans was considerable; from them, as we before observed, they derived their sacred rites, and their knowledge of the pretended art of divination; and this, if it were not the only literature which the Etruscans studiously cultivated, seems to have been all for which the Romans valued an Etruscan education. "*Habeo auctores,*" says Livy, speaking of the four hundred and forty-fourth year of Rome, "*vulgo tum Romanos pueros, sicut nunc Græcis, ita Etruscis literis erudiri solitos.*"† Cicero‡ and Valerius Maximus§ tell us that the Senate sent youths‖ of the principal families in Rome to the nations of Etruria, to be instructed in their prophetic discipline. The Poetry of the Etruscans, as far as we can learn, was contemptible to the last degree; their ignorance of the drama, in particular, is sufficiently evident from what has already been said about Etruscan players in Rome. From them therefore the Romans certainly never derived their Poetry; and had they done so, the opportunities were so great and so numerous before the final conquest of Etruria, that it is most improbable that they would not long before have availed themselves of them.

Greek Literature.

Horace indicates the real cause:

> "GRAECIA *capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes*
> *Intulit agresti Latio:*" ¶

It was Greece, and Greece alone, that was equal to the miracle; she wound her chains around her barbarous conqueror, and held him in a slavery more glorious than his boasted freedom and universal mastery. But by *Græcia* we are not here to understand Greece Proper, but *Græcia Magna* and Sicily; which, being inhabited by Greeks, first brought, by their subjugation, the Greek writers to the notice of the Romans.

Horace. Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

The boundaries of *Magna Græcia* are not accurately ascertained, nor does it belong to us to attempt settling them here. But the south of Italy had for many centuries, been peopled with settlers from Greece, who retained and cultivated the Arts and literature of the mother country. In the 487th year of the city, the Romans obtained complete possession of this interesting country by the conquest of Tarentum; and the intercourse established between the two nations necessarily introduced literary pursuits at Rome. The study of poetry in particular had not been neglected by the Italian Greeks. Pythagoras and his School gave their Philosophic precepts in verse: Orpheus of Crotona wrote a Poem on the Argonautic expedition; Ibycus of Rhegium composed odes; Alexis of Thurium wrote two hundred and forty-five comedies; Stephanus, his son, was a comedian. Dunlop* says that this Stephanus (whom he calls Stefano, apparently taking this part of his work from Tiraboschi, *Storia della Lett. Ital.* lib. i., part 2. c. 2,) was, according to Suidas, the uncle of Menander. The words of Tiraboschi are certainly ambiguous; but Suidas, in the edition which Tiraboschi himself cites, makes Alexis, and not Stephanus, the uncle of Menander. "Αλεξις Θουρεος." "Γέγονε δὲ πάτρως Μενάνδρου τοῦ κωμικου."† Tiraboschi and Dunlop make Stephanus a tragedian on the authority of Suidas; but the lexicographer adds, "ἔσχε δὲ υἱον Στέφανον, καὶ αὐτὸν ΚΩΜΙΚΟΝ." Xenocritus of Locris wrote dithyrambs, Theano of the same place composed lyric poetry, and Nossis also of Locris wrote epigrams.

Magna Græcia.

Sicily.

The conquest of *Magna Græcia* was succeeded by an event which contributed in a still greater degree to advance the cause of literature among the Romans. Two years only after the capture of Tarentum, arose the first Punic war. The scene of this contest was not, as formerly, in the neighbourhood of their own territory; a circumstance which gave them leisure to contemplate the charms of the Grecian Muse at home, while they were every day unveiling new beauties in the theatre of the war, Sicily. In this country the flowers of Grecian Poësy had blossomed with much greater luxuriance than even on the neighbouring continent, and here was the cradle of the pastoral and comic Muses. It was here that Stesichorus is supposed to have invented Bucolic Poetry, and certainly did reduce lyrical compositions to the regular division of strophe, antistrophe, and epode. It was here that Empedocles "married to immortal verse" the "illustrious discoveries" of his "divine mind;" that Epicharmus invented comedy, which was cultivated by Philemon, Apollodorus, Carcinus, Sophron, and various others; and that Tragedy found successful votaries in Empedocles, Socicles, and Achæus. It was in Sicily that the mime was invented; or, at least, perfected; Pindar, Æschylus, and Simonides, had re-

* *Æn.* vi.
‡ *De Div.* i. 41.
† Liv. ix. 36.
§ Val. Max. i. 1.
‖ There is a controversy about their number. The copies of Cicero generally state six; those of Valerius, ten. Commentators, however, are generally agreed that Valerius meant to follow Cicero, although it is difficult to decide which text is corrupted, if indeed both are not. The number of the Etrurian nations was twelve.
¶ *Ep. ad Aug.* v. 156.

* *Hist. of Rom. Lit.* vol. i. p. 63.
† Suid. voc. Αλεξις.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

sided at the Court of Hiero I. and Theognis of Megara committed his precepts to elegiacs in Sicily. The Dionysii also were authors as well as patrons of literary men. At the time when the Romans were in Sicily, it is not improbable that Theocritus was living. On the conclusion of the peace with Carthage, in the year of the city 512, a part of Sicily was ceded by Treaty to the Romans, who had now leisure and tranquillity to enable them to inquire

"Quid Sophocles, et Thespis, et Æschylus utile ferrent."

Many of the inhabitants of the conquered Provinces came to reside at Rome, and imported their arts and cultivation; and from this period the History of Roman Poetry assumes a regular and connected form.

Early Drama.

In the Consulship of C. Claudius Cento, and M. Sempronius Tuditanus, the 513th or 514th year of Rome, (for in Cicero's time authors were not agreed on the exact chronology,*) Livius Andronicus first advanced the Dramatic Art from the *satura* to a regular plot. His surname evidently proves that he was a Greek, but whether of Greece Proper, Italy, or Sicily, is not known. His Roman name seems also to intimate that he was the freedman of a certain Livius; it being the custom of freedmen at Rome, to assume, on liberation, the name of their former master. It is most probable that he fell into the hands of the Romans in their wars in *Magna Græcia* or Sicily, as the Romans, at that time, had no regular intercourse with Greece. He is generally asserted to have been the slave of Livius Salinator, but Tiraboschi can find no better authority for this statement than the *Chronicle* of Eusebius; and as Salinator was not Consul until U. C. 534, he concludes that the master of Andronicus was another of the same family. Attius, the annalist, according to Cicero,† said that Livius was made captive at Tarentum, thirty years after the date usually assigned to his first play; but Cicero treats this as a gross error. The account which Livy gives of the introduction of the Drama is curious.‡ "Livius," says he, "being, as was then the case with all, the actor of his own productions; and having weakened his voice by being frequently recalled on the stage, is said to have obtained leave to introduce a boy to sing his part before the flute-player, and was thus enabled to perform his compositions with more spirited action, because he was no longer impeded by the use of his voice. From this circumstance," adds the Historian, "arose the custom of actors performing to the singing of others, and only employing their voices in dialogue." The works of Andronicus have perished; but if we are to judge by the opinions of Cicero and Horace, Time might have been more injurious to us. Cicero says they were not worth a second perusal;§ and Horace, in whose time they were regularly taught in the schools, reproves the undiscriminating antiquaries of his day, who exalted them above the refined productions of a more polished age: ||—

"Non equidem insector, delendaque carmina Livi
Esse reor, memini quæ plagosum mihi parvo
Orbilium dictare; sed emendata videri,
Pulchraque, et exactis minimum distantia, miror.
Inter quæ verbum emicuit si forte decorum, et
Si versus paulo concinnior unus et alter,
Injustè totum ducit venditque poema."

The names of the plays ascribed to Andronicus are *Achilles, Adon, Ægisthus, Ajax, Andromeda, Antiopa, Centauri, Equus Trojanus, Helena, Hermione, Ino, Lydius, Protesilaodamia,* (fortè *Protesilaus et Laodamia*) *Serenus, Tereus, Teucer, Virgo.* Beside his Dramatic works, he made a translation of the *Odyssey* in the Saturnian metre; and Livy tells us, that a Hymn composed by him in honour of Diana, was sung through the city by twenty-seven virgins, in the year 546, of which the Historian gives us no very favourable account: "*Illâ tempestate forsitan laudabile rudibus ingeniis, nunc abhorrens et inconditum, si referatur.*"* Some, on the authority of Diomedes,† the Grammarian, make Livius the first Latin Epic Poet; but for "*Livius*" we should read "*Ennius*," or "*is*," as is found in the best editions. Livius, according to Suetonius,‡ taught Greek at Rome; that is, translated Greek words and authors for such as were desirous to obtain a knowledge of the language; for the Art of Grammar was then unknown to the Romans. He lived till Cato was a "youth;"§ that is, till he had reached his seventeenth year, and therefore could not have died before the year of the city 535. But it is evident that there is no certainty of his having lived until 546; as the Hymn sung in that year might have been composed on some previous occasion.

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Such were the beginnings of the first epoch of Roman Poetry. We shall now proceed to discuss, separately, the progress of its different departments during that period, which lasted about two centuries, and was succeeded by the splendid æra of which the life of Horace supplies to us the literary history. Cneus Nævius, six years after the representation of Livius's first Play,|| became a candidate for Dramatic fame, and wrote, as well as Livius, Comedies and Tragedies. The names of the latter preserved to us are *Ægisthus, Alcestis, Danaë, Dulorestes, Equus Trojanus, Hesiona, Hector, Iphigenia, Lycurgus, Phœnissæ, Protesilaodamia,* and *Telephus.* His Comic humour seems to have partaken much of the old Satyric spirit, and like that of the early Comic Poets of Greece, to have been fearlessly and liberally directed against the leading characters of the State. The following lines, preserved to us by Aulus Gellius,¶ were applied, by common scandal, to the elder Africanus:—

Comedy.

"Etiam qui res magnas sæpè gessit gloriosè,
Cujus facta viva nunc vigent, qui apud gentes solus
Præstat, cum suus pater, cum pallio uno, ab amicâ abduxit!"

He had also, in a comprehensive line, insinuated that the family of the Metelli did not enjoy the Consulship on account of their own deserts, but in consequence of the evil destiny of Rome:—

"Fato Metelli Romæ fiunt Consules."

This the Metelli retaliated with a threat, which was afterwards executed on the Poet:

"Dabunt malum Metelli Nævio Poëtæ."

Nævius was imprisoned, and composed in confinement his two Comedies, the *Hariolus* and the *Leontes*:** and for the sake of these, which were a sort of recanta-

* Cic. *Brut.* xviii. *cf. ejusd. Tusc. Disp.* i. 1. Aul. Gell. xvii. 21.
† *Brut.* xviii.
‡ Liv. vii. 2.
§ Ibid. xviii.
|| *Epist. ad Aug.*
* Liv. xxvii. 37.
† Diom. *Gram.* iii.
‡ *De Illustr. Gram.* i. 1.
§ Cic. *Cato. Maj.* xiv.
|| Aul. Gell. xvii. 21.
¶ *Noct. Att.* vi. 18.
** Aul. Gell. i. 24.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

tion of his former lampoons, he was set at liberty by the Tribunes of the people. Gellius, in the passage from whence this information is taken, tells us that the Satire of Nævius resembled that of the Greek Poets; and Horace informs us that the popularity of the Poet was so great, and that his works were so well known, that copies of them were neglected as useless to perpetuate what was in every man's memory:—

> *"Nævius in manibus non est, at mentibus hæret*
> *Pænè recens."**

The readings and interpretations, however, of this passage are various. Nævius died at Utica, whither he had been banished for continuing his invectives against the Roman Aristocracy, about U. C. 550.

The lawless and unsparing satire of the Old Comedy, intolerable even in the licentious Democracy of Athens, was little likely to maintain a permanent ascendancy at Rome. The example of Nævius had not been lost, and his successor, Plautus, carefully evaded the misfortunes which it appeared would too surely attend ridiculing the public characters of the day. Some of his productions seem imitated from the later Plays of Aristophanes, or what is generally called the Middle Comedy of the Greeks; and in these, probably, public characters were covertly satirized. Others, again, are formed on the model of Menander, or the New Comedy. Plautus, as we learn from Horace,† was an imitator of Epicharmus; but we have no means of ascertaining the merits of his model, nor the extent of his success. When we read the Plays of Plautus, and learn from all antiquity how highly they were admired, we cannot but feel surprise at finding Horace treating them as works agreeable indeed to their rustic forefathers,‡ but perfectly obsolete in his own more polite and fastidious age. But perhaps this is more than ought, in fairness, to be deduced from the words of the Poet:—

Plautus.

> *"At nostri proavi Plautinos et numeros et*
> *Laudavere sales: nimium patienter utrumque,*
> *Ne dicam, stultè, mirati; si modo ego et vos*
> *Scimus inurbanum lepido seponere dictum,*
> *Legitimumque sonum digitis callemus, et aure."*

These words, although they are generally understood to imply the most unqualified censure on Plautus, in reality only charge his metres with ruggedness, and his jests with coarseness; the truth of which charges will hardly be denied by his most devoted admirers. The Comedies of Plautus are written in a style much too unfettered by the Aristotelian rules of composition, to command the entire approbation of critics of that School; but, though he is greatly inferior to Terence in felicity of expression and purity of language, his Dramatic flights, not unfrequently, surpass the loftiest of that most elegant writer.

Comic Metre.

The New Comedy of the Romans was not, in all respects, a copy of the Greek; the scene was generally laid at Athens, and the characters were of the middle station of life, as in Menander; but the artifice of a double plot was added, and the Latin Muse, in all other compositions severer than her sister of Greece, in the Drama allowed herself much greater licences, and these in Comedy, were almost unbounded. It was doubted in the time of Horace whether Comedy was a Poem;§ inasmuch as its subject and style are prosaic, and it only differs from prose by being metrical. Even in this latter respect, however, the difference is not very sensible, and the following passage of Cicero will show that the harmony of the Comic verse was not very perceptible, even in his time: *"Comicorum senarii, propter similitudinem sermonis, sic sæpè sunt abjecti, ut nonnunquam vix in his numerus et versus intelligi possit;"** and among the moderns, Erasmus, Scaliger, Bentley, and Faber, who have endeavoured to reduce the metres of Terence to rule, have been obliged to admit great numbers of exceptions to their theories. The Latin Comic measure, like its model the Greek, consists for the most part of iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters, although these are much less restricted than the corresponding metres of the Greek Stage. Thus the iambic verse admits in every place, except the last, wherein the characteristic foot is always preserved, the dactyl, anapæst, spondee, tribrach, pyrrhic, and proceleusma. The same feet are allowed in the trochaic verse. The only distinction is that the iambus is never admitted into the trochaic verse, nor the trochee into the iambic. A principal difficulty, however, arises from many words being scanned in Comedy, as, doubtless, they were pronounced in conversation, in order to bring this species of composition still nearer the forms of ordinary life. We shall give some instances from Terence:

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Elision of v. *Libēnī | de ēp'ōn | dī fuēt | pōtēs | tūe u'ān | ēst.* | Iamb. Trim.

ep'ondi for *vicendi*, and *fuēt* for *fūit*.

Elision of l. *Hūbēt ād | dūc ūt ī' | dās quām | hūbēt | vōcēs | fūrus.* Iamb. Trim.

ī'las for *illas*.

Elision of d. *Qu' intĕr | ĕst hāc | ă dŭc' ĭn | hāc Fe | cērit | ēā ēmen | tēm | thi | bi.* Troch. Tetr. Cat.

Qu' inter, *Qui' inter*, for *Quid inter*.

But even these rules will not explain every verse. Terence is more remiss in the construction of his verses than Plautus, and the traces of early rusticity which were said by Horace to exist even in his days in the literature of his country, are no where more conspicuous than in the versification of the Comic Poets of Latium.

Prætexta and Togata.

The Roman Drama did not strictly confine itself to Greek subjects. Horace commends those authors who had patriotically ventured to desert the beaten path, and celebrate national topics:—

> *"Nec minimum meruere decus, vestigia Græca*
> *Ausi deserere, et celebrare domestica facta,*
> *Vel qui Prætextas, vel qui docuere Togatas."*

These plays were Tragedies and Comedies respectively, of which the characters were Roman. Patrick, indeed, in the life of Terence prefixed to his edition of that Poet, contends that the *Prætextæ* were only Comedies of a more serious kind. This idea is very common, and is advocated by Gyraldus and J. C. Scaliger, (Gyrald. *de Comœdiâ*:—Scal. *de Com. et Trag.* cap. iii.) But, whatever they may have been called, it is certain that they had not the nature of Comedy. Gyraldus distinguishes thus between Tragedy and what he is pleased to call the *Prætextate* Comedy. *"Prætexta verò in hoc à Tragœdiâ differt, quòd in Tragœdiâ heroës introducuntur, in Prætextatâ Romanæ personæ, ut Brutus, Decius."* According to this account, they were Trage-

* *Ep. ad Aug.*
† *Ep. ad Aug.*
‡ *De Art. Poet.*
§ Ibid. *Sat.* i. 4. 45.
* *Orat.* lv.

dies on Roman subjects. It is true that the word *Togata* was used generally to express a Roman Play, in opposition to *Palliata*, a Greek Play; because the *Prætexta* was but the *Toga* of the nobler Romans, and only differed from the ordinary *Toga* in being bordered with purple: *Toga* PRÆTEXTA *purpurâ*. When, however, the word *Togata* is used specifically, it denotes the *fabula tabernaria*, or Roman Comedy; or, a higher class of Comedy than the *tabernaria*, but still purely Roman. Besides these terms, there were others referring to the internal economy of plays. A Comedy which contained much bustle and action was called *Motoria*; the reverse of this was called *Stataria*; and where the two were combined, the composition was called *Mixta*. The principal writers of the *Comœdia Togata* were Trabea, Lamia, Pomponius, Atta, Titinius, and Afranius. The loss of the writings of the last-mentioned Poet, which were committed to the flames by the intemperate zeal of Gregory I. is an irreparable calamity to literature. From the character which he possessed among his countrymen, and which has been so beautifully given in one line by Horace,*

"*Dicitur Afrani toga convenisse Menandro,*"

there is reason to believe that his Dramas were, at once, excellent and original; and it must have been curious to see what the vigorous mind of a Roman Dramatist could have produced, when, drawing from the great model, Nature, he continually corrected and refined his copy from the elegant proportions of the Attic Thalia. Stephens has collected a few scattered fragments of this author, and though little judgment of the Poet can be formed from them, some of them evince great delicacy and elegance.

We have scanty means of tracing the progress of Comedy between the times of Plautus and those of Terence. All the works of the numerous Comedians who flourished during that period, exclusive of a few fragments, have perished. Their names, and the titles of their plays, may be found in Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Latina*, lib. iv. c. 1. Cæcilius Statius is the most celebrated among them; Varro gives his plots the palm;† Cicero doubts whether he is not the best Comic Poet;‡ and Quinctilian and Horace bear testimony to his great popularity.§ Cicero, however, in other passages, condemns his Latinity.‖ But the best idea to be formed of Cæcilius is from certain passages of his *Plocium*, an imitation of the Πλοκίον, or *Necklace* of Menander, which Aulus Gellius has cited, together with the originals, for the purpose of showing the inferiority of this Poet, and Latin Poets in general, to their Greek masters.¶ If we are to take these passages of Cæcilius as a specimen of the method of imitation of the Comic Poets, we shall find it greatly to have resembled Virgil's imitation of Homer or of Theocritus. Whatever may have been the general style or character of the Comedies written during the interval now in question, it is scarcely possible to believe that Terence could, at once, have raised this species of composition to the perfection in which he left it, had not several grades intervened. Indeed, the very nature of Comedy had, during this period, undergone alteration; seeking no longer to please by the mere ridiculous, the Comic Muse had applied herself to the more worthy and Philosophical task of delineating ordinary life as it is, with its pathetic, no less than its amusing character. This appears from the following judgment of Varro:* "πάθη *Trabea, et Attilius et Cæcilius facile moverant.*" This is the style of Comedy which Terence has chosen to excel in; although in pathos he was held inferior to those Poets. There is indeed no violent excitation of the passions in Terence; but, while the writings of Plautus are studiously filled with jests and witticisms, it is seldom that Terence indulges in any thing of this kind, but is content to raise a laugh naturally from his subject; employing sometimes a grave and sententious discourse, which would have been quite incompatible with the Middle Comedy. The unities, somewhat loosely observed by Comedians of the old school, have never been violated by Terence, except, perhaps, in the *Heautontimorumenos*; and to this rule he has, apparently, made important sacrifices. The artifice of a double plot, occasionally found in Plautus, was carried to its perfection by Terence, whose skill in its management is in the highest degree admirable. Such, however, was the state of society at Athens, (the scene of the greater part of Latin Comedies,) where master and slave formed the only prominent distinctions, and such the severity of the laws which, both there and at Rome, guarded every avenue of Satire, that the Comedies remaining to us, those of Terence especially, present little novelty of character or plot. A parasite and a soldier, a courtezan, a gentleman and a slave, are the usual ingredients of the Drama; the interest of which usually turns on the dexterity of the last, and the catastrophe on one of the characters turning out to be a free-woman of Athens.

Terence.

A life of Terence is extant which is referred by some critics to Donatus, and by others to Suetonius. This uncertainty is of no small importance to the credit of the narrative. If Donatus was the author of the life of Virgil, he was so careless and so credulous that his historical authority is contemptible. We fear, however, that the internal evidence, as far as style is concerned, would fix the story upon him. The anecdote of Terence supping with Cæcilius, is quite *Donatian*, and cannot be true, from chronological considerations, if Cæcilius the Poet be meant; but some copies have Cærius. Similar is the relation of Consetius, quoted by the same author, that he perished on his return from Greece with one hundred and eight Comedies, which he had translated from Menander; when it is most probable that Menander wrote only one hundred and nine, and it is not certain that he wrote so many; and Terence had already imitated four of them. Part of the work is certainly the production of Suetonius; but whether this is only a short quotation or the bulk of the history is uncertain; Terence, however, is generally admitted to have been a Carthaginian, and to have been a slave at Rome, where he was early liberated. He was intimate with Scipio Africanus, the younger, and Lælius; who are accused, with no slight colour of probability, of having assisted him in the composition of his Comedies. It is extremely improbable that the exquisite purity and elegance of the Terentian Latinity should be the unassisted production of a Carthaginian slave; and Terence himself admits, in the Prologue to his

* *Ep. ad Aug.* † *In Parmeno. ap. Non. in voc.* Poscere.
‡ *De Orat.* § Quint. lib. x. 1. Hor. *Ep. ad Aug.*
‖ *Ep. ad Att.* vii. 3. *Brut.* lxxiv.
¶ Lib. ii. 23.

* *Ap Sosip. Charis.* ii.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Adelphi, that he received the assistance of persons who were eminently useful in the State:

> *"Nam, quòd isti dicunt malevoli, homines nobiles*
> *Eum adjutare, assiduèque unà scribere:*
> *Quod illi maledictum vehemens esse existumant,*
> *Eam laudem hic ducit maximam, quùm illis placet*
> *Qui vobis universis et populo placent;*
> *Quorum operâ in bello, in otio, in negotio,*
> *Suo quisque tempore usus est sine superbiâ."*

Similar is the passage in the prologue to the *Heautontimorumenos:*

> *"Tum, quod malevolus vetus poëta dictitat,*
> *Repentè ad studium hunc se applicâsse musicum,*
> *Amicâm ingenio fretum, haud naturâ suâ;*
> *Arbitrium vestrum, vestra existimatio*
> *Valebit."*

His Biographer tells us that Terence was less solicitous to defend himself against this charge, because he knew that the reputation of being the author of his Comedies was, by no means, unacceptable to his patrons. He was born, according to the same authority, after the second Punic war, and died in the Consulship of Cornelius Dolabella and Fulvius Nobilior, and consequently, U. C. 594.

We have thus traced Latin Comedy to its meridian; the causes of its decline subsequently will be more conveniently noticed when we advance to the Poetry of the Augustan age.

Tragedy.

While Thalia had been improving the first essays of Roman genius into regular Comedy, Melpomene was not without her votaries. As no regular Tragic production anterior to the Augustan age has reached us, we must be content to take our estimate of the excellence of Roman Tragedy from the opinion of their critics; the fragments extant not being in any instance sufficiently numerous or connected to enable us to judge of the merits of whole compositions. Many of them, indeed, breathe a spirit of the purest Poetry; but the diction is, as might be expected from the age, harsh and unmodulated. As in Comedy, so in this branch of the Drama, an early excellence was followed by premature decay. The best Tragedies, for the most part, had been written before the language had attained vigorous maturity; and there were causes to discourage Tragedy subsequently, which we shall hereafter discuss. Horace accuses the Roman Tragedians of carelessness and inaccuracy,* while he admits their Tragic spirit and the success of their sallies. Quinctilian speaks highly of Attius and Pacuvius;† and yet allows that their writings were deficient in the last polish, which, however, he considers rather the fault of their age than of their genius. The *Thyestes* of Varius, according to this author, was comparable to any of the Greek Tragedies; and the *Medea* of Ovid he considers a remarkable evidence of what that Poet could effect, when he preferred the regulation to the indulgence of his genius. A similar eulogy on these productions is passed by Tacitus in his Dialogue *"de Oratoribus."* *"Nec ullus Asinii aut Messalæ liber tam illustris est quam Medea Ovidii, aut Varii Thyestes."* The favourite Tragedian of Quinctilian, however, was Pomponius Secundus; whose claims to priority, while his learning and eloquence were admitted, were yet, it seems, disputed at that time.

We have already seen that Livius Andronicus and Nævius were Tragedians as well as Comedians. Ennius, of whom we shall presently have occasion to make more particular mention, composed Tragedies and Comedies; he obtained, however, his highest Dramatic reputation from the former. But it does not appear that they were in any respect more original than the Roman Comedy. The names of almost all the Roman Tragedies, preserved by Fabricius, (*Biblioth. Lat.* lib. iv. c. 1,) prove that they were translations or imitations from the Greek, perpetually

Horace. Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

> *"Presenting Thebes, and Pelops' line,*
> *And the tale of Troy divine."*

In their Tragic metres the Romans were much severer than in their Comic. They seem indeed, to have admitted the same number of feet in both; but the iambus occurs much oftener in Tragedy, and the whole verse is modulated in a manner which makes it always perceptible, and sometimes even harmonious. The difference which is thus produced between the Tragic and Comic *senarii* is even greater than that which exists between the hexameters of Virgil and the Satirists.

Attius and Pacuvius.

As far as we learn, the highest favours of the Tragic Muse were reserved for Attius and Pacuvius. The opinion of the critics of Horace's day,*

> *"Ambigitur quoties uter utro sit prior, aufert*
> *Pacuvius* DOCTI *famam senis, Attius* ALTI,"

is just that of Quinctilian:† "VIRIUM *plus Attio tribuitur; Pacuvium videri* DOCTIOREM *qui esse docti affectant volunt.*" Correctness and eloquence seem to have been the great merits of Pacuvius, and in these he probably surpassed all other Tragedians of his country. One interesting circumstance is connected with this Poet, his tragedy of *Paulus* was the first in Latin on a Roman subject. Who, however, was the hero of this play is not apparent. Attius also composed Tragedies, the subjects of which were *Brutus* and the younger *Decius*. Pacuvius and Attius were patronized severally by the celebrated Lælius and Decimus Brutus. Attius appears to have been intimate with, and almost a pupil of, Pacuvius. His first Tragedy was performed under the same ædiles as the last of his master.‡ He seems to have imitated Æschylus in the loftiness of his style and subjects. He is called by Ovid *"animosi Attius oris,"*§ and Paterculus attributes to him more spirit than the Greeks possessed!‖ *"In illis limæ, in hoc penè plus videtur fuisse* SANGUINIS." A similar expression occurs in Persius, concerning this writer, which, though it is not meant in commendation, seems yet to imply that his fault was turgidity: "VENOSUS *liber Attii.*" Two Plays are ascribed to him, *Mercator*, and *Nuptiæ*, which, apparently, were Comedies. We shall conclude our observations on the Roman Tragedy with two passages from its most celebrated authors, in which the reader will readily discover the seeds of many well known passages of modern Poets. The first is from Attius, and is preserved by Cicero in the second Book of his Treatise on the Nature of the Gods. It describes the astonishment of a shepherd who beheld "the first bold vessel" from the summit of a mountain, and is written in iambics:

> *"——— tanta moles labitur*
> *Fremebunda ex alto, ingenti sonitu et spiritu,*

* *Ep. ad Aug.* 164. † Lib. x. 1.

* *Ep. ad Aug.* 55 † Lib. x. 1.
‡ Cic. *Brut.* lxiii. § *Amor. Eleg.* i. 15.
‖ Lib. ii. 9.

"Præ se undas volvit; vórtices vi suscitat,
Ruit prolapsa: pelagus respergit; prosilit.
Ita, dum interruptum credas nimbum volvier,
Dum quod sublime ventis expulsum rapi
Saxum, aut procellis, vel globosos turbines
Existere ictos undis concurrantibus;
Nisi quas terrestres Pontus strages conciet;
Aut, fortè, Triton, fuscinâ evertens specus,
Subter radices penitus undanti in freto
Molem ex profundo saxeam ad cælum eruit."

The next is from Pacuvius, and describes the storm which assailed the Greek army on its departure from Troy. It is in trochaics:*

"Interea propè jam occidente sole inhorrescit mare;
Tenebræ conduplicantur, noctisque et nimbûm occæcat nigror,
Flamma inter nubes coruscat, cælum tonitru contremit,
Grando, mixta imbri largifluo, subitâ turbine præcipitans cadit;
Undique omnes venti erumpunt, sævi existunt turbines,
Fervet æstu pelagus."

Having concluded, for the present, our remarks on the Roman Drama, it may not be deemed impertinent to subjoin the review of popular opinion on its writers which Horace has transmitted:

"Nævius in manibus non est, at mentibus hæret
Pænè recens: adeò sanctum est vetus omne poëma;
Ambigitur quoties uter utro sit prior, aufert
Pacuvius docti famam senis, Accius alti;
Dicitur Afrani toga convenisse Menandro;
Plautus ad exemplar Siculi properare Epicharmi;
Vincere Cæcilius gravitate; Terentius arte."

Satire.

Satirical compositions have always existed in every nation; human excellences and infirmities are alike engaged in promoting their popularity. The Philosopher and the Moralist cannot review the follies and vices which degrade and pollute their species, without yielding to the expression of virtuous and philanthropic indignation, while the malignant passions are gladdened at the exposure of another's faults. We have already seen that in a period of the Roman history when every species of regular Poetry was unknown the "*malum carmen*," or libellous verse was prohibited by a statute. The scenic entertainments were the chief vehicles of these offensive compositions, as being the most public; and when these were improved into *saturæ*, the "*mala carmina*" were so far from being universally discontinued, that they were rather more systematically pursued. The introduction of the legitimate Drama turned them into another channel; and thus we find Nævius adapting the Satirical vein of the old Greek Comedy to the domestic occurrences of his day. The signal example which the Roman Aristocracy made of this Poet, checked, but could not long arrest, the current; it soon flowed with redoubled strength and impetuosity in another direction; and while it retained the old name of *satura*, with which, from long association, it seemed identified, it so entirely changed its form as to give rise to those expressions of Horace and Quinctilian which have led many critics to suppose that the old *satura* was a Roman invention. As the English word Satire is generally applied to this Poem, we shall, in future, employ it, to distinguish it from the *satura*, from which it differed materially in form and excellence, though possessing the same name.

To the Satire the Latin writers constantly assign a Roman origin,—"*Satura tota nostra est;*" "here, at least, we have drawn from our own resources." Yet when we come to examine the merits of this solitary pretension to originality, we find them admitting that the same sentiments and modes of thinking had been common among the Greeks, but then,—they had never expressed them in hexameter verse! such is the proud title to originality which the Romans acquired by altering the versification of the old Greek Comedy! The severity of historical justice itself might relent in favour of a claim so rarely made, and so weakly supported. Yet this compels us to assert that originality of the Roman Satire rests then on a very slender foundation, and may be traced to the αἴλλος of the Greeks. Lucilius is asserted by Horace to have been the founder of the New Satire; and, accordingly he acknowledges the earlier Poet to be his master and model in this species of composition. But although Lucilius was the first who composed a *regular* metrical essay on a Satiric subject, the transition from the Dramatic to this almost didactic form did not take place immediately. The Satires of Ennius and Pacuvius have not reached us; those of the latter indeed are only mentioned by Diomedes the Grammarian: but the accounts which ancient authors have left us of the Ennian Satire, prove that it was the rude, but natural, result of the arbitrary proceedings of the Aristocracy, which drove Satire from the Stage. "*Carmen*," says Diomedes,* "*quod ex variis Poematibus constabat, Satura vocabatur; quale scripserunt Pacuvius et Ennius.*" By "*varia poemata*" Diomedes does not mean, as Mr. Dunlop understands him,† a cento, or mixture of extracts from various authors, but a mixture of various kinds of verse; wherein dactylic, iambic and trochaic verses were promiscuously confounded, after the manner of the Μαργίτης of Homer. This interpretation is warranted by the few fragments which remain to us of the Satires of Ennius. They are not indeed, sufficiently numerous to enable us to judge of the nature of the Poems whence they are taken; but we learn from Aulus Gellius,‡ that Æsop's Fable of "the lark and her young" was versified in one of them, probably introduced in the same manner as "the country *mouse* and city mouse" in Horace; Quinctilian also tells us,§ that the subject of another was a contest between Life and Death. Gellius subjoins the moral of his Fable, which was written "*versibus* QUADRATIS," i. e. in trochaic tetrameters:

"Hoc erit tibi argumentum semper in promtu situm:
Ne quid exspectes amicos, quod tute agere possis."

Cicero‖ has preserved some verses of Ennius, of exquisite point, which, in all probability belonged to his Satires, and which we shall subjoin:

"Non habeo denique nauci Marsum Augurem,
Non vicanos Aruspices, non de Circo Astrologos,
Non Isiacos conjectores, non interpretes somniûm;
Non enim il sunt aut scientiâ, aut arte divini,
Sed superstitiosi vates, impudentesque harioli,
Aut inertes, aut insani, aut quibus egestas imperat.
Qui sui quæstûs causâ fictas suscitant sententias;
Qui sibi semitam non sapiunt, alteri monstrant viam:
Quibus divitiæ pollicentur, ab iis drachmam petunt.
De divitiis sibi deducant drachmam: reddant cætera."

If this spirited passage be a sample of the Satires of Ennius there is great reason to deplore their loss. But whatever may have been their intrinsic merits, their absence is materially injurious to the clear understanding of the merits of his successors.

If, however, the loss of the Satiric writings of Ennius and Pacuvius be unfortunate for the illustration of the

* Cic. *de Div.* i. 14. *Cf.* Id. *de Orat.* iii. 39.

* *Gram.* iii. 483.
† *Hist. of Rom. Lit.* p. 106.
‡ *Noct. Att.* ii. 29.
§ Lib. ix. 2.
‖ *De Div.* lib. i. c. xl. *et* lviii.

history of Roman Poetry, that of Lucilius's works is still more so for the general interests of literature. Careless and incorrect as this author was held by Horace, that great Poet has not hesitated confessedly to imitate his style and to acknowledge his superiority even to himself; an acknowledgment which no student of Horace will refer to diffidence of his own powers. In one respect, indeed, the resemblance of the two writers is remarkable, if the character which Horace gives his master be, in any degree, correct:*

> *"Ille, velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim*
> *Credebat libris: neque si malè cesserat, usquàm*
> *Decurrens aliò, neque si benè. Quo fit ut omnis*
> *Votivâ pateat veluti descripta tabellâ*
> *Vita senis."*

These lines perfectly describe the conduct of Horace. This Poet has given us a very elaborate judgment on the writings of Lucilius.† From this it appears that he copied the old Greek Comedians in every thing but metre:‡

> *"Eupolis, atque Cratinus, Aristophanesque poetæ,*
> *Atque alii, quorum Comœdia Prisca virorum est:*
> * * * * * *
> *Hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus,*
> *Mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque."*

Although Horace accuses him of inelegance in versification, it appears from the fragments of his writings collected by the laborious Francis Dousa that he rejected the mixed measures of his predecessors. The first twenty books of his Satires were in hexameters, and the rest, with the exception of the thirtieth and last, which was also in hexameters, were in iambics and trochaics. He is censured by Horace for being as careless as voluminous; the fragments of his works now extant, though numerous, are seldom connected; where they are so, they scarcely bear out the charge. The great Poet, however, seems less to condemn Lucilius than to deprecate the excessive admiration of his writings which was then fashionable among the literati at Rome. Of two faults Lucilius appears to have been clearly guilty; corrupting his native tongue with an inordinate admixture of Greek, and separating the syllables of a word by a harsh and unusual tmesis. The first of these was, absurdly enough, considered by his admirers as an excellence, and Horace has not been a little severe on the subject:

> *"'At magnum fecit, quod verbis Græca Latinis*
> *Miscuit.' O, sevi studiorum! quæ tua putetis*
> *Difficile et mirum Rhodio quod Pitholeonti*
> *Contigit?"*

Of Lucilius's philellenic propensities the passages remaining to us afford ample proof. We shall instance one or two, in order to show the validity of the grounds which Horace had for his censure. Cicero, in his third book *"de Oratore,"* quotes the following:

> *"Quam lepidè λαξεὶς compostæ! ut tesseruke omnes*
> *Arte, pavimento, atque* EMBLEMATE *vermiculato."*

And, afterwards:

> *"Crassum habeo generum; ne ἐγγραμάτερὸ tu sis."*

Another instance is not less remarkable:§

> *"Nunc censes καλλιπλόκαμον καλλιφώρον illam*
> * * * * * *
> *Compernam aut varam fuisse Amphitryonis ἑκατὶ*
> *Alcmenam, atque alias, Ledam ipsam denique nolo*
> *Dicere, tute vide, atque διὸ βάλλαβον elige quodvis*
> *Τυρὸ ebrotepiav aliquam rem insignem habuisse,*
> *Verrucam, nævum pictum, dentem eminulum unum."*

This style has been occasionally imitated by Juvenal, the professed follower of Lucilius. The last mentioned fault of Lucilius has been thus illustrated and ridiculed by Ausonius:*

> *"Villâ Lucani- mox potieris -acâ.*
> *Rescisso discas componere nomine versum;*
> *Lucili vates sic imitator eris."*

Lucilius, however, with these and all his other faults, was a great genius and a noble writer, if we can rely on the testimony of antiquity. Quinctilian,† while he studiously expresses his dissent from those who would place him on the summit of the Latian Parnassus, no less decidedly disclaims the censorious sentiments of Horace. Pliny and Cicero extol his *"urbanitas"* and *"styli nasus,"*‡ expressions equivalent to those of Horace:

> *"——— quibus* SALE MULTO
> *Urbem defricuit,"*

and *"Emunctæ naris,"* and Aulus Gellius calls him *"vir apprimè linguæ Latinè sciens."*§ The animated description of this Poet which has been left us by one who, indisputably, had a right to criticize him is in the memory of every scholar:

> *"Ense velut stricto quoties Lucilius ardens*
> *Infremuit, rubet auditor, cui frigida mens est*
> *Criminibus: tacitâ sudant præcordia culpâ."*

His acquaintance with the Greek Comedians furnished him with the means of polishing while it sharpened his weapon; and the protection which the friendship of Scipio and Lælius afforded him, enabled him to attack with impunity vice and folly, however well sheltered in the folds of the *Prætexta*: Yet was he no less the enemy of plebeian vice:

> *"Primores populi arripuit, populumque tributim,*
> *Scilicet uni æquus Virtuti, atque ejus amicis."*

What he considered Virtue we learn from a passage preserved to us by Lactantius,‖ for the purpose of cavilling at its particulars, although it is indeed a noble monument of heathen morality, and the source, as this father admits, from which Cicero derived the substance of his *Officia*. Horace himself might not have blushed to own it:

> *"Virtus, Albine, est pretium persolvere verum,*
> *Quis in versamur, quibus victimus' rebu', potesse:*
> *Virtus est homini, scire id, quod quæque habeat res.*
> *Virtus, scire homini rectum, utile quid sit, honestum:*
> *Quæ bona, quæ mala item, quid inutile, turpe, inhonestum;*
> *Virtus, quærendæ rei finem scire modumque;*
> *Virtus, divitiis pretium persolvere posse;*
> *Virtus, id dare, quod re ipsâ debetur honori;*
> *Hostem esse atque inimicum hominum morumque malorum,*
> *Contrà defensorem hominum morumque bonorum;*
> *Magnifacere hos, his bene velle, his vivere amicum;*
> *Commoda præterea patriæ sibi prima putare;*
> *Deinde parentum; tertia jam postremaque, nostra."*

It would be scarcely expected that we should give here any thing like an analysis of the numerous fragments of Lucilius which remain to us. Most of them are disjointed and corrupt; but many are written in the finest spirit of Satire: in them the private life and public Religion of the Romans, especially their idolatry and Polytheism, are ridiculed and exposed with the keenest sarcasm. Besides his satires, Lucilius wrote a comedy called *Nummularia*, to which according to Porphyrion, the old scholiast on Horace, that Poet alluded in the line

> *"Pythias, emuncto lucrata Simone talentum."*

---

* *Sat.* ii. 1. 30.
† *Sat.* iv. *et* x.
‡ Id. i. 4. 1.
§ Dous. *Rel. Luc.* xvii. 1.

* *Ep.* v. *ad Theon.*
† Lib. x. 1.
‡ Cic. *de Orat.* ii. Plin. *præf. Hist. Nat.*
§ *Noct. Att.* xviii. 5.
‖ *Inst. Div.* vi. 5, 6.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740 to A. C. 30.

He wrote also *Epode Hymns*, and a Poem called *Serranus*. All these works have perished. Horace tells us that the theme of some of his Poems was his friend, the younger Africanus, whose intimacy he cultivated when serving under him at the siege of Numantia. Of his life few particulars are known. He was a Roman knight, and was born at Suessa in the territory of Aurunculi.

Varronian Satire.

Marcus Terentius Varro is admitted, by the common consent of antiquity, to have been the most learned of all the Romans: and the titles preserved to us of his works prove the extent of his information. The doctrines of Moral Philosophy, though personally important to all, were too intimately involved with the abstractions of the Philosophic Schools to reach the generality of readers. Varro, whose profound acquaintance with the writings of the Philosophers and whose extensive general reading peculiarly qualified him for the task, undertook to array in a plain and popular dress those wise precepts for the conduct of life, which before had lain concealed under the cumbrous attire of dogmatic Philosophy. Such are the motives which Cicero makes him assign for the publication of his Menippean Satires;* adding however his own opinion, that, although the work was diversified and perfectly elegant, it could only be said to have entered on Philosophy, and though it had done much towards inciting to its study, it had effected little towards instruction. Much the same opinion, as regards the latter part of it, is expressed by Diogenes Laërtius of Varro's prototype Menippus.† As the works of both writers are now lost, we must content ourselves with Varro's own assertion in Cicero, that he imitated without translating him: the probability, however, is in favour of the superiority of Varro. Menippus indeed, in common with the Sillographers, seems to have introduced much more parody than even the earliest Roman Satirists, if his works did not wholly consist of it. In the absence of better information, the "*Μένιππος, ἢ νεκυομαντεία*" of Lucian may be consulted, where his style is caricatured. The Satires of Varro the names of which are preserved to us amount to one hundred and thirty-seven; the diversity of their subject matter may be gathered from the following arbitrary selection of titles, comprised under the letter A in Fabricius's alphabetical arrangement. *Aborigines, περὶ ἀνθρώπων φύσεως. De Admirandis, vel Gallus Fundanius. Agatho, Age modò.* Ἀεὶ Λιβύη, *vel περὶ αἱρέσεων. Ajax stramentitius.* Ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς. *Ἄμφων μετρεῖν, περὶ φιλαργυρίας. Andabatæ. Anthropopolis, περὶ γαστρὸς λαγῶν.* Περὶ ἀρχῆς, *vel Marcopolis.* Περὶ ἀρχαιρέσεων, *vel Serranus.* Περὶ ἀρετῆς κτήσεως, *vel Trihodites.* Περὶ ἀφροδισίων, *vel vinalia. Armorum judicium.* Περὶ ἀρρητότητος, *vel Triphallus. Autumedus, vel Mæonius.* Dacier in his Essay on the Roman Satires, has collected a few fragments cited by ancient authors from the Satires of Varro. But the best judgment to be formed of their nature, at the present day, may be obtained from the extant Varronian Satire of Petronius, the *Ἀποκολοκύντωσις* of Seneca, and the *Cæsares* and *Μισοπώγων* of the Emperor Julian.

With the exception of Varro, History furnishes us with the name of no eminent Satirist between the times of Lucilius and Horace. Publius Terentius Varro of Atax is mentioned by Horace‡ as having attempted Satire unsuccessfully, in common with "certain others." These were, perhaps, Sævius Nicanor, mentioned by Suetonius * as the author of a Satire, Lenæus, the freedman of Pompey the Great, who satirized the historian Sallust; and Valerius Cato, author of a piece called *Diræ*, which is still extant, another called *Indignatio*, both on the subject of the loss of his patrimony by the soldiers of Sylla, and some amatory Poems, of which Lydia and Diana were the inspiring Muses.

* *Acad.* i. 2. 3. † Lib. vi. 99. ‡ Lib. 1. *Sat.* x.

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

We shall now return to Nævius, whose Dramatic productions we have already noticed, in order to trace the progress of the Latin Epopœia. Whatever the ingenuity and enthusiasm of some adventurous modern critics may have conjectured, there is every reason to believe that this author was the first who composed a regular Epic in Latin. Nævius patriotically deserted the brilliant fictions and luxuriant imagery of Greece, to sing in austerer strains the triumphs of Duillius, and the sufferings of Regulus. His Poem on the first Punic war, of which very inconsiderable fragments remain, was divided into seven books by C. Octavius Lampadio, the Grammarian, as we learn from Suetonius. It is from this Poem that Ennius is accused by Cicero of having plagiarized in his *Annales*;† and even Virgil himself has not disdained to have recourse to the imagery of Nævius, as is observed by Macrobius, who informs us that the latter Poet describes the Trojans tost in a storm; Venus complaining to Jupiter thereon, and Jupiter consoling his daughter with the hope of future glories; all which circumstances are narrated in the first *Æneid*.

Epopœia.—Nævius.

The metre used by Nævius was that called the Saturnian. The name is supposed to be derived from Saturnus, and to be identical with Italian, Italy being called *Saturnia tellus*. But this metre is admitted to be of Greek extraction by Terentianus Maurus, and is proved to be so by Bentley.‡

Saturnian measure.

It is of little use, however, to inquire minutely into the laws of a verse of which so few remains are preserved, and which, it is evident, were extremely lax. So lawless, indeed, was its construction, that Attilius Fortunatianus asserted that he scarcely knew what verses of Nævius to select as a specimen.§ "*Nostri antiqui* (says he,) *usi sunt eo, non observatâ lege, nec uno genere custodito inter se versûs; sed, præterquam quòd durissimos fecerunt, etiam alios breviores, alios longiores inseruerunt, ut vix invenerim apud Nævium quos pro exemplo ponerem.*"

A Poem, called the *Cyprian Iliad*, has been attributed to Nævius: it was a translation from a Poem called *τὰ Κύπρια*, falsely ascribed to Homer. Hermann,‖ with great probability, imagines that the Grammarians, deceived by the resemblance of names, have ascribed to this author a work of Lævius, a later Poet, author of pieces called *Erotopægnia* and *Centauri*. As this Poem was written in hexameters, it is extremely improbable that it was the production of Nævius; there being little doubt that this measure was introduced in regular Poetry by Ennius, who first familiarized his countrymen with the Epic muse of Greece. That Ennius was the first who composed Latin hexameters, is no where, indeed, expressly stated; but Lucretius intimates that he had made some important improvement in Latin Poetry:

* *De Ill. Gram.* v. *et* xv.
† *Apud Gesn. Thes. Ling. Lat. voc. Saturnius.*
‡ *Diss. on Epist. of Phaleris.*
§ *De Doctr. Metr.* xxvi. ‖ *In Brute.*

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. C. 13.

" ——— *Qui primus amœno*
Detulit ex Helicone perennem fronde coronam,
Per gentes Italas hominum quæ clara clueret."*

Hermann, however, relies more on the derision which Ennius cast upon the Saturnian verses, and contends that this alone is a sufficient proof that he was the original importer of the hexameter. Although the logic of the philologist in this conclusion is scarcely equal to his criticism, there is every reason to believe that the hexameter was not used before the time of Ennius in any regular composition.

Marcian oracles.

It is possible, however, that, out of regular literature, the hexameter was known to the Romans. The Oracles of Marcius, according to Livy, existed before the battle of Cannæ, that is, not later than the five hundred and thirty-third year of Rome, or, before Ennius completed his eighteenth year. These verses are supposed by some critics to have been written in hexameters, while others contend that their metre was the Saturnian.

Ennius.

The Epopœia, which Nævius had successfully originated, was still more successfully cultivated by Ennius. This illustrious and almost universal Poet, to whom we have already had frequent occasion to refer, was born at Rudiæ, in Calabria, in the five hundred and fourteenth year of Rome. Silius Italicus† represents him serving as a centurion under Titus Manlius, in the war which the Roman Government carried on against its rebel subjects in Sardinia. In that island he resided till he was brought to Rome by the elder Cato; who, as we observed before, censured the Consul Nobilior for his patronage of the same Poet. Tiraboschi suggests a probable account of this inconsistency of Cato, supposing that he rather honoured Ennius as a warrior than as a Poet,‡ in which latter character he was patronized by the Consul. Certain it is that his military, no less than his Poetical, excellence, has been the theme of commendation; according to Claudian,§ he accompanied the elder Africanus in many of his expeditions: but this is inconsistent with what other authors relate of the disposal of his time during the campaigns of that illustrious Captain. He was also intimate with Scipio Nasica, and the two Nobiliores, Marcus and Quintus; the former of whom, as we have already seen, he attended in his Ætolian campaign: and the latter procured him the freedom of Rome. Cherished and courted as he had been by the great, he was left in old age and exhaustion, like the worn out Olympian courser,‖ to which he compares himself, to poverty and neglect. But his genius was of a proud and enduring cast; and in the sensibilities, the violation of which has so often proved fatal to the Poet, he seems to have but slightly participated. An exalted consciousness of the dignity of genius was a possession which neither years nor destitution could take away; and this so far supported him under the miseries of both, that he exulted in his independence on their power. His feelings are strongly pourtrayed in the epitaph which he composed for himself:

" *Aspicite, ô cives, senis Enni imaginis formam.*
Hic vestrûm panxit maxima facta patrum.
Nemo me lacrymis decoret, nec funera fletu
Faxit. Cur? volito vivu' per ora virûm."

After his death, which happened U. C. 585, his memory was honoured with a marble statue, erected in the family sepulchre of the Scipios.*

Horace—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766 — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13

To the severe injury of the literary world, time has spared us only detached fragments of the Poems of Ennius. The best collection of these is that made by Columna, with a life, and copious annotations. From them their author appears to have been what Scaliger designates him, a Poet of splendid genius; yet, though the veneration which the Roman critics, who called him a second Homer, entertained for this Poet, was the most implicit and unqualified, it is probable that much of his popularity among his contemporaries is chiefly referable to the novelty of the wonders which his Muse, opening the exhaustless treasures of Grecian poesy, disclosed. Ennius, however, arrogated to himself the title of Homer, whose soul he feigned to have passed into his own body, after migrating through that of a peacock; which most unpoetical metempsychosis has afforded amusement to Horace and Persius. Horace, indeed, is bold enough to tell the admirers of the father of Roman Poetry,† that the truth of his Pythagorean dreams is not always borne out by his productions. Yet it cannot be doubted that the Poetry of Ennius was, in general, lofty and dignified, although destitute of polish and ornament. The rules of elegant construction which critics have compiled from the practice of Virgil and Ovid, were entirely unknown to Ennius, whose hexameters exhibit nothing beyond the bare measure of that verse. The harsh elision of the final *s* is also of frequent occurrence in his extant writings.

Virgil has imitated no author more liberally than Ennius. It would not fall within the nature of this work to quote the several passages; but the reader, who is desirous of knowing how much the " Prince of Roman Poets " borrowed from the elder bard, may consult, in particular, the two first chapters of Macrobius's sixth book of the *Saturnalia*. The title of Ennius's great work was *Annales;* it comprised the history of Rome from its foundation to the termination of the Istrian war. The first Punic war was omitted, as Ennius himself affirms, because *others* had written it:

" ——— *scripsere* ALII *rem*
Versibus quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant,
Quum neque Musarum scopulos quisquam superârat,
Nec dicti studiosus erat;"

hence Cicero takes occasion to observe that he seemed unwilling to risk a competition with the bards he so much affected to despise.‡ Nævius was certainly pointed at in these verses. The *Annales*, as Suetonius informs us,§ were divided into eighteen books by the Grammarian Vargunteius, who recited them publicly; a custom which long prevailed in Italy, since we learn from Gellius that there was in his time, at Puteoli, a person who read the verses of Ennius to the public,‖ and who was called an *Ennianist* (*Ennianista.*) The cast which this Poem of Ennius gave to the Roman literary and civil character, was extremely powerful, and Seneca affirms¶ that Virgil was compelled to sacrifice his judgment to the prejudice of an " Ennian Public," (*Ennianus Populus,*) as this author calls the

* Lucret. lib. 1: v. 18. † Pun. xii. 393.
‡ *Storia della Lett. Ital.* part iii. lib. ii. c. 1.
§ *De laud Stil.* iii. *præf.* ‖ Cic. *de Senect.* v.

* Cic. *pro Arch. Poet.* ix. † *Ep. ad Aug.*
‡ *Brut.* xix. § *De Ill. Gram.* ii.
‖ *Noct. Att.* xviii. 5. ¶ *Apud Aul. Gell.* xii. 2.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Romans. To make an Epic interesting to this people, it was always necessary that it should be national; and Virgil, with all his art, was yet obliged to connect his Poem with the Roman fortunes. Even Ovid, in a work not altogether pretending to the flights of the Epopœia, felt the necessity of conciliating his readers by enlarging on the mythological and historical glories of the Empire. The influence and popularity of Ennius, therefore, long survived his diction, and Poets who contemned its rudeness and want of modulation, were yet compelled, by the strength of popular opinion, to reverence and emulate the grandeur of his genius, and in their journey to the Temple of Fame, to indulge in very limited excursions from the track of his steps.

The fragments of the *Annals* of Ennius are so numerous, and in general, so well known, that it would be difficult to select passages, and almost superfluous, to all purposes of illustration, to quote them. There is, however, a singularly beautiful fragment of his Poem on the exploits of Scipio, preserved by Macrobius,* which is less known, and which we shall here adduce:

——— "*Mundus cœli vastus constitit silentio,*
Et Neptunus sævus undeis asperis pausam dedit;
Sol equeis iter repressit unguleis volantibus;
Constitêre amnes perennes; arbores vento vacant."

Columna supposes that this Poem was written in hexameters, except the *proœmium* or introduction; as the few fragments extant are in that measure, Horace speaks in terms of high commendation of the *Scipio*:†

"*Non incisa notis marmora publicis,*
Per quæ spiritus et vita redit bonis
Post mortem ducibus; non celeres fugæ,
Rejectæque retrorsum Hannibalis minæ;
Non incendia Carthaginis impiæ,
Ejus qui domitâ nomen ab Africâ
Lucratus rediit, clarius indicant
Laudes, quam Calabræ Pierides."

Didactic poetry.

Ennius was also a didactic Poet, although so few fragments of his essays in this way are extant, that it is impossible to pronounce on their merits. One of his Poems was called *Phagetica*, and was a Treatise on eatables. But the noblest strain of his didactic Muse was his translation of Epicharmus, *On the Nature of Things*; a Poem which, apparently, excited the emulation of Lucretius, whose work was destined to obscure its fame.

Lucretius.

The Poem of Lucretius is that which forms the link between the old and new schools of Latin heroics, (we use the word as regards the versification,) between Ennius on the one hand, and the Augustan Poets on the other. It differs, indeed, from the didactic Poetry of Hesiod and Virgil, as it is occupied rather in stating and reasoning on Philosophical facts, than in delivering practical precepts. Still, it is strictly didactic, according to the derivation of the term. The Philosophy of Lucretius, as such, it would be irrelevant here to discuss; yet we may remark that its tendency was to suppress, rather than to kindle, the spirit of Poetry. The doctrine which removed Man from all connection with a higher state, which represented him, by nature, scarcely superior to the brute, and degraded by superstition; which regarded, with the severest intolerance, the most beautiful creations of Fancy, and which stigmatized, as unmanly and unphilosophical, some of the most amiable virtues of the human breast, could scarcely be expected to develope itself successfully in Poetry. Yet these disadvantages Lucretius completely overcame. His poetical studies at Athens, and a discriminating judgment, united, as is rarely the case, with a strong Poetical enthusiasm, which the cold and selfish theories of Epicurus, so far from suppressing, only enlisted in their active service, enabled him to perform his task. The object of Lucretius appears to have been two-fold; to introduce to his countrymen in the most alluring colours what he conceived to be the important, though repulsive, dogmata of Epicurus; and to polish and enrich the Latin Language; for which latter design his extensive acquaintance with the Greek writers, and the profound reverence with which he studied them, rendered him eminently qualified. With this view he adopted an antiquated style, as Spenser did at an analogous period of our own Poetical history; judging, perhaps, that the Language, taken in its youth, would be more flexible and susceptible of the character with which he wished to impress it, than in its nearer advance to maturity. On this account, although the harmony of the Latin hexameter is far from perfection in the lines of Lucretius, the language of his Poem is elaborately Poetical. He complains indeed of the poverty of his native Tongue, and the difficulty of applying it to the illustration of a subject so new to his readers as the speculations of the Greek Philosophy:

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

"*Nec me animi fallit, Graiorum obscura reperta*
Difficile inlustrare Latinis versibus esse,
Multa novis verbis præsertim quùm sit agendum;
Propter egestatem linguæ, et rerum novitatem."

But he has completely mastered this difficulty, and almost removed it from subsequent writers, by enriching the Language in a degree perhaps wholly unparalleled in the history of Latin Poetry.

Cicero.

Of the Poetry of Cicero, who followed Lucretius in his didactic career, it is usual to speak in terms of disparagement. It is, however, to be recollected that the *Phænomena* and *Prognostica* are translations, and from no very poetical writer. They were written by Cicero when very young, ("*admodùm adolescentulo*," Cic. *de Nat. Deor.* ii. 41,) although it is true that they were approved by him in his riper years. They afford a great contrast both to the inartificial versification and Poetic fire of his contemporary Lucretius. But the Poetic powers of Cicero are to be best determined from the fragments of his historical Poems; and these certainly do not entitle him to the highest honours of the lyre. It is, however, extremely unfair to cite, as a specimen of his general powers, that well-known line from a Poem on the events of his own time,

"*O fortunatam natam me consule Romam!*"

As well might we judge the genius of Ennius from a similar jingle:

"*O Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti.*"

Voltaire has fallen into the opposite extreme,* and, delighted with some verses of Cicero's *Marius*, which unquestionably are highly spirited, he pronounces Cicero at once "one of the first Poets of his age," and balances him against Lucretius; asserting that it was totally impossible for him to have been the author of

* *Sat.* vi. 4. † *Lib.* iv. *Od.* 8.

* *Prof. à la Trag. de Catilina.*

the obnoxious verse above quoted. The following is the passage of the *Marius* alluded to :—

" Hic Jovis altioni subitò pinnata satellos,
Arboris e trunco, serpentis saucia morsu,
Ipsa feris subigit transfigens unguibus anguem
Semianimum, et varià graviter cervice micantem ;
Quem se intorquentem lanians, rostroque cruentans,
Jam satiata animos, jam duros ulta dolores,
Abjicit efflantem, et laceratum affligit in undas,
Seque obitu à Solis nitidos convertit ad ortus."

Before we notice the works of Catullus, which supply the closest connection between the Augustan and earlier Poetry, we shall just mention the principal names which occur to us antecedently. M. Furius Antias wrote *Annales*, from which Virgil pillaged, if we believe Macrobius.* L. Calidius is mentioned by Cornelius Nepos,† as a most elegant Poet, and classed with Lucretius and Catullus: of his Poems we know nothing; but from this judgment it appears that they must have been extremely diversified. J. Cæsar wrote a Poem, called *Iter*, a Tragedy, called *Œdipus*, and a Panegyric on Hercules, as we learn from Suetonius.‡ C. Helvius Cinna wrote a Poem entitled *Smyrna*, which was much admired by Quinctilian and Catullus. To him Virgil is supposed to allude in the lines—

" Nam neque adhuc Varo videor, neque dicere Cinnâ
Digna, sed argutos inter strepere anser olores."

And the Argonautic expedition was celebrated by the Varro of Atax before-mentioned. We purposely omit Epigrammatists, as we shall have occasion to speak of them presently.

Catullus, unlike Lucretius his contemporary, wrote in the style of his own day; and, by the excellence no less than the diversity of his compositions, may claim honourable competition with most subsequent Poets. In management of the hexameter and in force of description, his *Peleus and Thetis* may be compared with the happiest efforts of Virgil; he bewails his brother with the elegance of Ovid, and the tenderness of Tibullus, and he has touched the lyre of Sappho with a hand only inferior to that of the great Venusian. In every branch of Poetical literature in which the Augustan age stood conspicuous Catullus excelled; and, had he been assumed as a model by all the Poets of that brilliant period, a greater resemblance to his excellences could scarcely have been expected than that which is actually found in the Augustan writers.

The Poems of Catullus have been divided into Lyric, Elegiac, and Epigrammatic; an arrangement convenient from its generality, but to which all his Poems cannot be with strictness reduced. He appears to have been the earliest lyric Poet of Latium, although Horace claims that honour for himself. Horace certainly was not ignorant of the writings of Catullus, as he has mentioned, and, perhaps, has imitated him; § and he must therefore have known that the lyric measures of Greece had been previously introduced. The meaning of Horace, probably, is that he himself introduced *some* new measures from the Greeks. The Sapphic measure of Catullus is, in one respect less strict than that of Horace; beginning, as sometimes in the Greek, with a ditrochee instead of a second epitrite :—

" Otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est ;".

but it is most probable that this line was never written by Catullus. Certain it is that it has no natural connection with the Poem of which it is usually considered part. The Ode is a most spirited and beautiful translation of a part of that exquisite Poem of Sappho, preserved to us by Longinus. In all probability, the remainder of the Poem, either not being translated, or the translation having been lost, has been thus awkwardly supplied by another hand: or perhaps it is only a monkish gloss, which has, in frequent transcription, crept into the text. The Glyconian verse was used, probably for the first time in Latin, by Catullus, in his *Carmen Sæculare*, and in his *Epithalamium* of Manlius and Julia.

In his Elegiac Poems, Catullus is very different from Tibullus and Propertius, and is still more removed from Ovid. The niceties of the Latin pentameter, particularly its termination with a dissyllable, had been observed by previous writers. Catullus has disregarded their example, and has copied strictly from the Greeks. Of this species of composition Horace observes,

" Versibus impariter junctis querimonia primùm,
Post, etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos :"

and the Elegies of Catullus are of both descriptions. The most considerable part, however, of his writings is the Epigrammatic division; not in talent, but in number. There is one, and it is the highest beauty of the Greek Epigram, which the Latin writers have never completely attained, and which is best described by a word taken from the Language in which alone this species of Poetry has been successfully cultivated,—ἀφελεία· a word which our *simplicity* but inadequately renders. The distinction which has been luminously drawn between Catullus and Martial by Vavasour is applicable to the Greek and Roman Epigrammatists severally.* *" Catullum quidem, puro ac simplici candore, et nativâ quâdam minimèque adscitâ excellere venustate formæ, quæ accedat quam proximè ad Græcos. Martialem acumine, quod proprium Latinorum, et peculiare tunc fieri cœpit, valere; adeoque Catullum toto corpore Epigrammatis esse conspicuum, Martialem clausulâ præcipuè atque ultimo fine, in quo relinquat cum delectatione aculeum spectari."* We cannot agree, however, with this author's *" quam proximè."* It is true that Catullus is much less pointed in his Epigrams than Martial; yet their style is very different from that of the best Greek Epigrams. The address to the Peninsula of Sirmio is extremely beautiful and simple; yet its beauty and simplicity are not those of the Greek Epigram. A few Greek Epigrams attempt point; and to

---

* *Sat.* vi. 1. † *In Vit. Att.* xii.

‡ Suet. i. *Vit. Julii.*

§ It is scarcely possible that all the following resemblances can be referable to chance :—

Dianam pueri integri
Puellæque canamus. Catull. x. 22.

Dianam teneræ dicite virgines;
Intonsum, pueri, dicite Cynthium. Hor. lib. i. *Od.* 21.

Quo tunc et tellus, atque horrida contremuerunt
Æquora, concussitque micantia sidera mundus.
Catull. *Pel. et Thet.*

Quo bruta tellus, quo vaga flumina,
Quo Styx, et invisi horrida Tænari
Sedes, Atlanteusque finis
Concutitur. Hor. lib. i. *Od.* 34.

Soles occidere et redire possunt;
Nobis, quùm semel occidit brevis lux,
Nox est perpetua una dormienda. Catull. v.

Damna tamen celeres reparant cœlestia Lunæ
Nos, ubi decidimus
Quo pius Æneas, quo Tullus dives, et Ancus,
Pulvis et umbra sumus. Hor. lib. iv. *Od.* 7.

Compare also Catull. xi. with Hor. *lib.* ii. *Od.* 6.

* Var. *de Lud. Dict.*

these the lighter Poetry of Catullus has some resemblance.

The Epigram was cultivated at an early period of the Poetical history of Latium: Ennius, Plautus, Nævius, Pacuvius, all composed Epigrams on themselves, which approximate much nearer to the Greek than any by Catullus. That of Ennius which we have cited above, is formed, in metre as well as style, on the legitimate Greek model; but even in this there is an antithesis between "*funera*" and "*vivus*" not strictly in the spirit of the Epigrammatic ἀφελεία. The Epitaph of Pacuvius has more of this latter quality, although his iambics are not conformed to the strict canons of the Greeks:

"*Adolescens, si properas, hoc te saxum rogat*
Uti se adspicias? deinde, quod scriptum est, legas.
Hic sunt Poetæ Pacuvii Marci sita
Ossa. Hoc volebam nescius ne essem. Vale."

When the number of Latin Epigrammatists is considered whose names have been preserved to us, it is astonishing that more abundant materials for a Latin Anthology should not exist. The names of Epigrammatists whose extant works have been collected, may be found in Fabricius, (*Biblioth. Lat.* lib. iv. c. 1. 6.) They embrace those of many of the most illustrious characters of their respective ages. The following are the most celebrated: Q. Catulus, Porcius Licinius, Val. Ædituus, Q. Cornificius, C. Helvius Cinna, M. Furius Bibaculus, C. Ticida, Laurea Tullius, and C. Licinius Calvus. The latter Poet and Catullus were decidedly the favourites of Rome, as sufficiently appears through Horace's contemptuous sneer

"*Simius iste,*
Nil præter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum;"*

and from a variety of passages in which their names are associated.† A curious passage of Aulus Gellius affords some explanation of the paucity of early Epigrams now extant. In the 9th chapter of the XIXth book of his *Noctes Atticæ*, he introduces some Greeks speaking on the subject of Greek and Latin Epigrams, and inquiring "*ecquis nostrorum* [*Latinorum*] *Poetarum tam fluentes carminum delicias fecisset?*" to which question they make their own reply: "*nisi Catullus, fortè, pauca, et Calvus itidem, pauca. Nam Nævius implicata, et Hortensius invenusta, et Cinna illepida, et Memmius dura, ac deinceps omnes rudia fecerunt atque absona.*" This is, doubtless, meant to be spoken in the spirit of Greek criticism; probably, however, it affords the most satisfactory explanation of the disappearance of these numerous authors. Antonius Julianus, to whom these insulting observations were addressed, was not so easily to be put down, and begged permission to sing to them some Epigrams of Ædituus, Porcius Licinius, and Quintus Catulus. The character which Gellius gives of these Poems will not be readily confirmed by scholars: "*mundius, venustius, limatius, pressius, Græcum Latinumve nihil quicquam reperiri puto.*" We shall subjoin the Epigrams, in order that our readers may have an opportunity of estimating what were, confessedly, the best efforts of the most celebrated Roman Epigrammatists. The first is from Ædituus:—

"*Dicere quum conor curam tibi, Pamphila, cordis,*
Quid mi ubi te quæram? verba labris abeunt.
Per pectus miserum manat subitò mihi sudor:
Si tacitus, subidus, duplo ideò pereo."

The following verses of the same author are called by Gellius "*non hercle minùs dulces quam priores:*—"

"*Quid faculam præfers, Phileros, quâ nil opus' nobis?*
Ibimus. Hic lucet pectore flamma satis.
Istam non potis est vis sæva exstinguere venti,
Aut imber cœlo candidus' præcipitans.
At, contrà, hunc ignem Veneris, si non Venus ipsa,
Nulla est quæ possit vis alia opprimere."

LICINIUS.

"*Custodes ovium teneræque propaginis agnêm,*
Quæritis ignem? ite huc: quæritis? ignis homo est.
Si digito attigero, incendam sylvam simul omnem.
Omne pecus flamma est; omnia quæ video."

CATULUS.

"*Aufugit mi animus, credo, ut solet; ad Theotimum*
Devenit. Sic est, perfugium illud habet.
Quid si non interdixêm, ne illuc fugitivum
Mitteret ad se intro, sed magis ejiceret?
Ibimus' quæsitum. Verum ne ipsi teneamur,
Formido. Quid agam? da, Venus', consilium."

Between these and the Poems of Catullus it is unnecessary to notice the difference.

Those works of Catullus not strictly reducible to the heads under which the Grammarians have classed his productions, are the *Epithalamium of Peleus and Thetis*, another Epithalamium, composed on an uncertain occasion, and the Poem of *Atys*. The two former are lyrical in spirit, though written in hexameters; but the latter not only differs from every other Poem of Catullus, but has no extant parallel in Latin Poetry. It is written in the Gallianbic measure, and is the only entire Latin Poem extant in that metre. It is highly animated and impassioned; and though it bears every external evidence of translation from the Greek, it is yet sufficiently removed from resemblance to any thing extant in that language to convey, perhaps, more ideas of originality to a modern reader than any other single piece of Latin Poetry, if we except particular productions of Horace.

Pervigilium Veneris.

The *Pervigilium Veneris* has been ascribed to Catullus, while some critics assign to it so late a date as the time of Nerva. It has been greatly corrupted, but is still a very beautiful Poem, and is well worthy the pen of Catullus. The *Ciris*, attributed by some to the same author, is also much corrupted; but it combines with much poetical merit a considerable resemblance to the style of *Peleus* and *Thetis*. The Poem is usually referred to Virgil; but there are some circumstances which make it probable that Catullus was its author. The most substantial difficulty is the dedication to Messala, who was not born until some years after the epoch usually assigned to the death of Catullus. But it is not certain that the patron of Tibullus was meant; neither is it certain that Catullus did not live during the time of this same Messala. Bayle, who, in his *Dictionary*,

Ciris.

---

* *Sat.* i. 10. 18.

† *Ista meis fiet notissima forma libellis;*
Calve, tuâ venià; pace, Catulle tuâ. Propert. ii. 25. 3.

Obvius huic venias hederâ, juvenilia cinctus
Tempora cum Calvo, docte Catulle, tuo. Ovid, *Amor.* iii. 9. 61.

Facit versus, quales Catullus meus, aut Calvus.
Plin. lib. i. *Epist.* 16.

The same author (lib. iv. *Epist.* 27.) quotes the following passage from Sentius Augurinus:

"*Canto carmina versibus minutis,*
His, olim quibus et meus Catullus
Et Calvus."

Lastly, Ovid, having just mentioned Catullus, (*Trist.* lib. ii. 431.) adds,

"*Par fuit exigui similisque licentia Calvi.*"

(art. *Catulle*.) contends against the late epoch assigned by Scaliger to the death of Catullus, admits that the words of Martial imply a positive assertion that he was the contemporary of Virgil,* and argues only on the supposition that Martial was mistaken. This difficulty, therefore, is not insuperable. Many verses in the *Ciris* are found in Virgil's acknowledged works; but we know that Virgil was by no means scrupulous in his use of the productions of his predecessors. But the principal argument in favour of Catullus is that Pliny expressly mentions an imitation of the Φαρμακεύτρια of Theocritus by this Poet, which is no where to be found in any of his acknowledged works.† The Poem has been also ascribed to Gallus and to Valerius Cato.

Horace's birth,

Such was the state of Poetry at Rome when Horace appeared on its Poetical horizon. This great and various genius was born at Venusia or Venusium,‡ a town on the frontiers of Lucania and Apulia, in the Consulship of L. Aurelius Cotta and L. Manlius Torquatus;§ consequently in the 688th year of Rome, and sixty-three years before the vulgar æra. His father was a freedman and a taxgatherer;|| who, nevertheless, gave him a liberal education at Rome, under Orbilius Pupillus of Beneventum.¶ By him he was instructed in Greek literature, and had perused the *Iliad*, as he himself informs us,** before he went to Athens, which had long been a place of fashionable literary resort for the Roman youth, to complete his education. During his abode there, the assassination of Cæsar and the consequent troubles took place; and Brutus, on his march to Macedonia, took with him among many other young Romans of similar pursuits Horace, who was then in his twenty-third year, and gave him the rank of Military Tribune.†† He freely confesses his cowardice at the battle of Philippi, where he left his shield,‡‡ a circumstance which the ancients considered particularly ignominious. It is possible, however, that Horace has himself overcharged the picture, and has wished, by this stroke of apparent candour and simplicity, to persuade Augustus that his connection with the adverse party was less the result of political conviction than of the natural activity and restlessness of a youthful mind, ardent for adventure, and only brave while thoughtless of danger. That Augustus could totally forget the circumstances in which Horace had placed himself was not to be expected; it might, therefore, have been politic in the Poet to set them in a less unpleasant light: and with the mention of the event he has not forgotten to notice the scattering of the brave, and the prostration of the threatening, before the irresistible arm of Cæsar.

and education.

Battle of Philippi.

Confiscation of the patrimony of Horace, Virgil, Propertius, and Tibullus.

Before the Triumvirate undertook their expedition against Brutus and Cassius, they had agreed at Mutina, in order to retain their soldiers in allegiance, to give them, in the event of success, eighteen principal towns of Italy, which had adhered to the opposite faction; among which were Venusium and Cremona. Thus, in the distribution which followed the consummation of the war, the paternal estate of Horace at the former place was confiscated,* and the neighbourhood of Mantua to the devoted Cremona, ensured it a fate scarcely less deplorable from the lawless soldiery. Virgil, whose property was situated at this place, was therefore placed in the same circumstances with Horace. Tibullus and Propertius shared a similar fortune; at least, Propertius certainly bore part in this extensive calamity. Tibullus deplores a sudden deprivation of his property,† which is supposed to refer to this circumstance. That he had competent resources after this loss, appears from Horace's address to him, "*Di tibi divitias dederunt*," although some read "*dederant*;"‡ but it is not to be supposed that Horace would have taunted his friend with the possession of riches which he had lost. It was this competency which enabled Tibullus to live without dependence on Court patronage; for in no part of his works has he celebrated Augustus or Mæcenas, while he is profuse in his commendations of his patron Messala, who had served in the army of Cassius. By whose intercession Virgil regained his patrimony, authors are not agreed. Asinius Pollio, and Mæcenas, the celebrated patron of literature, have the best authorities in their favour. Pollio, having charge of that district, probably recommended his case to Mæcenas; who was little likely to have been otherwise acquainted with the son of obscure villagers, as all Virgil's biographers represent his parents to have been. On this event his Ist Eclogue was, most certainly, composed. The character of Tityrus in this Poem does not appear to have been intended for Virgil himself; it is however a lively picture of the surprise and gratitude of an outcast, who finds himself suddenly restored to his domestic comforts, and contrasts strikingly with the desperate melancholy of the houseless wanderer Melibœus, taking his last survey of the desolated hearth, with which all his dearest affections were associated. The removal of Pollio was attended with disastrous consequences to Virgil. His estate was again seized by the rapacious military, and himself compelled to seek his safety by flight to Rome. The story of his second expulsion is treated in the IXth Eclogue. He succeeded in again recovering his patrimony, apparently through the interest of one Varus, of whom he speaks in the highest strain of commendation in the sixth and ninth Eclogues; who this Varus was, cannot now be determined.§ Perhaps he was Quintilius Varus, whose death Horace deplores in the twenty-fourth Ode of the first book, and whom he there speaks of as the especial friend of Virgil.

Horace made no solicitations to Augustus. Thrown on his own resources, his habits and pursuits allowed him no other subsistence than literature. Poverty, whose chilling influence on the fire of Poetry the great Satirist has so pathetically lamented,|| was his bold and stimulating Muse.¶ What were the productions of her inspiration, or whether any are now extant, is not known; the situation of public affairs, however, renders it possible that the XIVth Ode of the Ist Book, in which he addresses the Roman State under the allegory of a weather-beaten vessel, was written

---

* *Sic forsan tener aurus est Catullus*
Magno mittere "Passerem" Maroni.
Mart. *lib.* iv. *Ep.* 14.

† *Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 2.
‡ *Ib.* ii. *Sat.* 1.
§ *Lib.* iii. *Od.* xxi. *cf. Epod.* xiii. *et Ep. lib.* i. 20.
|| *Lib.* ii. *Sat.* vi.
¶ *Ep. ad Aug.*
** *Lib.* ii. *Ep.* 2.
†† *Lib.* i. *Sat.* 6.
‡‡ *Lib.* ii. *Od.* 7.

* *Lib.* ii. *Ep.* 2.
† *Eleg.* i. 1. 19—23. *cf.* iv. 1. 183—190.
‡ *Lib.* i. *Ep.* iv.
§ Conf. Heyne, *Excurs.* ii. *ad Bucolica.*
|| Juv. *Sat.* vii.
¶ *Lib.* ii. *Ep.* 2, *et* ii. 2. 51.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

under these circumstances. Whatever were the merits of his early compositions, he was soon known to Virgil, the similarity of whose situation almost necessarily interested him in the fate of his brother bard; and by him Horace was recommended to Mæcenas. He had, however, the advantage of a still more powerful friend—Varius, "the lofty bird of Homeric song," as he is termed by Horace, in his poetical raptures,* and in his prosaic moments "the unrivalled Epic;"† and whose Tragic excellence has been already noticed, became interested in his favour, and also mentioned him to Mæcenas. Horace has left us a pleasing and natural account of his introduction to that illustrious man.‡ In few and broken words, he candidly explained his simple history; he received a brief answer, and in nine months after his introduction, that lordly monarch of wits called him to the number of his subjects. His earliest composition after this event is, probably, that which stands first in his works; at least, he informs us that his first Poem was composed in honour of Mæcenas;§ and this Ode has the appearance of being written under such circumstances. It describes the various pursuits of mankind briefly, but comprehensively; it touches on the addiction of each individual to his own; and it concludes with an animated eulogy on Poetry, describing the author's exclusive devotion to its cultivation, and expressing a hope that Mæcenas would class him among the lyric bards. His patron assented; and the consequent cessation of jealous malevolence is gratefully and exultingly celebrated by Horace, in the third Ode of his fourth book.

Horace introduced to Mæcenas.

Though Mæcenas was slow in the formation of our Poet's acquaintance, he showed himself forward in its cultivation afterwards; and very shortly after Horace had been thus noticed, he accompanied the Minister on his journey to Brundusium, whither he was sent by Augustus to treat with Antony, who was then menacing Italy with a renewal of the Civil wars. This event must have taken place at so early a period of Horace's acquaintance with Mæcenas, that some writers have supposed that the Poet celebrated in his *Journey to Brundusium*, a subsequent expedition of a similar nature, which Mæcenas undertook two years after, when Antony landed at Tarentum; but the name of Coccejus Nerva, which occurs in the *Satire*, restricts the subject to the earlier event, as that person only attended on the former expedition. On this occasion Horace had an opportunity of enjoying the society of his friends Virgil, Varius, and Plotius. The enthusiasm of his admiration for these illustrious men, and the warmth of his attachment, so exquisitely expressed in his *Satire* on the occasion, are among the many proofs that rivalry in ingenuous studies, is far from being necessarily connected with disingenuous passions; and that the friendships which result from literary, and especially poetical, sympathy, are ordinarily the most exalted and permanent of any. But although Mæcenas took every opportunity of conversing with Horace, his caution and reserve were still maintained: for that at the end of seven years they had not attained a strictly confidential familiarity, is the least that can be inferred from what Horace himself then says of the state of their acquaintance;‖ although it must be admitted that the description is designedly exaggerated. He appears at this time to have been, what Suetonius tells us he was, a Quæstor's secretary: since he mentions the desire of the secretaries to see him on a matter affecting their common interest:—

Journey to Brundusium.

> "*De* RE COMMUNI *scribæ magnâ atque novâ te*
> *Orabant hodiè meminisses, Quinte, reverti.*"

The frankness and warmth of the Poet, however, at length prevailed over the caution and formality of the Courtier, who afterwards returned the fidelity of Horace with conduct less resembling the patron than the friend. The whole history of Mæcenas indeed exhibits aversion to hasty decision, and steadiness of action where he had once decided.

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

By Mæcenas Horace was recommended to Augustus, with whom, according to Suetonius, or the writer of the life ascribed to that Historian, he lived on terms of the closest familiarity. How far he was qualified for the intimacy of Princes, he has not left us in doubt. That wonderful versatility, which in the genius of Horace produced such diversified poetical excellence, seems to have extended to his inclinations. He appears to have enjoyed, with equal intensity, the tranquillity of literary rural seclusion, and the tumultuous pageantry of the Court and City. His *Tigellius** is the faithful portrait of himself. So sensible indeed was he of this inconsistency, that he has put a severe censure of himself, on this account, into the mouth of one of his own slaves.† On his conduct at the Court of Augustus, his Epistles to Scæva and Lollius form an admirable commentary. Even in the former of these he admits that a life of obscurity is no misfortune, although he prefers an honourable intercourse with the Great. From the precepts which he affords for the conduct of every part of life, and his known familiarity with Augustus, we may conclude, that in all his transactions with that Prince, he was neither importunate nor servile; that, while loaded with honours, he made no degrading compromise—no unseasonable solicitation; but either complied with freedom, or dissented with modesty and respect.

Introduction to Augustus.

His character.

An analysis of the several productions of Horace is foreign, to the nature of this work; we shall notice therefore such only as bear on his biography and the Literary history of the time. But, before this is done, it will be convenient to premise a few words on the departments of Poetry which he especially cultivated. We have already offered a conjecture in explanation of his repeated claim to the importation of Lyric Poetry from Greece. To this we may add the undisguised contempt which he entertained for Catullus, and the consciousness of his own great superiority. Indeed, Quinctilian, with an enthusiasm which his subject amply justifies, designates him "*lyricorum ferè solus legi dignus.*" But Horace, as we observed in the early part of this Memoir, had much more substantial claims to originality than those which he so ostentatiously put forth; his metres, the introduction of which he so proudly vaunts, are Greek, and, as far as may be conjectured from extant Greek fragments, considerably restricted; but his subjects breathe all the freshness of original conception. Nor can it be objected that the loss of their models allows us no criterion of their excellence; since many are purely

His writings.

Odes.

* *Lib.* i. *Od.* vi.
† Id. *Sat.* i 10.
‡ *Sat.* i. 6.
§ *Ep.* i. *lib.* 1.
‖ *Sat.* ii. 6. 40.

* *Sat.* i. 3.
† Ibid. ii. 7.

Biography. From U. C. 1 to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Roman in sentiment and allusion, while others are totally unlike what ancient authors lead us to conclude respecting the strains of the Lesbian lyre. The elegant negligence of Anacreon, the daring and magnificent sublimity of Pindar, and the plaintive melancholy of Simonides, alternate in the Odes of Horace; but it is the *spirit* alone of these writers that we recognise; and it is probable that his imitations of Alcæus and Sappho were of the same nature. At most, they seem to have been that kind of happy adaptation, which is not to be found in the Eclogues of Virgil, and which gives the beauties of an original to an acknowledged imitation. As an illustration of what we mean we will here adduce a fragment of Alcæus, manifestly corrupt, but which Horace certainly had before his mind when he wrote the IXth Ode of his Ist Book:

Τει μὲν ὁ Ζεὺς, ἐκ δ' ὀρανῶ μέγας
Χειμὼν, πεπάγασιν δ' ὐδάτων ῥοαὶ.
* * * *
* * * *
Κάββαλλε τὸν χειμῶν', ἐπὶ μὲν τιθεὶς
Πῦρ, ἐν δὲ κίρναις οἶνον ἁφειδέως
Μαλιχρὸν αὖτερ ἀμφὶ κόρσᾳ
Μάλθακων ἀμπιθεὶς γναφάλλων

Yet every Roman must have felt the originality and domestic sentiment of Horace's picture, as strongly as *we* participate in the social cheerfulness of Cowper's snug and curtained fireside The XXXVIIth Ode of the same Book has been partially imitated from an Ode of Alcæus, beginning:

Νῦν χρὴ μεθύσκειν, καὶ τινα πρὸς βίαν
Πίνειν, ἐπειδὴ κάτθανε Μύρσιλος

But the whole spirit of the composition is essentially Roman, and the magnificent description of Cleopatra stamps it original. The XVIIIth Ode of the same Ist Book is, probably, one of the closest imitations of Alcæus in the whole volume: the first line of it is a strict translation from a passage of Alcæus preserved in Athenæus:

Μηδὲν ἄλλο φυτεύσῃς πρότερον δένδρεον ἀμπέλου

But the "*solum Tiburis*" and the "*mœnia Catili*" domesticate the production with peculiar felicity.

Iambics, or Epodes.

There is another species of Poetry of which Horace claims the introduction; the Iambic. The word "*iambi*," separately taken, conveyed a very different idea to the ancients from that of the mere Iambic measure; an idea which the Epodes of Horace express more clearly than any definition. The *Iambographia* formed a distinct department of Poetry; approaching indeed to the Lyric, and yet distinguished from it by Horace himself.* The object of Horace in writing his Iambics, as declared by himself, was to express the spirit of Archilochus without his malignity:†

"*Parios ego primus Iambos*
Ostendi Latio: numeros animosque sequutus
Archilochi; non res, et agentia verba Lycamben."

Catullus and Bibaculus wrote Iambics; still, as Quinctilian informs us,‡ they were not professed iambographers, and perhaps Horace did not consider their works of this nature sufficiently perfect to entitle them to notice. But the more probable ground of Horace's assumption is that he first introduced the Epode; for we learn from Quinctilian that it did not appear in the Iambics of Catullus or Bibaculus.§ It is true that the *Epode Hymns* of Lucilius are mentioned; but these were, in all probability, compositions widely removed from the Horatian Epode; perhaps, written in the Pindaric measures. The "*Parii iambi*" are, therefore, those forms of the Iambic measure which the Book of Epodes exhibits. Gesner quotes a passage from the *Enchiridion* of Hephæstion which places this matter beyond a doubt.† "Εισὶ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι καὶ οἱ ἀρρηνίκως οὕτω καλούμενοι ἐπῳδοὶ, ὅταν μεγάλῳ στίχῳ παριττόν τι ἐπιφέρεται, οἷον·

"Πατὴρ Λυκάμβα, πῶων ἐφράσω τόδε;
Τί σὰς παρῆψε φρένας;"

The quotation is from Archilochus, and is exactly the same metre with

Ibis Liburnis inter alta navium,
Amice, propugnacula.

The Epode is not necessarily Iambic, but is a name applied to any metre consisting of a longer and shorter line alternately. Of this measure Archilochus is the reputed inventor, as is expressly asserted by Terentianus Maurus:‡

"*Hoc* [epodon] *doctum Archilochum tradunt genuisse magistri;*
Tu mihi, Flacce, sat es:
'Diffugere nives: redeunt jam gramina campis,
Arboribusque comæ.'"

Marius Victorinus is no less explicit· *Archilochus primus Epodas excitavit, alios breviores, alios longiores, detrahens unum pedem seu colum metro, ut illi subjiceret id quod ex ipso detractum esse videbatur. Horatius ejus exemplum sequutus est in ed Ode:*

"*Solvitur acris hyems gratâ vice Veris et Favoni;*
Trahuntque siccas machinæ carinas."

From these testimonies it appears that the Parian or Archilochian Iambic was the Epode; of which Horace was the earliest Latin writer. Bassus was afterwards celebrated for his Iambics, as we find from Ovid, (*Trist.* Lib. iv. *Eleg.* 10.) "*Bassus quoque clarus Iambo.*"

Ethics and Criticism.

The division of Horace's Poems remaining to be noticed is his Satires, Epistles, and Art of Poetry, which are all referable to one head, that of familiar and moral discourses or essays. The original spirit of these productions has gone far towards supporting the hypothesis, that the old *saturæ* and the Ennian Satire were wholly of Roman origin. Without the slightest appearance of dictation or assumed authority, they contain more real good sense, sound morality, and true Philosophy than perhaps any single work of heathen antiquity: and their frequent perusal has a tendency to make the reader satisfied with himself and others, and to produce on his part a conduct at once conciliatory towards the world, and consistent with his own independence and integrity. Their character has been exquisitely drawn by one who had imbibed a large portion of their spirit:§

"Horace still charms with graceful negligence,
And without method talks us into sense;
Will, like a friend, familiarly convey
The truest notions in the easiest way.

* *Lib.* ii. *Ep.* ii. 59.
† *Art. Poet.* 259.
‡ *Inst. Orat.* x. 1.

* Such appears to be the meaning of the sentence: "*Iambus non sanè à Romanis celebratum est ut proprium opus: à quibusdam interpositus: cujus acerbitas in Catullo, Bibaculo, Horatio; quanquam illi epodos intervenire reperiatur.*" The word *illi* seems more applicable to "Horatio" than "iambo."
† *In* lib. . *Epod. Horatii.*
‡ Terentianus has been made, absurdly enough, to call Archilochus the inventor of EPIC poetry! See Bayle's *Dictionary*, Art. Archilochus, note (K.)
§ *Essay on Crit.* 653.

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

He, who supreme in judgment, as in wit,
Might boldly censure, as he boldly writ,
Yet judg'd with coolness, tho' he sang with fire;
His Precepts teach but what his Works inspire."

Another more diffuse and general character of his writings is contained in the following stanzas of De la Motte:

"*Qu'Horace connût bien l'elegance Romaine!*
Il met le vrai dans tout son jour,
Et l'admiration est toujours incertaine
Entre la prende et le tour.
Sublime, familier, solide, enjoué, tendre,
Aisé, profond, naïf, et fin;
Digne de l'univers; l'univers, pour l'entendre
Aime à redevenir Latin."

Chronology of his writings.

Bentley asserts that Horace not only published each Book separately; but even that he was never engaged in Lyric and Satiric Poetry at the same time; that he never wrote an Ode while he was employed in completing a book of Satires, Epistles, or Epodes. With respect to the publication, there is every reason to suppose that it took place in separate Books, and that Bentley's order is true; we shall therefore adopt it. It is as follows: The Ist Book of Satires, probably published in Horace's twenty-eighth year. The IId, in his thirty-third. The Epodes, in his thirty-fifth. The Ist Book of Odes, in his thirty-eighth. The IId, in his forty-first. The IIId, in his forty-third. The Ist Book of Epistles, in his forty-seventh. The IVth Book of Odes and the Secular Poem, in his fifty-first. After these, the IId Book of Epistles, and the Art of Poetry. But our great critic has entered little into the feelings of a Poet, especially a Poet of Horace's cast, in supposing that so various and versatile a genius could sit down to the composition of a Book of Odes or Satires, and never deviate from the line which he prescribed. Such an hypothesis is contradictory to all the history of Poetical genius, and to every external and internal evidence connected with the writings of Horace. Rejecting it, therefore, we shall return to the subject of our biography.

ode of k.

Seven years had elapsed from his first acquaintance with Mæcenas, when Horace composed the VIth satire of his second Book; he was then settled in his Tiburtian villa, enjoying Poetical and Philosophical leisure, and in possession of more than his wishes. It was in this dignified retirement that he became "noble in Æolian song," and while he was within sight of the waywardness and vanity of mankind, was yet too far above their atmosphere to imbibe its splenetic contagion, and lose his temper and happiness in the survey; his own failings bore their due proportion in the picture, and, while he treated them with no more indulgence than those of others, he endeavoured, in sowing the fertile soil of his mind, to disencumber it of whatever weeds might impede its culture.

pil's gues.

While Horace, from circumstances which promised very different results, was thus enjoying the favour of the Great, and the approbation of the Wise, Virgil was no less studious of the opportunities which his own good fortune had given him of enriching his country's Literature. His local situation, added to his mode of living, had engendered in him a strong perception of the pleasures of rural life. The beauties of Theocritus, therefore, were deeply felt by him, and we have already noticed the Ist and IXth Eclogues, in which he attempted to convey their spirit in his native tongue. Martyn, however, conjectures that the *Alexis* and *Palæmon* were the earliest in point of composition, from the following passage in the *Daphnis:*

"*Hîc nos te fragili donabimus antè cicutâ:*
Hæc nos: 'Formosum Corydon ardebat Alexin:'
Hæc eadem docuit: 'Cujum pecus? an Meliboi?'"

He then makes the *Daphnis* the third in order. His argument is: "as the Poet does not give the least hint here of his having composed any other, it seems probable that these were the three first Eclogues which our author composed." The subject is scarcely of sufficient importance to demand a formal refutation of Martyn's argument, which is certainly defective. Suffice it to state that about this time the Bucolics were completed. We shall prefer taking a sketch of the Bucolic Muse, as she appeared attired in the Latian garb by the hand of Virgil.

No department of Greek Poetry promised less to the Latin imitator than the Pastoral. The Poems of Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus, are distinguished by a simplicity equally remote from Epic majesty and sordid rusticity. Every charm of the country has been rifled to adorn them, and almost every deformity carefully concealed. If the Romans were unfortunate in possessing no Attic dialect for Dramatic expression, the want of a Doric was a still greater obstacle to success in the Pastoral. This dialect at once removed the reader from the town, while it afforded the Muse every facility of expression. The lordly language of Imperial Rome was ill suited to convey the unpremeditated effusions of unlearned herdsmen. If Virgil, therefore, has fallen very far short of his great prototype, the difficulty of his attempt must not be forgotten. Indeed, he appears not insensible of it himself; and, by the nature of the language in which he composed, he has been compelled to abandon his original intention, and to attempt loftier flights than the nature of Pastoral Poetry strictly justifies.

The Eclogues of Virgil possess one remarkable characteristic: they are allegories. This at once introduces a great difference between them and the *Theocritean Idyl.* The allegorical veil is, sometimes, allowed to fall, and the shepherds who represent the Poet and his friends converse like scholars and Philosophers. It has been a great question, whether the *Alexis* partakes of this figurative character; many are of opinion that it is merely an imitation of the Ἐράστης of Theocritus; while others, who discover Virgil in Corydon, yet believe the Poem an offering to friendship. The latter opinion we consider inadmissible. All the Grammarians identify the Poet with Corydon; but the real name of *Alexis* is a matter of considerable doubt. The opinion mentioned by Servius, that Augustus was intended, scarcely deserves to be noticed. Some make *Alexis* to have been Alexander, a slave of Pollio; but, most probably he belonged to Mæcenas. Although it would be perhaps impossible to remove this imputation from Virgil, Juvenal, most assuredly, did not make any allusion to the circumstance in the following lines, which Dryden has most grossly amplified and perverted:*

Alexis.

——"*si Virgilio puer et tolerabile deesset*
Hospitium, caderent omnes è crinibus hydri,—
Surda nihil gemeret grave buccina."

There are many difficulties in believing this to have been the first of Virgil's compositions, on the supposition of Alexis being the slave either of Mæcenas or Augustus; inasmuch as, in that case, it must have been

* *Sat.* vii.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Pollio.

written before we have any account of Virgil's acquaintance with either. That Virgil intended himself by Corydon, was believed by his contemporary Propertius, who also identifies himself with Tityrus.*

But the most extraordinary composition of Virgil is his *Pollio*, a Poem which has been the subject of endless conjecture. The much litigated and unsettled question, "whom was it intended to commemorate?" we shall pass over, as not materially connected with our subject; only observing that this honour has been ascribed to the young Marcellus, to a son of Pollio, to a son of Augustus, to Asinius Gallus, to Drusus, and, lastly, even to Augustus himself.† What is principally worthy of notice is, that this Poem exhibits a coincidence with the Sacred Writings too close to be fortuitous. That the Greeks had acquired, indirectly, some acquaintance with the histories of the Hebrew Scriptures, is not to be doubted; as Hesiod and Ovid, the expounders of their Theology, have clearly discovered it; and it is probable that Theocritus, at the Court of Ptolemy, had seen the Sacred Volume, and even borrowed its phraseology. But, in this Poem, Virgil only imitated Theocritus in the structure of the composition, for, with one or two exceptions, there is no resemblance in the detail, which, in Virgil, resembles an epitome of Scripture prophecies of the Messiah. Though much of the fabulous history of the early world is corrupted from the Scriptures, the Greeks, in general, were ignorant of its source, and were too much possessed with a contempt for Barbarian literature to study, much less to imitate, the Hebrew writers. The universal contempt entertained for the Jews at Rome made, it still less probable that their Literature would meet imitation or even perusal there. An intelligent writer,‡ indeed, imagines that he has discovered an avowal on the part of Virgil, of his intention to avail himself of the treasures of Hebrew Poetry in the line§

" Primus Idumæas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas;"

but to this it is only necessary to reply, that the line cited was not written until after the *Pollio* was composed. The inquirer must, therefore, advance on other ground, than that of supposing that Virgil accommodated the Prophetic Scriptures to his purpose. The Poet has, indeed, given us a clue in our inquiries; he has asserted that his Prophecies are taken from the verses of the Cumæan Sibyl. The fable of the Sibyl's interview with Tarquin is well known. The books which she was supposed to have given to the Romans were destroyed in the conflagration of the Capitol during the Marsian war; emissaries were then despatched by the Senate throughout Italy, Greece, Asia, and the coasts of Africa, to collect the best authenticated Prophecies of the various Sibyls; and the collection thus made, was called "*Cumæum Carmen*," because it was compiled to supply the loss of the writing of the Cumæan Sibyl. In this miscellany it is nothing improbable that Prophecies of the great Person then about to appear should be found; especially when it is recollected that Tacitus and Suetonius have borne witness to the general expectation of such a Person then prevalent in the East. It is also remarkable that Ælian mentions the JEWISH SIBYL, together with the Cumæan;* her oracles, therefore, which were, probably, in substance the same as the Prophetical writings, were likely to be in the collection. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, on the authority of Varro, asserts that such of the Prophecies as were not genuine, were written in acrostics.† Eusebius has preserved a pretended acrostic oracle of the Erythræan Sibyl, the initial letters of which form the words ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ Υ ΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ; but this is, evidently, a forgery on the bare inspection. We have *σαρξ* used for mankind, *εἴδωλα* for idols, and in one place the very words of Scripture have been quoted: "*Θρῆνός τ' ἐκ πάντων ἔσται καὶ βρύγμος ὀδόντων.*" Constantine, in his "*Λόγος τῷ τῶν ἁγίων συλλόγῳ*" gives a very elaborate interpretation of the *Pollio*, with a Greek translation of the greater part of it, and asserts that the oracle, whence it was taken, was translated by Cicero into Latin verse, and annexed to his Poems. We have now no trace of this translation, if it ever existed: but it is a curious circumstance, that Cicero informs us that the Sibylline oracles did predict a King, and were written in acrostics.‡ If any name were mentioned in them, it must have been Cornelius; as we find from Cicero, Sallust, Plutarch, and Appian, that the pretence which Lentulus adduced for his connection with Catiline, was a Sibylline Prophecy, portending that the Empire of Rome was to be given to three *Cornelii*; that Cinna and Sylla were the two former, and the third was to be himself. It is by no means improbable that among the Prophecies copied from the Jewish Scriptures, or gleaned from Jewish tradition, which were, in all probability, found among the Sibylline writings, the great subject of prediction was called קרן אל *the power of God*, which would, assuredly, have been translated Cornelius by the Romans.

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

The author of the ingenious and elaborate *Observations*, who conceives that Virgil meant to refer the Sibyl's prediction to Augustus, imagines the whole Poem to be a metrical horoscope, and discovers a clear explanation of every expression and allusion contained in it, by a reference to the phraseology of Astrological art. How far this author is bigotted to hypothesis, may be conjectured from his application of the following lines to the sign Aries:

" Ipse sed in pratis ARIES *jam suave rubenti*
Murice, jam croceo mutabit vellera luto:"

Two lines before occurs the verse

" Robustus quoque jam TAURIS *juga solvet arator;"*

and there can be no doubt that the same ingenuity, had this line followed those above cited, would have given an equally convincing interpretation of TAURIS. Any mind unsophisticated by hypothesis, cannot fail to perceive that the Poet is describing a time of universal opulence and rest, when agriculture and commerce should be alike unnecessary: and when the Ram in the fields (not in the skies,) should wear his

* *Eleg.* ii. 34.
† The latter opinion is maintained at great length, in a work entitled, *Observations in Illustration of Virgil's celebrated Fourth Eclogue.* London, 1810.
‡ Notes on the *Caliph Vathek.*
§ *Georg.* iii. *init.*

* Var. *Hist.* xii. 35. † *Antiq. Rom.* iv. 62.
‡ *Div.* ii. 54. *cf. etiam* Quinct. v. 10.

fleece, without the dyer's labour, attired in the most costly and splendid colours.*

That the *Daphnis* was composed, like Milton's *Lycidas*, to commemorate the death of some real person, is scarcely to be doubted. That Menalcas represents Virgil is evident from the conclusion, wherein he states himself to be the author of two of Virgil's Eclogues. Mopsus, according to Servius, is Æmilius Macer of Verona, who wrote a Poetical history of serpents, plants, and birds, in imitation of Nicander, and a supplement to the *Iliad*. If *Daphnis* be a personification, Julius Cæsar is the only person whom the character can pourtray, as Heyne justly observes; although he believes the Poem to be merely a commemoration of the celebrated Sicilian shepherd. Servius and Donatus make *Daphnis* the Poet's brother Flaccus. An uncertain Epigrammatist has the following distich:

Daphnis.

> *"Tristia fata tui dum fles in 'Daphnide' Flacci,*
> *Docte Maro, fratrem Dis immortalibus æquas."*

Virgil concluded his Bucolics with an elegant compliment to Cornelius Gallus, a celebrated contemporary Poet, consoling him for the loss of his Lycoris, whom the old commentators assert to have been an actress, whose real name was Cytheris. She was the freedwoman of Volumnius Eutrapelus, and took the name of Volumnia. As she was familiar with Antony, the old commentators have supposed that she deserted Gallus to accompany Antony on his Gallic expedition. Heyne, however, in his argument of the *Gallus*, has shown, from chronological considerations, that this could not be the case. The genuine Poems of Gallus, with the exception of a few fragments, are lost. They consisted of four Books of Elegies, called *Amores*, or *Lycoris*, and a translation of *Euphorion*, as we learn from Servius. A pretended edition of the Works of Gallus was published by Pomponio Gaurico, at the beginning of the XVIth century; but the fraud was soon detected in Italy, and Tiraboschi attributes them,† according to common report, to a certain Maximinian, who flourished in the time of Boëtius. As an Elegiac Poet, Gallus ranked very high in public opinion. Ovid speaks of his fame as universal; Propertius and Martial have borne testimony to his excellence; and Virgil, in his beautiful and extraordinary VIth Eclogue, has panegyrized his *Euphorion* in the noblest strains of mythological eulogy. Virgil had also, according to Servius, celebrated his praises in the conclusion of his Georgics. Gallus, however, was afterwards executed by the command of Augustus, on suspicion of having conspired against him; and Virgil, at the instance of the Emperor, substituted the fable of *Aristæus*.

Gallus.

The publication of Virgil's Bucolics created a powerful sensation in literary Rome. The Grammarians tell us, that they were recited on the stage,‡ and that, on one occasion, when Cicero was present in the theatre, and heard some verses of the *Silenus* recited by Cytheris, he called for the whole Eclogue, and, when he had heard it through, exclaimed, "*Magnæ spes altera Romæ.*" This cannot be true, for Cicero was then dead: but we have the high authority of Tacitus for the truth of the honours publicly lavished on Virgil.* From him we learn that, when some verses of Virgil were recited on the Stage, and the Poet happened to be present, all the spectators rose, and paid him the same marks of respect which they would have shown to Augustus. Propertius† has celebrated the conclusion and publication of the Bucolics, and Ovid‡ has foretold their immortality.

Following the chronology of Bentley, which we have above adopted, we must refer the publication of Horace's first Book of Satires to nearly the same date with that of Virgil's Bucolics. We shall presently have to notice a different opinion. In the tenth Satire of that book, Horace gives the following sketch of the poetical proceedings of the day:

> *"Turgidus* ALPINUS *jugulat dum Memnona, dumque*
> *Diffingit Rheni luteum caput, hæc* EGO *ludo:*
> * * * * *
> * * * * *
> *Argutâ meretrice potes, Davoque Chremeta*
> *Eludente senem, comis garrire libellos,*
> *Unus vivorum,* FUNDANI. POLLIO *regum*
> *Facta canit pede ter percusso. Forte epos acer*
> *Ut nemo,* VARIUS *ducit: molle atque facetum*
> VIRGILIO *annuerunt gaudentes rure Camœnæ."*

If Bentley's chronology be correct, there can be no foundation for the remark with which Heyne opens his Preface to the Georgics. "*Ad Georgica facetum illud ac molle, quod peculiari aliquo Musarum munere Virgilio concessum esse Horatius memorat, proprio quodam modo spectare videtur.*" It may not be irrelevant to estimate the force of this eulogy on Virgil, by reference to the exposition of Quinctilian. "*Facetum,*" says the critic, "*non tantùm circa ridicula opinor consistere. Nec enim diceret Horatius, facetum carminis genus naturâ concessum esse Virgilio. Decoris hanc magis et excultæ cujusdam elegantiæ appellationem puto. Ideoque in Epistolis Cicero hoc Bruti verba refert: næ illi sunt pedes faceti, ac deliciis ingredienti molles. Quod convenit cum illo Horatiano, molle atque facetum Virgilio,*" &c.§

Some light may be thrown on the poetical history of the period, by an examination of this concise review. This, therefore, we shall take, before we proceed with what more immediately relates to the subject of our biography.

Alpinus.

Who "Alpinus" was, is a question as yet undecided. Dacier and Torrentius suppose it to be the name of a Poet, Aulus Cornelius Alpinus, that he wrote a Tragedy, entitled, *Memnon*, in imitation of one bearing the same name by Æschylus, and that he is here sarcastically said to have murdered the hero, and anticipated the stroke of Achilles. The Scholiast says that the *Memnon* was an hexameter Poem. The word Alpinus, however, is generally considered, by commentators, to be the designation of the Poet's country, the Alps, and, taken in this sense, it is applicable to many. Cruquius, without the shadow of an argument, refers it to Cornelius Gallus. Acron interprets the appellation of Vivalius, which Bentley and Sanadon conjecture to be a corruption of Bibaculus, of whom they suppose it to have been a nickname. M. Furius Bibaculus, to whom we have before alluded as the

Bibaculus.

* The reader, desirous of prosecuting the subject of Virgil's *Pollio*, is referred to the following works: Heyne's *Virgil*. Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, book i. c. 4. sec. 16. Martyn's *Virgil*; and Blondel, *de Sibyllis*.

† *Storia*, part iii. lib. iii. sec. 27.

‡ Donat. *in Vit. Virg.* and Serv. *in Ecl.* vi. 11.

* *Dial. de Orat.* xiii.

† *Lib.* ii. *Eleg.* 34.

‡ *Am.* lib i. *Eleg.* 12.

§ Quinct. *Lib.* vi. 3.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

writer of many small pieces, was also the author of a Poem on the Gallic wars, a verse of which has been preserved by Horace and Quinctilian; the former of whom has noticed the bombastic character of his style:

> "*pingui tentus omaso*
> *Furius 'hybernas candâ nive conspuit Alpes:'*"

the epithet here applied corresponds to "*turgidus*," and from the line

> "*Jupiter hybernas candâ nive conspuit Alpes*"

it is probable that he derived his appellation Alpinus. He was born at Cremona. The subject of his Poem might, very naturally, lead him to a description of the Rhine. Of Fundanius we know nothing beyond what is here recorded; but we shall have occasion to notice this passage of Horace presently, which we shall find to throw some light on the Augustan Drama. C. Asinius Pollio, here mentioned as a Tragedian, was illustrious no less in his political than his literary character. We have already noticed the conjecture that he recommended Virgil to Mæcenas: and the old biographer of that Poet tells us that the Bucolics were completed at his desire. Virgil speaks of him in terms of high commendation:*

Fundanius.

Pollio.

> "*Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam:*
> * * * * *
> *Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina!*"

where the word "*nova*" seems to imply *unprecedentedly* beautiful. And to Pollio is supposed to be addressed the VIIIth Eclogue, in which the following apostrophe occurs:

> "*En erit, ut liceat totum mihi ferre per orbem:*
> *Sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna cothurno!*"

Horace was no less intimate with Pollio, and to him is dedicated the 1st Ode of the 2d Book, wherein Horace recommends him to resume the composition of Tragedies, which his History of the Civil wars had interrupted.

Varius.

The high eulogium here passed on Varius, and the appellation "*Mœonii carminis ales*," bestowed on him by Horace in the VIth Ode of the 1st Book have been before alluded to, as well as his Tragedy of *Thyestes*. But the loss of his Works is, perhaps, a less calamity than the literary world ordinarily suppose. His excellence in the Drama, where this branch of Poetry was, in general, so unsuccessfully cultivated, might be comparatively great, and yet absolutely moderate: and as he was the first Epic of any tolerable eminence in the new school, he might easily be unrivalled where there was no emulation. If it be said that he was not strictly unrivalled, because there was his contemporary, Valgius, who has received from Tibullus the exaggerated panegyric "*æterno propior non alter Homero*," the answer is easy. The judgment of Horace on this subject is infinitely more valuable than that of Tibullus. Varius and Valgius were both friends of Horace: and he acknowledges the value of their approbation: but he never, for a moment, admits a competition of poetical excellence. The Elegies of Valgius might influence the partialities of Tibullus towards a Poet of a similar cast with himself; and private friendship might extort and excuse an hyperbole which his own judgment, and that of an unbiassed public could not sanction. A similar observation may

Incidental notice of Valgius.

* *Ecl.* iii.

be made on the equally extravagant panegyric which Propertius has passed on Ponticus, the author of the *Thebaid*.* Varius, therefore, at this time, seems to have been undisputed master of the Epic, and that, because the honour was by no means warmly contested. Macrobius, in the beginning of his 6th Book, cites some verses of this Poet "*de Morte*." It is not easy to see what connection they have with the title of the Poem. The following are the most complete, as a specimen of his style:

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Varius.

> "*Ceu canis umbrosam lustrans Gortynia vallem,*
> *Si veteris potuit cervæ comprendere lustra,*
> *Sævit in absentem, et, circum vestigia lustrans,*
> *Æthera per nitidum tenuem sectatur odoren:*
> *Non omnes illum medii, non ardua tardant,*
> *Perditæ nec seræ meminit decedere nocti.*"

He composed a panegyric on Augustus, from which, if we are to believe the Scholiast on Horace, that Poet took the following lines, which he inserted in the XVIth Epistle of his 1st Book:

> "*Tene magis salvum populus velit, an populum tu,*
> *Servet in ambiguo, qui consulit et tibi et urbi,*
> *Jupiter!*"

These passages, although far too brief and scanty to enable us to form any clear conception of the genius of Varius, are yet promiscuously selected, and contain nothing in favour of the felicity of his epithets, or the melody of his versification. The Poetical capabilities which the Bucolics discovered, induced Mæcenas, almost as soon as they were finished, to request Virgil to undertake the Georgics. The neglected state of agriculture, in consequence of the Civil wars, might be the reason why Mæcenas chose this subject for Virgil's Muse: and indeed this state of the country is graphically described by the Poet himself:†

> "*ubi fas versa atque nefas; tot bella per orbem,*
> *Tam multæ scelerum facies: non ullus aratro*
> *Dignus honos: squalent abductis arva colonis,*
> *Et curvæ rigidum falces conflantur in ensem.*"

But it is not to be supposed that this Statesman ever conceived that the military settlers could be moved by an exquisite Poem to the cultivation of their estates. The fact was, that a more effectual and more delicate method of calling the attention of Augustus to this important subject, could not be imagined; and in his power lay a great portion of the remedy.

Virgil's Georgics.

Of the character of the Georgics it is unnecessary to speak, because no reader of this memoir can be ignorant that this Poem is the most elaborate and extraordinary instance of the power of genius in embellishing the most barren subjects, which human wit has ever afforded. The commonest precepts of farming are delivered with an elegance which could scarcely be attained by a Poet who should endeavour to clothe in verse, the sublimest maxims of Philosophy. Indeed one consideration alone is sufficient to show us the excellence of Virgil in this particular—the uniform failure of his imitators. It is, however, much to be regretted that Virgil was not free to choose his own subject; as, in all probability, he would have selected a theme better suited to his Muse. It is said that the Poet, while he was employed on this immortal work, composed many verses every morning, but by the evening, reduced them to a very few; so that he

* *Lib.* i. *Eleg.* vii. † *Georg.* i. 162.

used to compare himself to a bear which licks her shapeless offspring into form.*

Battle of Actium.

According to the computation of Donatus, or the writer of the *Life of Virgil* ascribed to him, the Poet must have been at Naples, after six years' attention to the Georgics, when Augustus undertook the expedition against Antony, which ended in the decisive victory of Actium. It was on this occasion that Horace is supposed to have written his magnificent Ode *ad Romanos*, (Epod. xvi.) His friendship and gratitude towards Mæcenas had now obtained their zenith, when the Statesman was suddenly called to attend his master on his perilous expedition, which bade fair to decide the possession of the Roman world. In the Ist Epode, Horace expresses his fixed resolution to accompany his patron wherever his fortune might lead him: not that he could hope to contribute to his security, but to escape the anxieties of absence. Whatever may have been the reason, there is good cause to believe that Mæcenas never left Italy. Dio,† Tacitus,‡ and Velleius Paterculus,§ all assert that at that time the care of the city was intrusted to him by Augustus. Virgil has given a most elaborate Poetical picture of the battle of Actium, without making any mention of the exploits of Mæcenas; an omission of which he would scarcely have been guilty, had his patron borne a part in so conspicuous a scene; and this negative argument derives additional strength from another of the same kind, drawn from the silence of Horace respecting Mæcenas in his triumphal Ode on the same occasion, (lib. i. Ode xxxvii.) That Mæcenas took part in the battle of Actium has been attempted to be proved from an Elegy on his death ascribed to Pedo Albinovanus, which expressly asserts the fact; but the meagreness of the composition, and its historical inaccuracy, have caused it to be rejected by most scholars, as the production of a later period. Three Elegies are remaining to us, which have been ascribed to this Pedo; that just mentioned, another, which seems to be a continuation of it, called *Mæcenas Moribundus*, and the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, which, however, on better authority is attributed to Ovid. From the latter author, whose friend Pedo was, we learn that he wrote a Poem on the exploits of Theseus.‖ If he were the same as Celsus Albinovanus, which seems doubtful, he was, according to the account of Horace, an enormous plagiarist.¶ Dacier lays great stress on the following verses of Propertius, as supporting the hypothesis that Mæcenas was at Actium:**

> "*Quod mihi si tantum, Mæcenas, fata dedissent,*
> *Ut possem heroas ducere in arma manus,*
> * * * * *
> "*Bellaque, resque tui memorarem Cæsaris; et tu*
> *Cæsare sub magno cura secunda fores.*
> *Nam quoties Mutinam, et civilia busta Philippos,*
> *Aut canerem Siculæ classica bella fugæ,*
> * * * * *
> "*Aut regum auratis circumdata colla catenis,*
> Actiaque in sacrâ currere rostra viâ,
> *Te mea Musa illis semper contexeret armis,*
> *Et sumtâ et positâ pace, fidele caput.*"

but this would equally prove that Mæcenas took part in the battle of Philippi. The IXth Epode has been thought by some to favour the opinion that Mæcenas accompanied Augustus; and Desprez, in his notes on that Poem, deliberately tells the reader that it was addressed to Mæcenas in his absence on that occasion. The student, by consulting the Poem itself, will find nothing, however, positive about the situation of Mæcenas at that time. To this Poem, to the very elaborate analysis given by Masson, in his *Life of Horace*, and to the answer of Dacier, prefixed to his edition of the Poet, the reader desirous of more precise information on this subject is referred.

Horace was, at this time, about thirty-six years of age; so that, if Bentley's chronology of his works be true, the Ist Book of his Satires had seen the light eight years. Masson, however, refers the Xth Satire of that Book to this date, relying, principally, on his account of the death of Cassius of Parma, who was reported, according to this passage, to have been burned with his books. Cassius of Parma was put to death at this time at Athens, by the direction of Augustus, for having espoused the cause of Antony. We should rather be disposed to refer what Horace here says to another Cassius, than disturb the chronology of Bentley. Whoever he was, it is nothing wonderful that his books should supply him with a funeral pile, when it is considered that he was in the habit of composing four hundred verses every day.

Cassius of Parma.

Of Cassius of Parma Horace speaks expressly in his Epistle to Tibullus:

> "*Quid nunc te dicam facere in regione Pedanâ?*
> *Scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula vincat?*"

These verses are understood seriously and ironically by different critics. The word "*opuscula*," however, is sufficiently descriptive of his Poems, which were chiefly Elegies or Epigrams. The Scholiast on Horace attributes to him Tragedies also: and relates that Varus, who was sent to execute on Cassius the orders of Augustus, embezzled his papers, and from them produced the Tragedy of *Thyestes*. This is the celebrated work which has been before mentioned, as the production of Varius, of whom we have had occasion to speak, and who has here been confounded, as in other places, with Varus. The Grammarians, however, as if determined to deprive Varius of the credit of this Tragedy, have attributed it to Virgil.* A Poem called *Orpheus*, consisting of nineteen lines, and which, if genuine, must have been only a fragment of a larger composition, was given to the world by Achilles Statius, as the work of Cassius of Parma, discovered among the Bruttii. But as Statius did not condescend to enter minutely on the evidences of its genuineness, there is every reason to believe that it was a forgery of his own. The Poem may be found, with numerous illustrative references, in the second volume of Wernsdorf's comprehensive and accurate edition of the Latin minor Poets.

The Æneid.

To the year following the battle of Actium, the completion of the Georgics is commonly assigned. At what time the *Æneid* was first projected, is uncertain; but Virgil appears from a very early period to have had a strong desire of composing an Epic Poem. That he had attempted something of the kind, before the Eclogues were finished, is evident from these verses in his *Silenus*:

> "*Quùm canerem* REGES *et* PRŒLIA, *Cynthius aurem*
> *Vellit, et admonuit,*"—

* Donat. *Vit. Virg.* ix. Quinct. *Lib.* x. 3. Aul. Gell. xvii. 10.
† *Lib.* li. ‡ *Ann.* vi. 11.
§ *Lib.* lxxxiii. ‖ *Ep. ex Pont.* iv. 10.
¶ *Ep.* i. 3. ** *Lib.* ii. *Eleg.* i.

* Donat. *Vit. Virg. et* Serv. *in Ecl.* iii.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

his ambition to produce some work of distinguished excellence is attested by the ardent exclamation in the opening of the IIId Georgic:

"Tentanda via est, quâ me quoque possim
Tollere humo, victorque virûm volitare per ora."

Even in his *Culex*, which he is said to have written at fifteen years of age, he gives promise of higher things:

"Posterius graviore sono tibi Musa loquetur
Nostra, dabunt quùm securos mihi tempora fructûs
Ut tibi digna tuo poliantur carmina sensu."

He is said to have begun a metrical Chronicle of the Alban Kings, but afterwards to have desisted in consequence of the harshness of the names.* After the completion of the Georgics, or, perhaps, some short time before, he laid down the plan of a regular Epic on the wanderings of Æneas and the Roman destinies; to form a sort of continuation of the *Iliad* to the Roman times, and to combine the features of that Poem and the *Odyssey*. The idea was sufficiently noble, and the Poem, long before its publication or conclusion, had obtained the very highest reputation. While Virgil was employed on the *Æneid*, *"quo nullum Latio clarius exstat opus,"* Propertius wrote with generous admiration:

"Cedite, Romani scriptores! cedite, Graii!
Nescio quid majus nascitur Iliade!"

Augustus, while absent on his Cantabrian campaign, wrote repeatedly to Virgil for extracts from his Poem in progress; but the Poet declined, on the ground that his work was unworthy the perusal of the Prince. The correspondence is recorded by Macrobius, in the first book of the *Saturnalia*; but its genuineness is very questionable.

On his return from this expedition, debilitated by exertion and disease, it is probable that Augustus wrote to Mæcenas the letter mentioned by Suetonius in his *Life of Horace*, in which he offered the Poet the office of his private secretary. *"Ante,"* says he, *"ipse sufficiebam scribendis epistolis amicorum: nunc occupatissimus et infirmus Horatium nostrum te cupio adducere. Veniat igitur ab istâ parasitică mensâ ad hanc regiam, et nos in scribendis epistolis juvabit."* Horace declined the offer: and the Emperor, so far from discovering the least resentment, continued towards him his friendship and familiarity. In the letters which he afterwards addressed to him, he entreated him to assume the liberties of an intimate associate, and with a felicity which only the Greek expression can attempt, courted his acquaintance: *"neque si ut superbus amicitiam nostram sprevisti, ideò nos quoque ἀνθυπερφρονῆμεν."*

For five years after the return of Augustus, Horace continued to enjoy an uninterrupted tranquillity, in the most perfect conceivable independence, although mingling with the utmost intimacy among the great and powerful, who sought his society even to obsequiousness. At the end of this period an event occurred which forms a prominent feature both in the biography of our Poet, and in the Poetical History of the time. Virgil, who had just revised and altered the Bucolics and Georgics, with a view to giving the ultimate polish to the *Æneid*, which he had now completed, projected a tour in Greece and Asia. With a dread almost prophetic, and an ardour not disproportionate, Horace addressed the ship which bore his departing friend:

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

"Sic te Diva potens Cypri,
Sic fratres Helenæ, lucida sidera,
Ventorumque regat pater,
Obstrictis aliis, præter Iapyga,
Navis, quæ tibi creditum
Debes Virgilium, finibus Atticis
Reddas incolumem, precor,
*Et serves animæ dimidium meæ!"**

At Athens Virgil met with Augustus, who was returning from Samos, where he had wintered after his Syrian expedition, to Rome. Changing his former intention, Virgil determined to accompany his patron. On a visit to Megara he was seized with a sudden indisposition, which his voyage increased, and he died a few days after his arrival at Brundusium, in his fifty-second year. On his death-bed he earnestly desired that his *Æneid* might be burned, and even left in his will an injunction to that effect. Being, however, informed by the celebrated Varius and Plotius Tucca, (the same who is mentioned by Horace, in his journey to Brundusium,) that Augustus would not permit the destruction of his Poem, he left it to them to publish, on condition that they would make no additions to the text, even for the purpose of supplying an unfinished verse. How far his executors were faithful to their trust, must now be uncertain; several unfinished verses are extant in the *Æneid*; but the terminations of some complete lines render it not improbable that they have been supplied by another pen. The biography and the writings of Virgil have, unfortunately, fallen into the hands of ignorant Grammarians and monastics, who have most miserably corrupted both. It is not the object of this Memoir to relate all the absurd legends with which his biographers have disfigured his history: the curious reader, however, may derive amusement from the perusal of the article *Virgile*, in Bayle's *Dictionary*, in which several anecdotes concerning the *magical* powers of the Poet are selected, which probably arose out of the known attachment of Virgil to the study of Natural Philosophy. The corruptions of his writings are chiefly to be found in his minor Poems. Donatus mentions, as his acknowledged works, the *Catalecta*, the *Moretum*, the *Priapëia*, the *Epigrams*, the *Diræ*, and the *Culex*; and notices a Poem called *Ætna*, the genuineness of whch he considers doubtful. This Poem is to be found, illustrated with copious dissertations, and notices of the authors to whom it has been ascribed, in the fourth volume of Wernsdorf's *Poëtæ Minores*, where it is attributed to Lucilius Junior, a writer of the time of Nero. To these, Servius adds the *Cirina*, which is the same with the *Ciris*, before noticed as ascribed to Catullus, and the *Copa*. The *Catalecta* are miscellaneous little Poems, mostly in the style of Catullus. One Epigram, entitled *Votum pro susceptâ Æneïde*, will not be ungrateful to the reader:

Death of Virgil.

Virgil's minor Poems.

"Si mihi susceptum fuerit decurrere munus,
O Paphon, ô sedes quæ colis Idalias!
Troïus Æneas Romana per oppida digno
Jam tandem ut tecum carmine vectus eat:
Non ego tute modò, aut pictâ tua templa tabellâ;
Ornabo, et puris serta feram manibus:
Corniger hos aries humiles et maxima taurus
Victima sacratos tinget honore focos;
Marmoreusque tibi, Dea, versicoloribus alis,
In morem pictâ stabit Amor pharetrâ.
Adsis, ô Cytherea! tuus te Cæsar Olympo,
Et Surrentini litoris ora vocant."

* Donat. *in Vit.* Serv. *ad Ecl.* vi.

* *Lib.* i. *Od.* iii.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

It is scarcely necessary to distinguish these from the *Epigrammata*. What the *Priapeia* were, it is, obviously, unnecessary to investigate. The *Diræ* is a Poem attributed, more justly, as we have already seen, to Valerius Cato. The *Moretum* is a piece of very peculiar beauty; and approaches nearer to Theocritus in spirit than any of the Bucolics. It bears also a remarkable resemblance to Bloomfield's *Farmer's Boy*. It is a lively description of a rustic's day, and takes its name from a kind of sallad, called *Moretum*, the making of which is described in it. The *Copa* is a Bacchanalian invitation in the person of a *Copa*, or Syrian woman, who attended, as a dancer or singer, on houses of public entertainment.—*Ambubaiarum collegia*.

Culex.

Of all the minor Poems, however, ascribed to Virgil, the *Culex* is, for many reasons, the best deserving notice. Whatever doubts may be thrown on the genuineness of the others, there seems to be every reason for believing that this Poem, allowing for all its gross and manifold corruptions, is the work of Virgil. That Virgil wrote a Poem bearing this name cannot be questioned; for, besides the testimony of Donatus and Servius, we have the more respectable evidences of Martial,* Statius,† and Lucan,‡ for the fact. Donatus quotes two verses from the Poem, and Nonius Marcellus one, which are found in the extant copies. The Poem, however, seems to have suffered much from alterations and interpolations. Allowing for these, it must have been a very beautiful production, and by far the most original effort of Virgil's Muse. It opens with a dedication to Octavius; who this Octavius was is a matter of uncertainty. In the *Catalecta* mention is made of a certain Octavius who died in a paroxysm of anger occasioned by drinking; if this person be, as some commentators suppose, the same to whom the *Culex* is addressed, he cannot be the Octavius of whose opinion Horace speaks so highly in the Xth Satire of his 1st Book, since the *Catalecta* were, according to Donatus's account, completed when Virgil was fifteen years of age.§ From the dedication, the Poet proceeds to a most glowing description of sun-rise, and a goatherd driving his flock afield: and thence takes occasion to indulge in a long digression on the happiness of rural life, which, though less polished, is more winning and pathetic than the corresponding passage in the Georgics. He has not, indeed, surpassed in intensity of relish for the country his great model Lucretius; but he has amplified him with great taste and independence, and this passage, taken all in all, is one of the most vivid and delicious in the whole range of Latin Poetry. From this, Virgil returns to his short narrative. The noon approaches, and his rustic hero seeks the shelter of a grove to enjoy his *siesta*. While he is sleeping, a serpent is on the point of destroying him, when a Gnat, perceiving his danger, gives notice to him by a timely sting. Enraged with the insect, of whose benevolent intention he is ignorant, he instantly crushes him. At night, however, the shade of the Gnat appears to him, and, after a poetical but tedious description of the regions of the departed, reproaches him for his ingratitude. In this passage the reader may trace the sketches from which Virgil afterwards drew his more perfect pictures of the appearance of Hector, and the descents of Orpheus and Æneas. The goatherd, on awaking, as the only compensation in his power, erects a monument to his benefactor, with an inscription, which concludes the Poem:

> "*Parve Culex, pecudum custos tibi tale merenti*
> *Funeris officium vitæ pro munere reddit.*"

Virgil, by his amiable and conciliatory life, had established himself in the esteem of all the most eminent of his literary contemporaries. From Donatus, however, we learn that Anser declined his acquaintance from party considerations, being himself attached to Antony, in whose praise he composed a Poem. This Anser is called by Ovid "*Cinnd procacior.*" Yet the splendour of Virgil's success attracted many to perish in the blaze which they sought to extinguish. On the appearance of his Bucolics, an anonymous author published a dull parody, called *Antibucolica*; and one Carvilius Pictor, in imitation of his worthy prototype Zoïlus, composed an *Æneidomastix*. Cornificius, also, appears to have written against Virgil. The works of this Poet are compared by Ovid to those of Valerius Cato:* they were, therefore, probably, satirical productions in the style of the *Diræ*, or amatory pieces, which Cato is said to have written, and traces of which are to be found in the *Diræ* itself. Virgil is said to have retaliated on Cornificius under the name of Amyntas, in his *Alexis* and *Daphnis*.†

Anser.

Cornificius.

Death and notice of Tibullus.

The death of Virgil was shortly succeeded by an event scarcely less afflicting to Horace and to literary Rome:

> "*Te quoque Virgilio comitem non æqua*, TIBULLE,
> *Mors juvenem campos misit ad Elysios,*
> *Ne foret aut elegis molles qui fleret amores,*
> *Aut caneret forti regia bella pede.*"‡

Tibullus had been associated with Horace, if not by the bonds of intimate friendship, yet by the sympathies of liberal pursuits; to his candour and discrimination Horace submitted his ethical writings, and from Horace he received counsel and consolation in the sufferings of disappointed love.§ The real name of his Delia, as we learn from Apuleius, was Plania; and it is probable that Glycera was disguised under Neæra or Nemesis. On his return from his third military expedition with Messala, he retired to his seat near Pedum, a short distance from Rome, to enjoy, apparently, after a life devoted to the cares and excitements of passion, the advantages of that true Philosophy, which, teaching him to regard every morning as his last, made each completed day wear the welcome appearance of an unexpected friend. It was here that he polished those beautiful productions, which, to a reader of this Memoir it will be sufficient to have thus noticed: that he lived in the society of the most eminent contemporary Poets, and that he died, bewailed by the Muse of Ovid.

Horace was now approaching his fiftieth year, and the loss of two friends, with whom he had been so long associated, threw back on his heart a tide of generous affection, which soon flowed towards his early and benevolent patrons Augustus and Mæcenas. The former, at once to prove his friendship for the

* *Lib.* viii. *Ep.* 56. and xiv. *Ep.* 185.
† *Sylv.* ii. 7. 74. Id. *Præf. Sylv.* lib. i.
‡ Suet. *Vit. Lucani.* § Some correct, twenty-five.

* *Trist.* ii. 436. † Serv. *in Ecl.* ii. and v.
‡ Domitii *Marsi Epigramma.*
§ *Lib.* i. *Ep.* iv. and i. *Od.* xxxiii.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Poet and his admiration of his genius, selected him to compose the Hymn to be sung in honour of Apollo and Diana at the Sæcular Games. This Poem is, in all respects, extremely valuable; for not only is it a composition of high intrinsic excellence, but it is the only considerable extant specimen of the lyrical part of the Roman worship. The Hymn of Catullus cannot endure any comparison with it, although probably written for a similar occasion. The *Carmen Sæculare* in most editions, begins with "*Phœbe, silvarumque potens Diana,*" and ends with "*Dicere laudes.*" Some scholars, however, among whom is Sanadon, take a far more extensive range. They make the Poem consist of three parts, with a sort of prelude or introduction, which is supplied by the first stanza of the Ist Ode of the 3d Book. On the first day, say they, were sung the seven first stanzas of the VIth Ode of the 4th Book; on the second, the XXIst Ode of the 1st Book; and on the third, the Poem, commonly reputed the *Carmen Sæculare*, followed by an Epilogue, which is furnished by the remaining stanzas of the VIth Ode of the 4th Book. Nearly the same arrangement is adopted by Anchersen. There is no donbt that this arrangement produces a very noble and beautiful structure, and that the fugitive pieces which it has been attempted to collect into a regular whole have connection with the subject; there is not, however, any evidence beyond this internal congruity in favour of this ingenious collocation.

Carmen Sæculare.

Lyric Poetry.

In one sense, the *Carmen Sæculare* is the most valuable production of Horace for illustrating the genius of its author. That the Romans, while they cultivated every other species of the Greek Poetry, should have neglected the Lyric, is easily explained from the unpoetical cast of the national character. Though deficient themselves in invention, they could appreciate and imitate the more regulated flights of the Mæonian swan; but when the "Theban eagle" was

> "Sailing with supreme dominion
> Through the azure deep of air,"

he was, to their eyes, lost in the clouds above which he was towering. Horace was fully sensible of this; and although his brilliant eulogium on Pindar proves how entirely he understood and felt the beauties of the Theban, he considered a successful attempt to imitate his style and sentiment impossible.* The attempt, however, was made by Septimius Titius, supposed to be the same to whom Horace addressed the VIth Ode of the 2d Book, and whom he recommended with so much delicacy and elegance to Tiberius.† Antonius Rufus was equally venturous.‡ But the real success of these Poets may be fairly estimated from the judgment of Quinctilian, who, as was before observed, considers Horace almost the only Latin Lyrist worth reading. Although, however, Lyrical Poetry never *flourished* in Latium, there were occasions when it was necessary that it should be cultivated. There were Religious Festivals. On the due observation of the ceremonies of Religion, the welfare of the State was supposed greatly to depend; and, as the enthusiasm of Roman patriotism is beyond question, it might fairly be supposed that in their hymns, at least, there would be traces of inspiration. The fact, however, is otherwise. The *Carmen Sæculare* of Horace, therefore, is not a composition refined and corrected on a long series of approved models, but a production possessing the highest excellences of its class, written amidst a people, who, with every inducement to cultivate this species of Poetry, had totally failed in it. So pleased was Augustus with this composition, that he commanded Horace to celebrate in an Ode the victory which Drusus and Tiberius obtained over the *Rhæti* and *Vindelici*,* which Poem, together with the Book of which it forms a part, was published by the Emperor's order, in the same year, according to Bentley, with the *Carmen Sæculare*.

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Nor was Augustus desirous alone to have his public successes embalmed in the verses of Horace. He read the Poet's *Epistles* and *Satires*, and felt chagrined and discontented because none of them were addressed to himself. "I am angry with you," he writes to Horace, "because you do not especially choose me to converse with in the principal part of your writings of this nature. Do you fear lest the appearance of my intimacy should injure you with posterity?"† To this flattering reproof, Horace replied, by the Ist Epistle of the 2d Book, in which he extricates himself from the charge of neglect, with that consummate skill and address which were so peculiarly his own. From this highly valuable composition, we obtain materials for the most correct and methodical investigation of the whole History of Latin Poetry. We have, in the early part of this Memoir, acknowledged our obligation to Horace in this respect; and it is mainly in consequence of this Epistle that this obligation is contracted. We have followed its guidance up to the Augustan age; and the present will be the most favourable opportunity of examining, by its light, what was at that time the general state of Poetry, and, in particular, that of the Drama. The subject and style of *The Art of Poetry* are so similar to those of the *Epistle to Augustus*, that it will be convenient, both for conciseness and perspicuity, to combine the notices of each.

Epistles to Augustus and the Pisos.

Dr. Hurd, in his very minute and elaborate commentary on the two great critical Epistles of Horace, supposes that the *Epistle to the Pisones* was written with a view to the regeneration of the Roman Drama exclusively; that, on this principle, the Poem is reducible to a regular and consistent plan; and that all which it contains concerning other departments of Poetry may easily be referred to that digressive character which is essential to the freedom of epistolary writing. No reader will contest the ingenuity of the hypothesis, nor the plausibility of many of the arguments by which it is supported; yet it is impossible to rise from the perusal of Dr. Hurd's observations without feeling that his connections, in many instances, are any thing but natural. To find an accurate method in Horace is what is not to be expected; a conversational absence of method and a "graceful negligence," have been pointed out as his distinguishing features, by an author who entered more fully into the spirit of his Essays than perhaps any critic or commentator whatever: and with respect to the greater number of his *Satires* and *Epistles*, this opinion neither has been, nor can be, controverted. It does not, therefore, appear

Art of Poetry.

* *Lib.* iv. *Od.* ii. † *Lib.* i. *Ep.* iii.
‡ Ov. *Ep. ex Pont.* iv. 16. *et* Burmanni *not.*

* Suet. *in Vit. Hor.* † Ibid.

probable that Horace intended, in his *Epistle to the Pisones*, an exception to the general style of his other Epistolary writings: or, if such has been his intention, never was art more artificially concealed. It has been too much the fashion to neglect or despise the old Scholiasts, whereas they are often the only sources of authentic information. Porphyrion tells us that the Art of Poetry was principally compiled from the more methodical work of Neoptolemus: and as this account appears liable to no objections, the most probable conclusion that can be formed on the subject is, that Horace intended to convey in a popular form the elements of those of Critical science, as he had already done by the science of Ethics.

But although it may not be universally admitted that Horace had no other object in writing this Epistle than the recovery, if possible, of the Roman Drama, it might be expected that in a Treatise, however familiar and unmethodical, on Poetry, the Drama would claim a very peculiar attention; and that this attention would in no small degree be augmented by the extreme degeneracy of that province of Poetry at the time when this Treatise was written. Without entering on an investigation of the causes of the disease, which appear to have been numerous and complicated, the literary patriot would point out to his countrymen the means of remedying them, by recalling their attention to just models, and well-grounded maxims. And this is just what Horace has done. Although all his precepts are intended for the Roman Poet, he admits no other excellence (except in subject) than that which the Greeks allowed; and experience proves that, however controvertible may be the efficiency of his canons in modern Poetry, the Romans, whose main excellence was imitation, succeeded precisely in proportion as they regarded the laws, which, existing before in the reason of things, or in the practice of the Greeks, were digested and elucidated by Horace. While reconducting the Dramatist, as well as every other Poet, to the study of those authors from which the best writers for the Roman Stage had learned their art, Horace has not been unmindful of his father's Philosophy,* which taught him to ground his precepts on example: his rules, though general in their form, glance at particular beauties and demerits in Roman authors. The loss of the great mass of Latin Dramatic literature makes it sometimes impossible to appropriate his observations, and, occasionally, perhaps, to perceive them. A curious passage in Cicero enables us to determine the scope of one of these with some certainty. The first judgment which the Poet passes on the Drama, is on the style of its versification:

> "*Versibus exponi Tragicis res Comica nonvult:*
> *Indignatur item* PRIVATIS *et* PROPE SOCCO
> DIGNIS CARMINIBUS *narrari* COENA THYESTÆ."

Cicero,† speaking of the difficulty of understanding the melody of Poetry adapted to music, quotes the following line from the *Thyestes* of Ennius:

> "*Quemnam te esse dicam? qui tardâ in senectute*"——

and adds: "*et quæ sequuntur;* QUÆ NISI QUUM TIBICEN ACCESSIT, ORATIONI SUNT SOLUTÆ SIMILLIMA." There is little doubt, therefore, that in this passage the Poet designed to illustrate his meaning more particularly by reference to this Tragedy of Ennius; and this observation may serve as a general view of the conduct of the Epistle.

It cannot be minutely ascertained to whom this Epistle was addressed: but the conjecture of Dacier is probable; namely, that Lucius Piso may claim this honour, who was Consul, U. C. 738, and his two sons.

We shall now discuss briefly the causes of what may be called the total extinction of the Drama, in an age when every other department of Poetry had reached the meridian of cultivation. The want of encouragement afforded to Poetry of any kind, which once operated so powerfully against the interests of the Drama, was now removed; and it might have been supposed that Nævius and Cæcilius, Attius and Pacuvius, would have been supplanted in an age when Ennius and Lucilius were succeeded by Virgil and Horace. The truth is, we can never hope to reason correctly of the general state of Poetry in a nation from that of the Drama. The former varies with the cultivation of the few; the latter, with the promiscuous taste of the people. At Athens, where the institution of slavery afforded no inconsiderable leisure to the meanest citizens, and every individual was an integral part of the government, there were necessarily many opportunities and advantages for forming a just taste among the people; and to these we may in some measure attribute the encouragement which the Drama received at their hands, and the consequent excellence of their Dramatists. In the early ages of Roman literature, the case was widely different. While the Attic ploughman was enjoying Aristophanes and Menander, the Roman nobleman was at his plough. This state of things had yet its relative advantages for the Drama. As the disregard of literature was nearly universal, there were few literary patrons for Poets to cultivate; and hence they were almost compelled to appeal for their fame to a theatrical audience. Plays, therefore, constituted the principal part of the early Roman Poetry: but their judges were too easily pleased, too ignorant of the sources whence the Poets drew, and too careless or indifferent to allow the Drama to attain that vigorous health and mature proportion which it had acquired in Greece. When therefore, in a happier age, literary, and especially Poetical, excellence, became the certain path to distinction and honour, the fluctuating decisions of popular caprice were, naturally enough, deserted for the steadier countenance of the learned. In the mean time, while learning had been advancing in the higher classes, the ferocity of the lower remained unmitigated; or, at best, was tempered only by the vices which naturally arose out of an unsettled Government, a luxurious Aristocracy, and an intercourse with the refuse of mankind from every part of the known world. They were as little civilized as the audiences of Livius and Nævius, but they had lost the virtues of uncivilized life, and with this, the power to appreciate and enjoy every thing intellectual.*

At no time, indeed, does the Roman public appear

* *Lib.* i. *Sat.* iii. † *In Oratore.*

* The causes of the neglect which the Romans manifested towards the Drama, especially in the age of Augustus, have been much canvassed. Several probable hypotheses have been assigned by Tiraboschi, and by Mr. Frederick Schlegel, in his third lecture on the *History of Literature*. Mr. Dunlop, who has lately written the *History of Roman Literature*, has some good observations on the same subject; but he has pillaged, most unreservedly, from both.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

to have entertained a very poignant relish for the Drama. Plays were acted as part of Religious ceremonies, and the people attended them among the other exhibitions, of which they were generally the least attractive, because the least intelligible. Even in the age of Terence, the golden period of the Roman Drama, buffoons and gladiators could at any time divert the attention of an unlettered and savage audience from Dramatic entertainments. When the *Hecyra* of Terence was first brought on the Stage,* the devotion of the mob to boxers and ropedancers would not allow it to be heard through: when it was produced for the second time, a sudden report of a gladiatorial combat caused an immediate tumult, and compelled the actors to retire. It was soon evident, that a Dramatist must trust for his success to something else than the excellence of his Poetry or his plot. As among ourselves,

> (*"pudet hæc opprobria nobis*
> *Et dici potuisse, et non potuisse refelli,"*)

no trash was so paltry that it could not pass with the aid of spectacle; while Thalia and Melpomene themselves would have been hissed from the Stage, had they ventured to appear before the Sovereign People without the statutable proportion of spangles and tinsel. That writers of genius therefore would descend to a competition with mountebanks and property men, was not to be expected; especially where the result of the contest was so little equivocal.

There is extant a letter from Cicero to Marius, (Cic. *Ep. ad Familiares*, lib. vii. *Ep.* 1.) in which the writer gives an account of the entertainments presented at Rome in the year of the City 698, 110 years after the second rejection of the *Hecyra*, which, as curiously illustrative of the state of the Roman Drama, at that time, we shall here partially quote. From this it will appear that the ever-memorable *Blue Beard* is no more to be compared to a Roman spectacle, than Covent-garden to the Coliseum. "If you ask how the games were got up, I must say, most splendidly: not at all, however, to your taste, so far as I may judge from mine."—"All the pleasure of the audience was engrossed in the contemplation of the pageantry: pageantry, the absence of which, I can well conceive, you would not have deeply regretted. What amusement indeed is afforded by SIX HUNDRED MULES in the Tragedy of *Clytæmnestra?* or THREE THOUSAND targeteers,† in the *Trojan Horse?* or the ornamented armour of cavalry and infantry in action? These things command the admiration of the mob, but could have afforded no pleasure to you."—"And where is the pleasure a cultivated mind can derive from seeing a defenceless man mangled by a powerful beast, or a generous beast transfixed upon a hunting-spear?"—"On the last day was the battle of the elephants; where there was enough for the mob to admire, but little to be pleased with. Indeed there was a feeling of pity arising from the persuasion that there is some natural sympathy between that animal and man."

* *Prologi in Hecyr.*

† "*Craterarum tria millia.*" Various corrections have been suggested. Grævius conjectures the right reading to be *cetrarum*. The *cetra* was a kind of buckler made of elephants' hide, principally in use among the Spaniards and Africans. We offer, as a slight improvement on the reading of Grævius, "*cetratorum*," *sc. militum.*

This passage of Cicero brings the history of the Roman Drama very near the time of Horace; it is not therefore to be wondered that, when Folly and Cruelty had taken so entire a possession of the Stage, Virtue and Sense should have failed to resume their ground. Indeed the attempt would have been useless; for in the age of Horace the contamination had reached the highest classes, who no longer sought their pleasure at the theatre in listening to the melody of versification, or in acquiring noble and beautiful ideas, but in gazing on cameleopards, elephants, horses, processions, and combats, the exhibition of which would sometimes occupy four hours and upwards at a time. Sometimes indeed the Knights personally engaged as gladiators,* and performed in Plays.† The encouragement which Augustus and Mæcenas gave to literary merit, would never have been resigned by any sensible Poet, for the precarious and worthless applause of an audience whose restless anxiety for the boxing-match or the bear-baiting might break forth in the midst of his performance. It is not improbable that this state of the Augustan Stage has lost us a Drama from the pen of Horace. No Poet ever felt more deeply the charms of the Dramatic Muses: no Poet ever drew a juster picture of Dramatic inspiration, nor could our own great enchanter of *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* have been described more accurately than in the following lines:‡

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13

> "*Ille per extentum funem mihi posse videtur*
> *Ire poëta, meum qui pectus inaniter angit,*
> *Irritat, mulcet, falsis terroribus implet,*
> *Ut magus: et modò me Thebis, modò ponit Athenis.*"

But Horace judged with Aristotle,§ that *acting* is an essential part of the Drama, and where he could not obtain this, he preferred relinquishing dramatic writing altogether, to composing for the closet; a custom which has been always too prevalent when the Stage is corrupted, and which is often the surest indication of its corruption. There were no closet Dramas in the days of Attius and Pacuvius, of Shakspeare and Jonson; but we have abundance of them now, and something of the same kind appears in the time of Augustus. Fundanius, as we have seen, was pronounced by Horace the first, or rather the only Comic Poet of his day. The latter, strictly speaking, he was not; he must have been, however, a Poet of no inconsiderable comparative excellence: yet it is remarkable that not only no work of his has reached us, but that we are in total ignorance who he was: his works therefore were, in all probability, known to few. But this they could not have been, had they been publicly acted. They were, probably, therefore, not intended for the Stage, but were only allowed to circulate among his friends. And this hypothesis derives confirmation from the term "*libelli*," which Horace bestows on them, an expression not frequently applied to Dramatic productions.

Closet Drama.

From Horace's mention of Fundanius, and the silence of all other writers respecting him, there is yet thus much to be gleaned: either he was a closet Dramatist, or though the best Comic Poet of his age, yet he was an author of very limited celebrity. In either of these cases, the miserably abject state of the Drama is evident; for an author of talent would never write

* Suet. *Aug.* xliii. † Dio. Cass. liii. 56.)

‡ Hor. *Ep. ad Aug.* 210. § *Poet. passim.*

Dramas merely for the perusal of friends, when the Stage could give him justice and reputation: nor can we think very highly of the Dramatic excellence of a period when the best Dramatic writer is an author whose name is scarcely known.

In further confirmation of the hypothesis that the legitimate Drama, insulted on her proper ground, the Stage, had taken refuge in the closet, we may observe that closet *Mimes*, or Farces, existed in the time of Julius Cæsar. It was usual for the authors of these pieces to sustain the principal character in them; yet Decimus Laberius, a Roman Knight, who never can be supposed to have designed to perform on the Stage, wrote no fewer than forty-three of these. Although Mimetic Poetry, like the more regular Drama, had decayed before the time of Augustus, we have postponed the notice of it to this place, because its history is intimately connected with that depravation of the Stage which could not so conveniently have been noticed elsewhere.

Mimes.

In that unsettled and fluctuating state of polite learning, which subsided at length into the beautiful and symmetrical fabric of the Augustan Literature: when the Greek Philosophy and refinement, imported by Lucretius and Cicero, were struggling with the coarser elements of the Roman idiosyncrasy, although there existed no cherishing influence to strengthen and guide their operations to the production of regular and definite excellence: when neither the encouragement of a promiscuous audience, nor the patronage of a Literary Aristocracy afforded an outlet to the general fermentation: Poetry, expelled from the Stage by Folly, invaded, in retaliation, the province of Buffoonery itself, and raised the old extemporaneous Farces to the dignity of compositions. It has been the custom, especially among the late Latin writers, to confound the *Mime* with the *Atellane* Play: the difference, however, is not inconsiderable. *Mimes* were invariably and entirely written in Latin: they were performed by professed actors, and not by the Roman gentry; and their whole spirit was so essentially different from that of the *Atellanes*, that Cicero almost contrasts the two species of entertainment;* for, in writing to Papirius Pætus, he complains that his correspondent had joked with him rather with the grossness of the *Mime*, than the delicate raillery of the *Atellane*:—"*Nunc venio ad jocationes tuas, quùm tu secundum Œnomaüm Attii, non, ut olim solebat, Atellanum, sed, ut nunc fit, Mimum introduxisti.*" The very reason assigned by Valerius Maximus for the rank and privileges of actors in the *Atellane*,† is the grave character of its humour; while, from all that can be collected from ancient authors, ribaldry and obscenity were the features of the *Mime*. Even Martial, whose obscenities can never be surpassed, avows that the *Mimes* were not less licentious than his own Epigrams.‡ And Ovid seems to consider them the very climax of licentiousness, when, apologizing to Augustus for the freedom of his own writings, he contrasts it with the gross and undisguised impurities of the *Mimes*:§

"*Quid si scripsissem Mimos* OBSCŒNA JOCANTES?
Qui vetiti SEMPER *crimen amoris habent;*
In quibus ASSIDUE *cultus procedit adulter,*
Verbaque dat stulto callida nupta viro.
* * * * *

* *Ep. ad Fam. lib.* ix. *Ep.* 16. † *Lib.* ii. 4. 4.
‡ *Lib.* iii. *Ep.* 78. § *Trist. lib.* ii. 497.

Scribere si fas est IMITANTES TURPIA *Mimos,*
Materiæ minor est debita pœna meæ."*

From these verses it appears that not only the character, but the plot of the *Mime* was tolerably constant. The same observation has been already made on the Roman regular Comedy: but it may be here extended, for there seem to have been some characters and situations which entered into the essence of the *Mime*, as is the case with our modern Harlequinades, and was with the ancient *Atellane*. The principal of these was *Sannio*, the prototype, most probably, of the Italian *Zanni*; for the Panniculus, a character which Mr. Dunlop mentions as a constant ingredient of the *Mime*, "who appeared in a party coloured dress, with his head shaved, feigning stupidity or folly, and allowing blows to be inflicted on himself without cause or moderation," seems only to be a creation of that ingenious author.† It appears that there was a Mimetic actor thus called in the time of Domitian,‡ who represented the slave of another actor, Latinus, in which character he was not treated in the gentlest conceivable manner; but there seems to be no reason for considering Panniculus other than his actual name, since we know that Latinus was a real character.§ In all the *Mimes* there was a principal performer, to whom the rest acted as foils, and who was generally, as was before observed, the author of the piece. His part was regularly composed, but the others assisted him by extemporaneous raillery and gesticulation; and whenever these failed, the actor left the Stage precipitately, and the curtain was drawn.‖

Laberius.

C. Decimus Laberius, a Roman Knight, attached to the old Republican Government, had, as we have already had occasion to observe, employed his leisure in the occasional composition of these rude Dramatic sketches.¶ Julius Cæsar, whose object it was to crush the spirit of the Roman Aristocracy, and especially of those among them whose regrets and affections lingered with former Liberty and independence, offered him 500,000 sesterces to perform his own *Mimes*. He complied; apparently, less on account of the inducement held out to him than through fear of offending the Dictator. When, however, he had consented to appear on the Stage, the infamy of his concession came on his mind in all its deformity, and he expressed the bitterness of wounded honour in an indignant Prologue, preserved by Macrobius,** to whom we are indebted for this part of our history, in which he contrasted his former life with the situation in which he was placed by the Dictator's authoritative request, whose persuasive eloquence he panegyrized in a vein of the richest irony. Not content with this, he represented, in the course of the piece, a slave flying from the whip, and exclaimed:

"*Porrò, Quirites, Libertatem perdimus!*"

And afterwards added

"*Necesse est multos timeat quem multi timent,*"

on which the eyes of the whole assembly were immediately turned on Cæsar. The fragments which remain

* Ovid. *Trist. lib.* ii. 575.
† *Hist. of Rom. Lit.* vol. 1.
‡ Mart. *lib.* i. *Ep.* v. *Lib.* ii. *Ep.* lxxii. *lib.* v. *Ep.* lxi.
§ Suet. *Domit.* xv. *et* Juv. *Sat.* ii.
‖ Cic. *Orat. pro Col. et ibi Variorum Comm.*
¶ Macr. *Sat.* ii. 8. ** *Ubi suprà.*

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

of the *Mimes* of Laberius are neither sufficiently numerous nor copious to afford us the means of examining his merits. Aulus Gellius reproaches him with a stiff and pedantic phraseology:* and Horace mentions the keenness of his humour together with that of Lucilius:†

> *"Nempe incomposito dixi pede currere versus*
> *Lucili. Quis tam Lucilî fautor inepte est*
> *Ut non hoc fateatur? At idem, quòd sale multo*
> *Urbem defricuit, chartâ laudatur eâdem.*
> *Nec tamen hoc tribuens, dederim quoque cætera; nam sic*
> *Et Laberî Mimos, ut pulchra poëmata, mirer."*

Nothing can be more incorrect than to distort this passage into a censure of Laberius; it is indeed a high compliment to his Comic and Satirical powers, and only distinguishes his *Mimes* from exact and elegant Poems, which they did not profess to be; whereas Lucilius, of whom the Poet is writing, assumed higher ground, and therefore justified higher expectations. The author of the Prologue in Macrobius was evidently capable of Mimetic excellence.

Contest of Laberius with Publius Syrus.

Laberius was reserved for further mortification. Publius, a Syrian freedman, who had gained a considerable celebrity by acting *Mimes* through the towns of Italy, came to Rome, and challenged all the professors of the art, whom he severally conquered: among these was Laberius.‡ In the decision, which rested with Julius Cæsar, there can be little doubt that the Dictator was actuated in some measure by revenge. He turned with a smile to Laberius and said

> *"Favente tibi me victus es, Laberi, à Syro:"*

and gave Publius the palm and Laberius a ring of gold. Publius then insulted Laberius with another verse:

> *"Quicum contendisti scriptor, hunc spectator sublevat."*

Laberius sought his place among the Knights, but was refused.

Works of Publius.

All that now remain of the works of Publius are between eight and nine hundred isolated verses, containing apophthegms of great beauty and expressed with peculiar happiness, generally each in a single line. The judgment which Seneca passes on them,§ that they are better suited to Tragedy than low Farce, will be readily acquiesced in by all readers: nor is it easy to understand how sentiments so noble, so true, and so philosophical could have amalgamated with the gross materials of the *Mime*. The truth appears to be that Tragic genius, discouraged in its proper field, invaded a province, in which, although adequate developement was impossible, nevertheless applause was certain.‖

Matius.

Contemporary with Laberius and Publius was Cneius Matius, who wrote Mimiambics, which differed from the *Mimes* of the two former authors only by being written in scazontics. He also translated the *Iliad* into hexameters.¶ After this time the *Mime* fell to its former level, and, in the time of Augustus, Poets had taken an almost entire leave of the Roman Stage. The pieces of the old Dramatists, however, were still performed, as those of Shakspeare are among us; and it was considered the height of critical ignorance to impugn the excellence of any of them; an attachment to antiquity which Horace justly ridicules.* But if the Dramatic Muses were treated with neglect, no attentions were withheld from their sisters. The literary fermentation, ill suppressed by the unfavourable position of politics, had only waited the sanction and encouragement of power to burst forth: and from those parts of the writings of Horace which are now under our more immediate attention, we may conclude that the situation of Augustus and Mæcenas was in no respect preferable to that state of literary persecution which Pope paints with such pathetic humour in the *Prologue to the Satires*. All was one *"amabilis insania."*† Augustus himself did not escape the infection.‡ He wrote a Poem called *Sicilia* in hexameters, a Tragedy entitled *Achilles*, another called *Ajax*, which he destroyed unfinished: some Fescennine verses on Pollio, and a book of Epigrams. Such being the character of the time, it is not matter of surprise that a great many names of Poets should have reached us of whom we know little more, and of whom the knowledge would, probably, be of little value. A select catalogue, in which Ovid wished posterity to place himself, forms the substance of the Poet's last Pontic Elegy: to many of the names which compose it we have before adverted, and we shall here give a brief notice of such among the rest as appear best to deserve it.

Horace's Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

General view of Augustan Poetry.

Ovid's Catalogue of Poets.

Domitius Marsus was an Epigrammatist, and author of a Poem called *Amazonis*, on the exploits of the Amazons. His Epigram on the death of Tibullus we have already quoted. It appears to be a portion of an Elegy. *Vide* Broukhuys, *ad locum*. Rabirius had celebrated the Civil wars of Augustus and Antony;§ if the common reading be genuine, he has been compared by Velleius Paterculus to Virgil.‖ Carus was a personal friend of Ovid, to whom the Poet wrote the XIVth of his IVth Book of Pontic Epistles, from which it appears that he was tutor to the sons of Germanicus. Cornelius Severus was a Poet of considerable celebrity. He wrote a Poem on the wars in Sicily, as appears from Quinctilian; and Ovid ascribes to him Tragedies. A spirited fragment of this Poet on the death of Cicero is cited by M. Seneca, which that writer pronounces inferior to none of the numerous compositions to which that occasion gave birth.¶ Quinctilian considers him a better versifier than Poet; but** would have placed him second to Ovid, had

---

* *Noct. Att.* lib. xvi. 7.
† *Lib.* i. *Sat.* x. *init.*
‡ Aul. Gell. *Noct. Att.* xvii. 14.
§ *Ep.* viii.
‖ The extant verses of Publius Syrus have been edited by Bentley, together with Terence: and a very copious and elegant edition was published at Leyden in 1708, entitled, *"L. Annæi Senecæ et P. Syri Mimi, forsan etiam aliorum, Singulares Sententiæ, Studio, et Operâ Jani Grutari."*
¶ Terent. Maur.

* *Ep. ad Aug.*
† *"Mutavit mentem populus levis, et calet uno*
Scribendi studio: pueique, patresque severi
Fronde comas vincti cænant, et carmina dictant.
* * * * *
Scribimus indocti doctique poëmata passim."
Hor. *Ep. ad Aug.* 107.
"Ludere qui nescit campestribus abstinet armis,
Indoctusque pilæ discive trochive quiescit,
Ne spissæ risum tollant impunè coronæ:
Qui nescit, versus tamen audet fingere.—Quidni?
Liber et ingenuus, præsertim censu equestrem
Summam nummorum, vitioque remotus ab omni."
Hor. *Art. Poet.* 379.
‡ Suet. *Aug.* lxxxv. Suidas, *voc.* Ἀβγοστος Macr. *Sat.* xi. 4. Plin. xxxiv. 10.
§ Sen. *de Ben. lib.* vi. c. 3.
‖ *Lib.* ii. c. 36.
¶ Sen. *Suas.* vii.
** *Lib.* x. 1.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766 — A. C. 740. to A. C. 13.

he succeeded as well in the whole of his Sicilian war, as he had done in the Ist Book. His work was interrupted by death. The same critic speaks very highly of his juvenile Poems. He is often cited by the Grammarians for instances of enallage of gender. Sabinus wrote replies to several of Ovid's *Epistles*. They are enumerated *Amor.* Lib. ii. 18. The "*velivoli maris vates*" is generally supposed to be Terentius Varro of Atax, who translated the *Argonautics* of Apollonius. The Poet "*qui Mæoniam Phæacida vertit*" is Tuticanus, to whom the XIIIth and XIVth Elegies of the IVth Book of the Pontics are addressed. He was the early and intimate friend of Ovid, and they had mutually corrected each other's writings. He translated the VIIth Book of the *Odyssey* into Latin. Melissus, as we learn from Suetonius,* was the author of a new kind of the *Comœdia togata*, called "*trabeata*;" in which characters appear to have been introduced of a higher class than those in the ordinary comedy. In his sixtieth year he began to write books of "*Joci*," or "*Ineptiæ*," which he composed to the amount of upwards of one hundred and fifty. He was a freedman of Mæcenas, and was appointed by Augustus keeper of one of the public libraries. *Tityrus*, of course, is Virgil.

Gratius Faliscus.

Such are nearly all the particulars now extant concerning these Augustan authors. One of the number, Gratius, is mentioned by no other ancient writer, and appears to have been almost unknown, since Oppian and Nemesian, who afterwards wrote on the same subject, speak each of himself as the first bard of hunting. A manuscript of the *Cynegeticon* of this Poet was found by Sannazaro in France, and by him was brought to Naples, and there shown to several eminent literary characters. The Poem was first printed at Venice, in 1534. In the total absence of testimony concerning this writer it would be idle to descant on his history or family, which, however, has been done. The name Faliscus was given him by Caspar Barthius "*e codice suo, quem tamen nemo alius vidit*," as Wernsdorf facetiously observes; but the line

"*At contrà* NOSTRIS *imbellia lina* FALISCIS"†

is commonly thought decisive evidence of his country.

Manilius.

Gratius is not the only Augustan Poet who has been fated to be the transmitter of his own fame. Of Manilius we have no contemporary testimony: even Quinctilian is silent concerning him: but Pliny is supposed to allude to him‡ when he mentions with commendation a certain Astronomer of this name, who placed a golden rod on the obelisk of Augustus in the *Campus Martius*, to distinguish the divisions of time by its shadow. It is probable that most of the copies of the *Astronomicon* perished when Augustus destroyed all the books of divination,§ except the Sibylline, amounting to upwards of two thousand volumes: and to this circumstance is probably to be ascribed the silence of antiquity concerning this author. Similar

Phædrus.

was the fate of Phædrus, who is only mentioned by Avienus, a writer who dedicated a work of the same kind with that of Phædrus to the Emperor Theodosius: unless we may except Martial, who is supposed by some to have alluded to him in the XXth Epigram of his IIId Book. Seneca was certainly ignorant of his writings, for he calls the "*Æsopæi λόγοι*" "*intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus.*"* We mention Phædrus here, although his Fables were not published until after the accession of Tiberius, for the reason assigned by Spence in his *Polymetis*,† "that he flourished and formed his style under Augustus, and his book deserves on all accounts to be reckoned among the works of the Augustan Age." Of Phædrus we know nothing beyond what he has himself imparted. He informs us that he was a Thracian, and the title of his book designates him "*Augusti libertus.*"

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

It is curious to observe how the Augustan Poets, who speak of themselves and their celebrity, in what they conceived to be the most unlimited expressions have yet in many instances underrated the extent and duration of their fame. The Priest and the Vestal no longer ascend the Capitol:‡ that Capitol is no longer the seat of the family of Æneas:§ but the works of Horace and Virgil are still the admiration of the world, and their perpetuity appears secure. Thus, while Ovid seems to have been content to take his chance with posterity as a single star in a great constellation, he has, in effect, by his surpassing lustre, cast into obscurity all the other luminaries, with the sole exception of his *Tityrus*. Although the chief celebrity of Ovid and those circumstances which principally connect his biography with literary history did not arise until after the death of Horace, we shall but slightly trangress our chronology if we mention them here.

Ovid.

Publius Ovidius Naso was born of an ancient and noble family at *Sulmo*,‖ now Solmona, a town of the Pelignian territory, in the seven hundred and eleventh year of Rome. He was first educated under Plotius Grippus,¶ and afterwards studied Oratory under Marcellus** Fuscus and Porcius Latro. He was designed by his father for the bar: and by the talents he possessed, and the proficiency which he made in the preliminary studies, he seems not to have been ill qualified for the profession. The elder Seneca speaks highly of his declamations,†† and has preserved an extract from one of them, observing, "*Oratio ejus jam tum nihil aliud poterat videri quam solutum carmen.*" This preponderating inclination to Poetical pursuits he struggled, at the instance of his father, to repress: but the lines in which he informs us that he was worsted in this conflict are sufficient in themselves to show what must have been the event of a contest between Ovid and the Muses:

"*Sponte sua carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos,*
Et quod tentabam scribere, versus erat."

Accordingly when he found that neither his bodily constitution nor his mental inclinations directed him to the profession for which he was at first intended, he deserted it altogether, and devoted himself to the study of Poetry and the society of Poets. He mentions at this time among the number of his intimates,

* *De Ill. Gram.* xxi.
† *Cyneget.* 40.
‡ *Nat. Hist. lib.* xxxvi. c. x.
§ Suet. *Aug.* xxxi.

* *De Cons. ad* Polyb. c. xxvii.
† *Dial.* iii.
‡ Hor. *lib.* iii. *Od.* xxx.
§ Virg. *Æn.* ix. 447.
‖ Very full particulars of the life of Ovid, as in the case of Horace, may be collected from the Poet's own writings. In the Xth elegy of the IVth Book of his *Tristia* he has written a professed sketch of his life, from which, where it is not otherwise specified, this account is taken.
¶ *Vit. in Cod. Pomponii Læti, itemque in Cod. Farnesiano.*
** Arellius *apud Senecam.*
†† *Contr.* x.

Biography. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

Macer, Propertius, Ponticus, Bassus, and, lastly, Horace himself. Of these he appears to have been most familiar with Propertius,* who like himself had relinquished Forensic for Poetical pursuits, and who occasionally read his Elegies to Ovid, which naturally excited the emulation of a breast devoted to Poetry and Love. Ovid, like Propertius, had attempted Epic Poetry:† but the failure of his friend in this species of writing, and his brilliant success in Elegy, appear to have determined his hesitating Muse. An attentive reader of the *Amores* will easily perceive the influence which the spirit of Propertius exercised in those compositions. They contain less of Greek sentiment and expression than the Poems of Propertius, who was a professed imitator of Callimachus, Philetas, and Mimnermus; indeed it is a principal beauty of Ovid's versification that he has moulded it with a peculiar regard to the natural melody of his native language: but, with more of originality, they bear a greater resemblance to the Elegies of Propertius than to those of any other extant writer. In particular he seems to have been indebted to this Poet for the idea of his Heroic Epistles, as will appear from a perusal of Propertius's *Epistle of Arethusa to Lycotas*.‡

Amores

When Ovid, agreeably to the custom of the time, first publicly recited the *Amores*, he was, according to his own account, very young:

> "*Carmina quum primùm populo juvenilia legi*
> *Barba resecta mihi bisve semelve fuit:*"

They originally occupied five Books; but his maturer judgment reduced these to three. Several Elegies were afterwards added, as that on the death of Tibullus, and others, where circumstances are mentioned which prove them to have been composed at a later period. Who their heroine, Corinna, was, has never, as yet, been discovered; we shall, however, presently have to notice some false opinions on this subject.

The life of Ovid, like that of most literary characters, exhibits few prominent incidents. From himself we learn that he was thrice married. His first marriage took place when he was almost a boy, and was soon dissolved as a low and unworthy connection. His second wife was also divorced, although he makes no charge against her; but his third remained with him until his banishment, in which she was prevented by Augustus from bearing him company. He studied at Athens, as was customary with the youth of his time. His Tragedies, which have been already alluded to, his second edition of the *Amores*, and his *Heroic Epistles* had seen the light, when in his forty-first year he published his *Art of Love*.§ This Poem was the ostensible pretext of his banishment ten years after: had this event taken place at the first publication of the work, it would have been little extraordinary, as the tendency of the Poem went directly to subvert all those salutary measures for the regulation of public morals which Augustus was taking singular pains to enforce: but Ovid, although, as a Roman Knight, he was subject to a moral examination on the part of Augustus, was never molested on the ground of the licentiousness of his writings, until an event occurred, which is hidden in impenetrable mystery, and the investigation of which has afforded amusement for the leisure of the learned. On this account, but professedly on account of the licentious character of his *Art of Love*, the Emperor banished him to Tomos, a town on the north of the Euxine. It will be much easier to show what his offence was not than what it was. The earlier commentators on Ovid, and some of the more recent, triumphantly appeal to Sidonius Apollinaris in proof that the cause of Ovid's banishment to Tomos was an intrigue with Julia, the daughter of Augustus:* the verses are these:

Heroic Epistles. Art of Love.

Horace.—Latin Poetry. From U. C. 1. to 766. — A. C. 740. to A. D. 13.

> "*Et te, carmina per libidinosa*
> *Notum, Naso tener, Tomosque misrum,*
> *Quondam Cæsareæ nimis puellæ*
> *Falso nomine subditum Corinnæ.*"

These lines can, at best, prove no more than that Ovid owed his exile to his licentious verses: and, were it otherwise, the words "*Cæsarea puella*" by no means distinctly indicate the daughter of Cæsar: they may signify a female menial. But that the conjecture founded on these verses is incorrect, is evident, were there no other consideration, from the manner in which Ovid himself perpetually speaks of the fatal circumstance, which he always represents as something unintentional and involuntary.† He was accidentally witness of some transaction which Augustus wished to be concealed. This is by some supposed to have been a criminal intimacy between Augustus and his daughter Julia; which cannot be true, as Julia had been banished from Rome several years before. Some make the granddaughter, Julia, the object of the illicit passion of Augustus: and there are those who conjecture that Ovid had witnessed some of her debaucheries with other gallants, and this opinion derives countenance from the fact that she was banished from Rome in the same year with the Poet. There are, however, strong reasons against this opinion, which the reader will find in the elaborate article "*Ovide*" in Bayle's *Dictionary*. A modern writer supposes that Ovid had seen and revealed some part of the Eleusinian mysteries.

In this banishment from the scene of all his early pursuits and affections Ovid existed, as we learn from his *Tristia* and Pontic Elegies, in a state of the greatest misery, with the Muse as his only friend. Although he could not resign the study of Poetry, he was dissatisfied with his productions, and at his departure committed the *Metamorphoses* to the flames.‡ The work, although it had not received its last polish, was complete in its plan; and had already passed into the hands of friends, whom he afterwards entreated to preserve it. His prosecution of the *Fasti*, six books of which only have reached us, was also interrupted by this misfortune. Masson contends from this verse of Ovid that only six were ever written:

> "*Sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos:*"

but his reasoning is at variance with all grammatical construction, and we are compelled to conclude that

* Of the life of Propertius so few particulars are known that they may be easily embraced here. He was born in the province of Umbria, and according to the most general opinion, in the town of Mevania. His losses in the Civil war have been before alluded to. The real name of his Cynthia, was Hostia, as we learn from Apuleius. The time of his death is uncertain, but he seems to have died at about forty years of age.

† *Am. lib.* i. *Eleg.* i. *Lib.* ii. *Eleg.* i. Prop. *lib.* iii. *Eleg.* iii. *et aliàs.* ‡ Prop. *lib.* iv. *Eleg.* iii.

§ Masson, *Vit.* Ov.

* Sid. *Apoll.* xxiii. 157.

† *Trist. lib.* ii. 103. *Lib.* iii. *Eleg.* v. *et passim.*

‡ *Trist.* i. 6.

time has deprived us of six books of the *Fasti*. Beside these works, Ovid composed *The Remedy of Love*, and a *Satire on Ibis*, which have reached us, and *Epigrams*, a Latin and a Getic Poem on the Triumphs of Cæsar, and *Phænomena*, which are lost. The *Nux*, the *Medicamina faciei*, and the *Panegyricus ad Pisones*, are, at best, doubtful. The other Poems attributed to Ovid, are manifestly spurious.

Ovid died after a seven years' banishment, and after having vainly employed the interest of his friends with Tiberius to be recalled. He was, however, treated by the natives with every attention, and received from them several immunities.*

Ovid was the only writer of eminence who prolonged the golden age of Latin Poetry beyond the time of Horace: and were it not that other causes may be assigned, the inferiority of his later Poems might seem to have been referable to that sudden languor of the Latian Muse, which the deaths of Horace and Mæcenas, and the infirmities and subsequent decease of her patron Augustus produced, and from which she never recovered. The last piece which Horace ever wrote was, most probably, the IId Epistle of his IId Book, which he addressed to Julius Florus, a Satiric Poet of high excellence,† and which, in that case, could not have been written long before his death. In it he professes his determination to relinquish the pursuits of Poetry for those of Moral Philosophy, especially the suitable contemplation of his advancing end. And, perhaps, never was death encountered with more genuine Philosophy, (in the real sense of the word,) than by Horace. He employed his latter days, exclusively, in a study to which he had devoted a considerable portion of his earlier life, the investigation of Moral good, and the nature of Happiness: an inquiry which he undertook for the advantages of its results, and not from any motives of ambition or ostentation; and which he therefore conducted on the principles of right reason and regulated sentiment, without reference to the subtleties and mechanism of any of the Philosophical systems then in vogue. He employed what light had been bestowed on him faithfully: and by that blessing, which, we now learn from the highest authority, is always given to the ingenuous and serious inquirer after truth, he made a proficiency in the knowledge of the situation and duties of mankind, rarely, if ever before attained by unassisted Nature, whose inability to discriminate universally between good and evil, and the objects to be severally pursued and avoided, was not unknown to him.‡ And hence his writings exhibit him, although not uninfected with vices which not even Religious ignorance, and the customs of a most depraved society, can greatly extenuate; yet, on the whole, perhaps the most moral, and certainly the happiest, character of profane antiquity.

Those who have attempted to assimilate the opinions of Horace to the tenets of any one of the Philosophical sects, have been guided rather by detached passages, than by the general tenour of his writings. In one place, indeed, where, in writing to Mæcenas, he gives an account of his method of studying Philosophy, he distinctly disavows his intention to adopt the systems of any, till he has examined all.* That, while prosecuting his studies at Athens, the Epicurean Philosophy might have first called his attention to the general subject, is highly probable: the supreme excellence of *happiness* (for such was, after all, the Epicurean ἡδονή) was the leading principle of Epicurus: and the same principle, refined from the heartless selfishness which mingled with it in the Epicurean system is the distinguishing mark of what may be called the Horatian Philosophy. That Horace had studied the Philosophy of Epicurus, we learn on his own authority;† but nothing is to be inferred with certainty from the appellation which he gives himself in his epistle to Tibullus, "*Epicuri de grege porcum*," as he is not there discussing his opinions, but rallying himself on his improved condition of body. The XXXIVth Ode of the Ist Book, in which he professes to renounce the creed of Epicurus, in consequence of having seen lightning in a clear sky, is altogether involved in too much obscurity, both as to its occasion and object, to enable us to derive from it any plausible conjecture. But in those parts of his writings which are least liable to cavil, and where he expresses his opinions without ornament or reserve, we find some part of the doctrines of every Philosophical School impugned in turn. The Stoics, in particular, he takes every occasion of ridiculing with the liveliest humour,‡ and he admits the power of the Gods wherever the subject requires an opinion to be given.§

The effects of the Philosophy of Horace were put to a severe trial, by the death of his early friend and best patron, Mæcenas: nor does it appear that it enabled him to recover the calamity, as he died a very short time after. Mæcenas had, for a long time, existed in what Pliny calls a perpetual fever; he was living in the greatest misery, and yet regarding death as the greatest conceivable of evils: his sleep was procured by wine, distant music, and artificial waterfalls; yet, among all these *appliances*, he was, as Seneca observes, as restless on his down, as Regulus on the rack.‖ His effeminate and luxurious habits had made pain intolerable: but it is a most ungenerous and unfounded suspicion that this effeminacy is covertly satirized by Horace in the character of *Malthinus*. Horace had, on one occasion, declared the impossibility of long surviving his friend; that one day must bring with it the fall of both;¶ and the prediction was very nearly fulfilled. The last entreaty of Mæcenas to Augustus was, "*Horatii Flacci, ut mei, esto memor.*"

Although this account of the death of Mæcenas, which we have from Suetonius, is sufficiently clear and intelligible in itself, some scholars have not been content to leave it in its plain and obvious meaning, and although they admit that there did not intervene more than a month between the deaths of the two illustrious friends, they place that of Horace first. In order to support this theory, they are obliged to

---

* For a more minute discussion of the history of this Poet than can be here given of him, see the article in Bayle, above alluded to, and Masson's copious *Life of Ovid*, published in Burmann's edition; and also in a small volume with his Lives of Horace, and Pliny the younger.

† Acro. *in loc. cit. cf. etiam* Hor. *lib.* i. *Ep.* iii.

‡ Hor. *lib.* i. *Sat.* iii. 113.

* *Lib.* i. *Ep.* i.

† *Lib.* i. *Sat.* v.

‡ See in particular, *lib.* i. *Sat.* iii. and *lib.* ii *Sat.* iii.

§ *Lib.* i. *Ep.* xviii. *fin. et passim.*

‖ *De Prov.* iii.

¶ *Lib.* ii. *Od.* xvii.

interpret the word "*extremis*," which, in all other passages, signifies at the point of death, "*extremis indiciis*," "*extremis verbis*," implying that the commendation of Horace was found in the Will of Mæcenas, where it was allowed to remain, although its object had ceased to require it. The only evidence produced for this fact is contemptible to the last degree, being some pretended verses of Mæcenas on the death of Horace, preserved by Isidore.* But as the passage stands in Isidore, it is not verse: neither is it expressly attributed to Mæcenas; nor is it said that Flaccus is the same with Horace. The following is the passage, as it is *corrected* by Sanadon, to support the theory of those who contend for the priority of the death of Mæcenas:

> "*Lugens te, mea vita, nec smaragdos,*
> *Beryllos neque, Flacce mi, nitentes,*
> *Nec percandida margarita quæro,*
> *Nec quos Thynica lima perpolivit*
> *Annellos, neque iaspios lapillos.*"

If this be a genuine restoration of the original verses, it manifestly proves nothing: but others read "*Lucentes, mea vita*," &c.

Horace was buried next to the tomb of Mæcenas, at the extremity of the Esquiline hill.

We must here leave the history of the most brilliant period of Roman Poetry with the biography of the character who most clearly illustrated, and most essentially adorned it. From those readers who think an undue portion of this work has been assigned to this subject, we shall shelter ourselves under its interest and extent: and the same plea will hold with those, if there be any, who, on the contrary, think enough has not been said: for to do entire justice to a subject of such magnitude, is what a work of this nature does not profess. For, in the words of Gesner, speaking of the literary life of Horace alone, "*adeo ab omnibus inde sæculis sategerunt circa Horatii Flacci Eclogas librarii, interpretes, critici, ut possit homo diligens, cui bibliothecæ pateant, facilè librum mediocrem vel sold hujus Poëtæ enarrandd historid litteraria implere.*"*

* *Orig.* lib. xix. c. 32.

* Gesner, *Præf. in Horatium.*—Of the literary lives of Horace which have been written, the most minute are those of Masson and Algarotti.

HEROD THE GREAT.

FROM A. M. 4668. B. C. 46. TO A. M. 4711. B. C. 3.

Biography. From A. M. 4668. to 4711. — B. C. 46. to 3.

THE course of events which led to the overthrow of the Asamonean Dynasty, and the accession of Herod to the throne of Judæa, has been already detailed. The preceding history clearly shows that we may ascribe his success to his ability in command; which recommended him to the Romans, as a person able to protect the interests of their Eastern Empire, by opposing the power of Judæa to the invasions of the Parthians.* During the nominal reign of Hyrcanus, Herod was appointed Governor of Galilee. By his just and judicious government, he won the affections not only of the inhabitants, but also of Sextus Cæsar, the Roman Governor: and even his enemies, when instigated by the jealousy of his own brother Phasael, could find no other ground of accusation, than general charges, that he had assumed the government, and put the chief of the robbers to death without a trial. The conduct of Herod, on this occasion, has been traced in Chapter xvii. In the prophetic warning, which Sameas is related to have given to the Council before which Herod was summoned to answer for his conduct, we discern what great expectations were then formed of Herod. The family of Antipater had been virtually nominated to the Sovereignty of the country; and in the falling condition of the Asamonean Dynasty, it did not require any very great sagacity to foresee the probability that a Prince, like Herod, would be placed by the Senate on the Throne of Judæa. The fears of future vengeance expressed by Sameas were, in fact, complimentary to the person whom he appeared to condemn; and even if Herod had not aspired to succeed Hyrcanus, no circumstance could have tended more to encourage such thoughts, than Sameas publicly foreboding that his power would be one day greater than that of the Council and of Hyrcanus. There is reason to suspect that Sameas secretly encouraged the hopes of Herod; for when Herod besieged Jerusalem,† Pollio and Sameas were most forward in advising the surrender of the city:‡ and in aftertimes, these two Chiefs of the Pharisees were held by Herod in such esteem, that when many of that sect refused to take the oath of allegiance, he desisted for their sakes from enforcing compliance with his command.

B. C. 41. Accession of Herod to the Throne of Judæa.

The invasion of Judæa by the Parthians, secured to Herod the possession of the Kingdom. The Parthians had taken Jerusalem, and placed Antigonus, the nephew of Hyrcanus, on the Throne, and carried away Hyrcanus with them as their prisoner. In this emergence Herod hastened to Rome, intending to ask the Kingdom for his brother-in-law, Aristobulus, the brother of Mariamne;§ but Antony was so willing to advance Herod himself, and withal, so accessible to the influence of promises of remuneration, that a decree was instantly proposed to the Senate,‖ importing that in consideration of the dangers which might arise from the Parthian invasion, it was expedient to make Herod King of Judæa. The Senate did not hesitate to confirm the decree; and at the breaking up of the assembly, Antony and Augustus, placing Herod between them, and accompanied by the Consuls and Magistrates, went in solemn procession to enroll the decree in the Capitol. The day concluded with a sumptuous entertainment, given to Herod in the house of Antony. In seven days after his arrival at Rome, Herod left Italy on his return to Judæa.*

Herod the Great. From A. M. 4668. to 4711 — B. C. 46 to 3.

* Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 14. sec. 4.
† Ibid. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 1. sec. 1.
‡ Ibid. lib. xv. c. 10. sec. 4.
§ Ibid. lib. xiv. c. 14. sec. 5.
‖ Ibid. *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 14. sec. 4.

* *On the Chronology of the commencement of Herod's reign.*

The interval of three years, which elapsed between the decree in favour of Herod, and Herod's becoming master of Jerusalem, constitutes a double epocha for the commencement of his reign. Josephus, (*Antiq.* lib. xiv. c. 14. sec. 5. edit. Hudson,) states that the decree passed in the Consulship of C. Domitius Calvinus and C. Asinius Pollio, and in the 184th Olympiad. The year of this Consulship agrees with B. C. 40, U. C. 714, Varro: which is assigned as the first year of the 185th Olympiad. Usher, in *Annal.* corrects Josephus's text, and places the date of the decree in the 185th Olympiad; but the correction is needless. for though the tables give B. C. 40, as Olympiad 185, 1; the Olympiad not commencing till July, the year B. C. 40 is partly in two Olympiads, and the apparent difficulty is solved by supposing that the decree passed before July in that year. The date of the decree forms the first epocha. The second epocha is dated from the capture of Jerusalem by the united force of Herod and Sosius, the Roman General, B. C. 37; M. Agrippa and L. Caninius Gallus, Consuls. The city, as Josephus states, (*Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 1. sec. 2,) was taken in a Sabbatical year; and that the year B. C. 37, was a Sabbatical year, is proved by Hales. See *Chronology*, vol. ii. p. 606. note. Dio, (lib. xlix.) differs from Josephus, and places the capture in the preceding Consulship of Appius Claudius Pulcher and C. Norbanus Flaccus. Usher reconciles Josephus with Dio, by supposing that the day of the capture was January 1, 37, but that by a wrong intercalation, that day fell on the 31st of December, B. C. 38, which was the last day of the last-mentioned Consulship. Josephus, (lib. xiv. *ad fin.*) states a very remarkable circumstance, that the capture of Jerusalem by Herod, took place twenty-seven years to a day after the capture by Pompey. That Pompey took Jerusalem during the Consulship of Cicero, is universally admitted. Usher having placed the capture of the city on January 1, B. C. 37, and the Consulship of Cicero beginning with B. C. 63, he conjectures either that Josephus mistook the time, or that the reading μετὰ κζ' ἔτη may be rendered in the twenty-seventh year; as μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας is rendered by τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Amidst the difficulties with which the chronology of this period is entangled, the following arrangement appears to us liable to the fewest objections.

B. C.
64. In October of this reformed Julian year, Cicero enters on his consulship. December, Pompey takes Jerusalem.
40. Before July, Herod appointed King by the Senate.
37. In the spring, Herod begins the siege alone, and blockades the city; it being now the third year of his reign.
— Consummates his marriage with Mariamne.
— After the marriage, Herod is joined by Sosius, and the siege is vigorously pursued in July.
— In December the city is taken, 27 years after the capture by Pompey. M. Agrippa and L. Caninius Gallus, Consuls. It is further rendered probable that the city was taken in the end of B. C. 37, rather than at the beginning; for the year being Sabbatical the consequent want of provisions, to which Josephus ascribes in some measure the surrender, would be more felt in the autumn of a Sabbatical year than at the beginning.

We must, however, not omit to mention that Prideaux, in his *Connect.* (*ad an.* 3,) places the capture of the city in June; supposing that "the third month" mentioned by Josephus, means the third month of the sacred year, and not as Usher supposes the third month of the civil year, which began in September.

On his arrival in Judæa, he received so little assistance from the Roman Generals, that more than two years elapsed before he commenced the siege of Jerusalem.

When the siege was so far advanced as to render success no longer doubtful, Herod consummated his marriage with Mariamne,* the daughter of Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, by a daughter of Hyrcanus; hoping by this union with the Royal family of the Asamoneans, to ensure the affections of the Jews to his person. To pave the way for this union, he divorced his former wife Doris,† the mother of his son Antipater: but if he sought the marriage at first only from motives of interest, it became afterwards, on his part at least, an union cemented by the strongest affection; but the uncertainty of the wisest efforts of mere human policy may be seen in the subsequent events of his history; for this marriage which seemed most conducive to his power, and which he achieved by most unjust behaviour to his former wife, proved to him the source of almost all the miseries which he endured.

Consummates his marriage with Mariamne.

After a siege of six months, Jerusalem surrendered.‡ The first acts of Herod's government upon taking possession of the city, were marked with cruelty and revenge, yet not without some tincture of generosity. He advanced to rank and power those persons who had espoused his interests, and conferred the highest distinction upon Pollio and Sameas, as the reward of the counsel they had given during the siege to deliver up the city. Of the adherents of Antigonus, forty-five persons were put to death, and the most vigilant search was made, that none should escape; the gates of the city being guarded, and even the dead bodies searched as they were carried out, lest the living should escape by concealment among them. If we may credit Josephus, the Chiefs of the Roman Empire sold their influence with the Senate at an enormous rate. The sagacity with which Herod seized each favourable opportunity of securing to himself the attachment of Augustus and of Antony, is a striking proof of his political wisdom. To the Roman General, Sosius, Herod was indebted for the capture of Jerusalem; but the ravages committed by his troops had reduced the country to the condition of a desert: to men less politic than Herod, therefore, a fair excuse would have offered itself for omitting to testify to Antony his gratitude; but he measured the propriety of his conduct more by what he was aware Antony would expect, than by his own apparent inability to discharge the debt of obligation: he therefore stripped the palace of every ornament, he forced contributions from the wealthy, and even availed himself of the plunder of the dead,§ and having converted all into money, he sent the produce to Antony at Antioch. The late King, Antigonus, was now a captive, preserved to grace a Roman triumph; but Antony, understanding that the preservation of this Prince was a bar to Herod's firm settlement on the Throne, in compliance with Herod's wishes, gave orders for his death. The misfortunes of

First acts of his reign.

* Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xiv. c. 15. sec. 14. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 17. sec. 8.
† Ibid. *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 12. sec. 3.
‡ Ibid. c. 18. sec. 4. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 1.
§ Ibid. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 1. sec. 2. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 18. sec. 4.

Hyrcanus were lightened by the kindness of Phraates, the King of Parthia, who released him from captivity, and permitted him to reside amongst the Jews at Babylon. By them he was honoured both as their High Priest and their King: but as soon as he learned that Herod had acquired possession of Judæa, his desire to return thither prevailed over every persuasion which the Babylonians could urge, and he committed himself without the least reserve to the protection of Herod.* Herod's conduct towards him was outwardly of the most gracious kind; he paid him every mark of honour, admitted him to his councils, called him father, and gave him the first place at his Court. Josephus attributes all this to mere hypocrisy, and, judging from the tragic termination of this Prince's life, he asserts that Herod from the beginning entertained treacherous designs against Hyrcanus;† an account not improbable, when we consider that Hyrcanus was put to death a few years after, on very slight gounds of suspicion.

Herod, on his accession, found the High Priest's office vacant. Had he respected either the Law of Moses, which ordained an hereditary succession to the High Priesthood, or the prejudices of the people, he would have acted not only the better but the wiser part, and in all probability would have escaped the troubles which immediately began to ensue. The High Priesthood belonged of right to his brother-in-law, Aristobulus, the son of Alexandra, the young man for whom, on his flight to Rome, he at first intended to have asked the Kingdom; but upon him Herod was afraid to confer this honour, lest the influence attached to the office should prove a source of danger to himself; he therefore sent to Babylon for one Ananelus, a man descended from the inferior families of the tribes of Levi, and made him High Priest in the room of Hyrcanus.‡ The pride of Alexandra could not brook such an insult; and she acquainted Cleopatra with the injury: through whose influence with Antony, Ananelus was deposed, and Aristobulus, now a youth of sixteen years of age, made High Priest.

B. C. 36.

Not long after, Herod secretly determined to rid himself of Aristobulus; and his purpose was hastened by the public admiration of him shown by the people at the Feast of Tabernacles:§ for he was recommended to their affections not less by his Royal descent, than by the extraordinary beauty of his person. The festival being ended, the King consented to share the hospitality of Alexandra at Jericho, and treacherously seized that opportunity to contrive the death of her son. The heat being excessive, the young men were amusing themselves with bathing in the numerous pools which adorned the gardens of the Palace; Herod persuaded Aristobulus to join the sport, when, under pretence of play, the attendants commissioned by Herod suffocated him by repeated immersion. Herod was hypocrite enough to shed tears, and pretend sorrow for his death, and further tried to conceal the murder by the most magnificent display of expense at his funeral. Such vanities could ill compensate to Alexandra for the loss of her son, or soothe her anger. She communicated the particulars of the transaction

Murder of Aristobulus.

* Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 2.
† Ibid. *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 22. sec. 1. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 2.
‡ Ibid. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 2. sec. 4. § Ibid. c 3.

to Cleopatra, and found in her a most powerful ally. Antony was on his way to Laodicea, and by the advice of Cleopatra, he summoned Herod to appear and answer before him. Herod obeyed the command; but money soon soothed the pretended indignation of Antony, and Herod returned to Jerusalem having been received as a Prince instead of condemned as a criminal.

B. C. 46. to 3.

When Herod was summoned to Laodicea,* fearful of the worst, he secretly commissioned his uncle Joseph, in the event of his death, not to suffer Mariamne to live, and become the partner of Antony. Joseph was a man utterly unfitted to be intrusted with such a design; for, in the absurd hope of convincing Mariamne of the warmth of her husband's love, he foolishly communicated to her and to Alexandra the orders which he had received. On the return of Herod, his sister Salome, in revenge for some insult which she had received from Mariamne, insinuated against her own husband Joseph, the existence of a criminal intercourse between them. The accusation was as unfounded as it was malicious, and Mariamne soon assuaged the wrath of Herod; but happening to reply to some expression of his affection, that his having given orders to put her to death, was no proof of love, this betrayal of his secret instructions, convinced Herod of the truth of the charge of illicit intercourse with Joseph, and it was with difficulty that he restrained himself from ordering her immediate death: Joseph, however, was instantly executed without being heard in his defence.

Secret instructions relative to Mariamne.

Execution of Joseph.

Judæa seems to have recovered rapidly under the government of Herod from the effects of the war with Antigonus; for we find the new King prepared to assist Antony, both with supplies of men and money for the war, which terminated in his defeat at Actium.† Antony, however, declined accepting his reinforcement. The fall of Antony was justly a cause of alarm to Herod:‡ his friends despaired of his safety; his attachment to the rival of Augustus was commonly known; and his enemies rejoiced at the prospect of his ruin. We cannot but lament, that one who could prepare himself for that interview with Augustus, upon which his life and fortune depended, with such admirable firmness and discretion, should have taken measures in the event of his death, to involve others in his ruin. On his departure, he committed Alexandra and Mariamne to the custody of his two friends, Joseph and Soemus, with orders that neither of them should be permitted to survive the event of his death, lest the spirit of Alexandra should disturb the settlement of the chief power in the hands of his children. His conduct showed a mixture of folly with cruelty; for had Augustus punished him with dethronement or death, for his attachment to Antony, there remained not the slightest probability either that the conqueror would set a descendant of Herod on the Throne, or that his family, even if supported by the whole nation, could have maintained their power for an instant against the will of Augustus. At Rhodes, Herod met Augustus, whom he addressed in the tone of a man conscious of having displayed towards his friend a fidelity which, in the judgment of all good men, was in the highest degree praise-worthy: he did not palliate his conduct, but seemed rather to lament that the assistance in money and provisions which he had afforded to his unfortunate ally was, if possible, less than his duty required. He represented that he had been prevented from joining actively in the war, but that he had done all that was in his power to advance the best interests of his friend, and that if Antony had taken his advice, and put Cleopatra aside, he might still have lived, and have been reconciled to Augustus. He proceeded then to state of himself, that from his fidelity to Antony, Augustus might judge of his general disposition to his friends; for that such as he was to Antony, he was also to all those to whom he was bound by the ties of gratitude and affection. Such openness and generosity, seconded by liberal presents, both to Augustus, and all who were about the person of the Conqueror, obtained for Herod the safety of his person, and the security of his Kingdom; the possession of which was confirmed to him by a second decree of the Senate. He returned to Judæa with honour and success, confounding the hopes of his enemies, who beheld him as it were gaining power from each danger which appeared to threaten him. Augustus soon after passed through Judæa on his road to Egypt, and was attended by Herod, who presented him with the immense sum of 800 talents,* and furnished him with such profusion as to make men suspect that he must exhaust the strength of his Kingdom. By this means, however, he gave assurance of his fidelity, and by being splendidly liberal in proportion to the necessity of the occasion, succeeded in producing that impression on the mind of Augustus which he desired.

B. C. 31.

Herod the Great. From A. M. 4668. to 4711. B. C. 46. to 3.

Profuse supplies.

In the absence of Herod, the remembrance of the orders formerly given to Joseph, naturally made Alexandra and Mariamne suspicious of the King's designs towards them. They found at first a difficulty in inducing Soemus to betray the confidence which the King had reposed in him; but the intreaties of his prisoners, the kind presents with which they flattered his pride, united to his own belief of the impossibility of Herod's safe return, by degrees undermined his fidelity, and he revealed the orders for their destruction, which had again been given. Herod, however, returned, and naturally expected that none would rejoice so much at the happy result of his interview with Augustus, as the wife whom he so much loved. But he found to his surprise, that neither the relation of the dangers which he had escaped, nor the honours which he had received, excited the least interest in her bosom. Hate and love by turns distracted him; at one moment he determined to punish her with death; at the next, his passion returned, and disarmed his intention of its cruelty. The state of Herod's mind could not be concealed from his mother and from his sister Salome, who viewed with barbarous exultation the changed temper of the King, as affording them the fairest opportunity of revenging upon Alexandra and Mariamne, some words which they had contemptuously spoken against the family of Herod. The moral conduct of Mariamne was wholly irreproachable; she was faithful and chaste, but there was somewhat haughty and severe in her natural disposition; and in the impe-

Intrigues of Salome against Mariamne.

B. C. 30. Interview with Augustus.

* Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 22. sec. 4. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 3.
† Ibid. *Antiq* lib. xv. c. 5. ‡ Ibid. c. 6.

* Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 6. sec. 7.

Biography. From A. M. 4668. to 4711. — B. C. 46. to 3.

rious manner which she used towards her husband, she seemed to take advantage of the blindness of his love, and to forget that, though his wife, she was still subject to his power. She sometimes conducted herself with a degree of insolence towards the King, and often spoke reproachfully of his mother and his sister, thereby sowing the seeds of irreconcileable dissensions between herself and the female branches of Herod's family. The discord between Herod and Mariamne had continued a whole year after his return from Augustus; it happened one day that the King, retiring to rest about noon, sought her company: she came, but instead of requiting his love with corresponding affection, she reproached him with the murder of her father and her brother. The King naturally was indignant, but his anger might have passed away,* had not Salome seized the opportunity which she had long sought, to excite him to severity against his wife, by suborning his Cup-bearer to assert that Mariamne had bribed him to give a certain potion, the nature of which, however, he knew not. Herod, anxious to learn its nature, put to the rack the eunuch most in the confidence of his wife, thinking he must be aware of her intentions. Nothing, however, was discovered from the eunuch, relating to the potion; but he said the cause of Mariamne's hatred was her knowledge of the orders with which Soemus had been intrusted. The King had such an high opinion of the fidelity of this officer, that he was persuaded that nothing but an illicit intercourse with Mariamne could have wrung from him the secret of his orders. Soemus was therefore ordered to instant execution; but Herod would not condemn his wife without the appearance at least of a regular sentence: he therefore summoned his most familiar friends, and accused her of administering the potion. The result was a sentence of death; which the tender weakness of Herod commuted into imprisonment. Salome, however, persuaded the King that the death of Mariamne was necessary to secure himself against the tumults of the populace; and by her advice she was led away to execution. On her way to the fatal spot, she had the additional pain of seeing her own mother, under the influence of terror, burst forth into the midst of the crowd, and load her with reproaches for her ungrateful conduct to her husband. How much Alexandra had excited her own daughter to behave contemptuously towards Herod was known to all; and men beheld with pity and astonishment, the dissimulation to which the fear of partaking her daughter's punishment had driven the wretched mother. Mariamne uttered not a word, nor betrayed the slightest emotion at this desertion by her parent, but met her death displaying in her end a firmness of character which corresponded to her noble birth. Herod, however, soon felt all the miseries of a wounded conscience, increased by the remembrance of ardent love. He was often heard to call Mariamne by name, his lamentations were unrestrained, he sought for pleasure in frequent banquets, but it fled from him; until at last he declined all regard to public business, and so forgot himself at times, as to order his servants to fetch Mariamne, as if she were yet alive. A pestilential disorder at this time prevailed, which took off in its ravages many of his friends. Under pretence of enjoying the amusements of the chace, he retired from society, and passed his days sorrowing in solitude; in a short time, the sufferings of his mind brought on him a fever and delirium, which baffled the skill of his physicians; who, finding all remedies ineffectual, left him to his fate. Whilst labouring under this disorder, the King resided at Samaria. That he should recover from such an illness, appeared to be impossible. Alexandra, therefore, lost no time in preparing measures to secure to herself the chief command, in the event of his death, and made proposals to the officers who were intrusted with the two forts in Jerusalem, which commanded the Temple and the city, that for the sake of security under the present calamity of the King's illness, they should deliver up the charge to herself and to Herod's sons. The officers were faithful to Herod, and sent him intelligence of Alexandra's proposal. The result was the immediate execution of Alexandra.

B. C. 29. Her execution. Remorse of Herod.

Herod the Great. From A. M. 4668. to 4711. — B. C. 46. to 3. Treason and execution of Alexandra

In process of time Herod recovered from his illness, and a remarkable change took place in his conduct:* he threw off the mask of religion, and laboured zealously to remove all the prejudices of the Jews in favour of the Law of Moses, by introducing among them the customs of heathen nations. All his views seem to have been henceforth directed to Romanize Judæa. He instituted Quinquennial games in honour of Augustus; he built a Theatre and an Amphitheatre on a scale of the greatest magnificence, at Jerusalem. Competitors for the prizes which he proposed to those who excelled in Gymnastic exercises, came from all parts. The chariot and the horse race were contested for rewards of no inconsiderable value; the most celebrated musicians were invited to contend for victory. In the Amphitheatre he exhibited animals for the entertainment of the populace; and to complete the picture of a Roman festival, gladiators fought with wild beasts and with each other, to the horror of the pious Jews, who regarded such shedding of blood as a pollution of the land. But the sight of these cruel sports, so strange to the Jewish nation, did not excite their anger so much as the trophies which were erected in the Circus, representing the nations which Augustus had subjected to the Roman power. The resemblance of the trophy to the human form, made them regard these emblems as idolatrous representations of the Divinity; and it was not until Herod had stripped the trophies of their ornaments, and shown of what material they were composed, that they were reconciled to their introduction into the city.

B. C. 28. B. C. 26. Public Games at Jerusalem

The designs which the King had manifestly formed against their religion, and his violation of every custom dear to the Jews, were, however, considered by many as sure forerunners of still more dreadful evils. Herod was, in name, their King, but, in deed, the enemy of their country and their God. Ten men, zealous for the Law, conspired to assassinate him in the theatre. The plan was discovered, and the conspirators were arrested, with daggers concealed about their persons. They were not ashamed of their designs, but boldly confessed their intentions, and were led away to execution.

Plot for assassination of Herod. B. 25

Herod now understood the feelings of the people, and found it necessary to increase his fortifications for the security of his own person, and to provide against

His precaution

* Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 7.

* Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 8. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 21.

rebellions. In the city he had two fortresses, the Palace, and the Castle of *Antonia*, so named in honour of Antony: he now planned the restoration of Samaria, and fortified it, probably as a balance to the strength of Jerusalem; for he not only rebuilt it, but peopled it with inhabitants, calling it Sebaste, in honour of Augustus, and erecting a Temple, which he dedicated to Cæsar. These fortresses, with many others, were built for safety; but to increase the prosperity of his Kingdom by trade, he entertained the grand design of converting the Tower of Strato into a city and seaport. He formed an artificial harbour with moles, and defended it by a break-water, surrounding the port with a wall and towers of defence. Few places presented more obstacles, but the skill and the munificence of Herod surmounted them all. The honour of this great work he sedulously declined ascribing to himself, and the names of Cæsar and of Cæsar's friends, were every where indelibly affixed. The most conspicuous tower in the port was called *Drusium*, in honour of Drusus, the son-in-law of Augustus; and in the splendid Temple which he dedicated to Cæsar, a colossal statue of Augustus, like that of the Olympian Jove, was erected, and near it another as great as that of the Argive Juno, being a female figure, representing the city of Rome. Twelve years were occupied in these stupendous works, but it was not in Cæsarea and Sebaste alone that he flattered Augustus. At Jerusalem he named two courts or wings of his palace *Cæsarium* and *Agrippium*. At the source of the Jordan, called *Panium*, another Temple arose in honour of his benefactor. At Jericho, in the palace which he there constructed, the names of Cæsar and Agrippa were again honourably attached to the buildings; and, as Josephus emphatically states, there was not a single place in the whole country worthy such distinction wherein the name of Cæsar was not conspicuous. It is, indeed, sufficiently evident that the policy which Herod pursued, and by which he retained a perfect Sovereignty over Judæa, was that of paying the most flattering court to Augustus. The forbidding character of the Jewish religion was well known to the Romans; but Herod sought their favour by the most public renunciation of every Jewish prejudice, and the adoption of every custom that could do honour to his protectors. He seems studiously to have laboured to convince foreign nations that he was the King of Judæa, but that he was not himself one of the despised and prejudiced race of Jews; that he had no narrow-minded views of religion, but was ready to patronize every opinion which other nations held: to this spirit we may ascribe his contribution of money for the restoration of the Olympic Games, as well as his erection of Theatres and Temples to heathen Deities at Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, and Damascus. Josephus asserts, that his bounty was experienced by innumerable cities both in Asia Minor, and also in Greece; and that he was in many cases restrained from doing as he wished, only by the fear lest those to whom the Sovereignty of the States belonged, should be jealous of the patronage which he extended to their subjects.* The sums which Herod expended in building cities and fortresses must have been immense; but he took care to prevent the Romans from interrupting the completion of his designs, by making his dedications to Augustus, seem so many public testimonies of his dependence upon the Emperor. In many instances, however, the structures which he erected, were monuments to the memory of those whom he loved. The city Antipatris he built as a testimony of his affection to his father; and dedicated to his mother's memory a magnificent castle at Jericho, which after her was called *Cyprion*. The Tower of Phasael and Hippicus, in the circuit of the walls of Jerusalem, were lasting memorials of fraternal and of friendly affection; nor was his love to the unfortunate Mariamne forgotten, for the fairest tower in the walls bore her name.

Herod was a Prince who seems to have had no rule of conduct, but that arising from a sense of political interest. The reasons which led him to undertake the stupendous work of rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem, may be traced in the accounts left us by Josephus of the state of the public mind a short time before he commenced this great work.* Herod's prosperity was at its height during the visit of Augustus to Syria, when his sons were still at Rome, under the care of the Emperor; and when the increase of his territory, by the acquisition of the district, called the House of Zenodorus, proved the confidence which Augustus reposed in him.† All his foreign success was gained by compliance with heathen customs. And when the indignation of the Jews at his conduct began to display itself in open murmurs, Herod at first strove to suppress the feelings of the people, by a most rigid and vexatious system of police, prohibiting persons from walking or conversing together; himself, in private dress, condescending to be the spy upon the common people, and filling the whole country with emissaries, who were employed to watch the expression of any the slightest feeling of hostility. By persecution and imprisonment, he endeavoured to force men to compliance with the customs which he prescribed, and thought to ensure the obedience of the people by administering to them an oath of fidelity to his person. Many consented to the oath from private attachment to him, or from fear; but the Pharisees and the Essenes boldly refused, and Herod is said to have ceased from enforcing his orders out of respect to Pollio and Manahem, the respective leaders of these sects. When he had thus tried in vain to subdue the feelings of his countrymen, he perceived that it would be better to yield entirely to their prejudices; and in proof of his good will to their religion, he undertook to rebuild the Temple on the greatest scale of magnificence. In a set oration he exposed his designs to them; but so great was their unwillingness to undertake the execution of such vast plans, as well as their suspicion lest the building once begun should remain unfinished, that Herod found himself obliged to make all his preparations for the erection of the new Temple, before he could venture upon removing a single stone of the old structure. The execution of that part of the former building which strictly constituted the Temple, and which comprehended the porch, the holy place, and the holy of holies, occupied a space of not more than eighteen months; but the porticoes and other works surrounding the Temple were not completed until the lapse of a further space of eight years. From the ac-

* Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 21. sec. 12.

* Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 10. sec. 4.
† Ibid. *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 20. sec. 4.

counts of Josephus,* it is evident that Herod did not leave any part of the Temple standing which had been erected on the return of the Jews from Babylon. The structure was entirely new, even from the foundation, and both in size and extent greatly exceeded the ancient building. And though it is said that Herod finished it in nine years and a half, it is probable that this *finishing* amounted to little more than the rude completion of the plan, the more exact adorning of the building occupying a much longer time. This appears both from *John*, ii. 20, where we read of the disciples speaking to our Lord, "forty and six years hath this temple been building," and also from *Antiq.* xx. 8, where it is related, that whilst Gessius Ftonus was Governor of Judæa the works were completed, and eighteen thousand artificers were discharged, who had been engaged up to that time.

B. C. 25. Famine in Judæa.

In the thirteenth year of Herod's reign a dreadful famine visited Judæa and Syria, attended with all the misery and disease which fails not to accompany a time of dearth.† The conduct of the King on this occasion was of the most noble description; and had not his crimes stamped the indelible brand of tyranny upon his memory, the sacrifices which he made then would have ranked him among those Kings who have been benefactors to their subjects. To supply the wants of his people, he stripped his palaces of every ornament of silver and gold, of every thing however precious its material or costly its workmanship, and loading a vessel with these spoils he sent it to Egypt to purchase corn. Benevolence such as this could not fail to conciliate the affections of his countrymen, and to diminish the hatred which they had cherished against him for his violation of their customs: the kindness which he displayed in this season of distress, for the time quite changed the temper of the multitude, who no longer judged of him by the past, but considered his present conduct as a proof of the natural mildness of his disposition.

Exertions of Herod to relieve it.

In justice to Herod, we must nor omit to mention the kind assistance which he gave to the Jewish colonists of Asia Minor, and his successful endeavours for the preservation of those privileges which had in former times been extended to them. In the expedition which Agrippa made against the inhabitants of the Cimmerian Bosporus, Herod bore a part; and after the business of the campaign had been accomplished, they returned together through Asia Minor.‡ In Ionia they were met by a great company of Jews, who came to request from Agrippa a release from the exactions which they suffered, and a restitution of the privileges which had been confirmed to them by the Romans. They complained of injury, in that they were hindered from living under their own laws; that they could not keep their sabbaths, being compelled on those days to attend the Courts of Justice; that they were robbed of the money which they collected for the purpose of transmitting to the Temple at Jerusalem; were forced to serve in the army, to accept public offices, and to expend in such services their sacred treasures. Herod requested the attention of Agrippa to the complaint, and obtained permission for Nicolaus Damascenus to plead the cause of the Jews; a task which he performed so eloquently, that he obtained from Agrippa a full confirmation of all the privileges of which his countrymen had been deprived.

B. C. 14. Joint expedition of Herod and Agrippa.

* Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 11. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 21. sec. 1.
† Ibid. *Antiq.* lib. xv. c. 9. ‡ Ibid. lib. xvi. c. 2.

With the exception of the events of the last two or three years of his life, these are nearly all the public acts of Herod. The dreadful troubles which arose from the dissensions of his family, and which certainly hastened his death, compose a tragical story; the parallel to which scarcely occurs in the annals of history. The particulars of its developement are related by Josephus at great length;* but we shall not enter into the minute details of the intrigues of female malice, and content ourselves with a brief narration of the facts which have stigmatized Herod as the murderer of his sons. In many respects Herod does not appear to have been wanting in natural affection; but when his personal interest in the maintenance of his authority happened to clash with his love to his children, at such time his ungovernable passions quickly overcame the dictates of nature, and of justice. By Mariamne he had two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, whom he treated with affection; purposing to leave his dominions as an inheritance to one or both of them. His care in sending them at an early age to Rome for education, and introducing them to the notice of Augustus, bears upon the face of it marks of parental fondness; and his taking a journey to Rome to visit Augustus, and to bring back his children to Judæa, on the completion of their education in the Roman Court, has every appearance of the pride of a father who was happy to receive his children from the hands of a Prince, to whose charge they had been intrusted; and at the same time desirous to make amends by his kindness to them, for the injuries he had inflicted upon their mother. The return of the young men to Judæa was a cause of great public joy; but to Salome, and to all those who had borne a part in the condemnation of Mariamne, the popularity of the young Princes, and their ascendancy over their father, occasioned the most painful reflections upon the past, accompanied with forebodings of certain punishment. They saw no way of escape, but in striving to alienate from them the affection of Herod; and for this purpose they sedulously spread reports that the young men disliked their father, and regarded him in no other light than as the murderer of their mother. While they were thus employed, Herod was absent with Agrippa in Asia Minor; and, on his return, Salome, and Pheroras, who shared in her design, communicated to the King the dangers to be apprehended from the revengeful temper of Mariamne's sons. Herod was exceedingly afflicted at this intelligence; and, unhappily, the course which he pursued, was such as could not fail to aggravate any feelings of resentment which Alexander and Aristobulus might actually entertain. Herod had a son, Antipater, by his first wife Doris, born before he ascended the throne, whom he now sent for to Court; thinking, by paying him honour, to depress the spirit of the two Princes. But the elevation of their half-brother was received by the other Princes as a direct injury, of which they openly complained. Antipater was a man of the blackest disposition: he seized every opportunity to irritate Herod against the sons of Mariamne.

History of the sons of Herod.

B. C. 16.

B. C. 14.

Rise of Antipater.

B. C. 13.

* Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xvi. c. 2. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 23—27.

Biography. From A. M. 4668. to 4711. — B. C. 46. to 3.

The more they complained, the more honour did the King confer upon his new favourite; and at last, on the return of Agrippa from Asia, he committed Antipater to his charge, to convey him to Rome, and introduce him to Augustus. Antipater, whilst at Rome, wrote frequent letters to exasperate the King, and to excite in his mind fears of safety from the designs of the two brothers; till Herod determined to take his sons with him to Rome, and there to accuse them before Cæsar. Augustus condescended to hear the charge; but Alexander defended himself so eloquently, that all the assembly, as well as Augustus, were moved with compassion; and, by the Emperor's advice, a reconciliation was effected. Antipater was enough master of his feelings, to appear as one who heartily shared in the universal joy. Herod and his three sons returned home together; and, having received anew from Augustus the privilege of appointing his successor, he conferred on each of them the same royal honours, in the hope that, by this equality, each might be induced to conduct himself with propriety in the prospect of becoming the successor to the Crown. For some time the brothers appear to have agreed together, but Antipater was only watching an opportunity to effect his malicious purposes. The family of Herod presented, alternately, the appearance of union and division—of affection and distrust: at length the King, excited by the arts of Antipater and Salome, and no longer doubtful that his sons were plotting against him, sought, and obtained permission, to accuse them before a Roman Council at Berytus. There were met together on this occasion the Roman Governors of Syria, the members of Herod's family, and a hundred and fifty chief persons of Syria. Before this assembly Herod accused his sons with all the vehemence of a bitter enemy; but the whole charge in proof against the two Princes, did not amount to any conspiracy or malice against their father, but only consisted of some reproachful speeches which they had uttered. The Princes were not allowed to answer to the accusation. Saturninus and others gave it as their opinions, that the power of life and death over his sons should be confirmed to Herod; yet that their crimes did not deserve the punishment of death; but Volumnius, and others, who were the majority, decreed that the Princes deserved to die; and the consequences of this sentence were so clearly seen, that, from that moment, the young men were regarded in no other light than as persons under actual sentence of death.

B. C. 9.

Trial of Alexander and Aristobulus.

Herod did not act immediately upon the decision of the Council; but, after a short time, having learned what interest was taken by the people in the fate of the two Princes, he became fully convinced of the guilt of his sons, and gave orders for their death. Antipater had now succeeded in removing out of the way the sons of Mariamne; but, fearful lest Herod should live long enough to discover the part he had taken against his brothers, he determined at once to plot his father's destruction. Pheroras, Herod's brother, and all the females of the family of Herod, Salome excepted, were willing to assist the ulterior designs of this ambitious Prince. The conspiracy, however, did not escape the notice of Salome, who watched their meetings, and gave constant intelligence to Herod of the dangers which surrounded him.

Their execution.

Conspiracy of Antipater.

It was at length resolved by the conspirators to despatch Herod by poison; but Antipater, fearful of discovery, procured a summons from Augustus to Rome, that, being out of the way when the attempt should be made, he might be the less suspected of participation in the murder. Herod soon after fell sick, and sent to Pheroras to come and see him; but he refused, on the ground that he had vowed never more to see him while alive. The King, however, did not requite his conduct in the same manner; for, in the last sickness with which his brother was soon attacked, Herod visited him unsent for, and at his death honoured him with a splendid funeral at Jerusalem. The death of Pheroras proved the ruin of Antipater; for the King, having been informed that he had been poisoned by his wife, set on foot the most strict investigation; and, after putting several persons to the torture, discovered the plot which had been arranged for his own destruction by Antipater and Pheroras. The whole investigation of this affair occupied a space of seven months; but so great was the detestation of the people towards Antipater, and so carefully were the avenues of information watched, that he was kept in entire ignorance of all the discoveries which had taken place during his absence at Rome. In the mean time, Bathyllus, one of his freedmen, arrived from Rome with letters: when put to the torture, he confessed that he brought poison for Doris, Antipater's mother, and Pheroras to use, in case the former potion should have proved ineffectual to despatch the King. Antipater himself soon returned; and reached Sebaste, before he suspected that his share in the conspiracy had been discovered, and that he must prepare to make his defence before Varus and the Council. The accusation was first made by Herod, and proceeded in by Nicolaus Damascenus. No proofs of guilt could be stronger than those produced against him. Having been condemned and thrown into prison, an embassy was despatched to Cæsar, to acquaint him with the conviction of the accused, and to request his final decision of the case. Whilst the embassy was at Rome, Herod fell sick;* and Judas and Matthias, who were the chief among the teachers of the law, in the belief that he could not recover, excited the people to throw down the golden eagle, which the King had, contrary to the laws and customs of the nation, erected over the Temple. The conspirators were seized; and Herod, though now so ill as to be unable to sit up, assembled the members of his Council. They disclaimed any approval of the transaction, and recommended that the authors of it should be punished; upon which Herod gave orders to burn alive Matthias, and all who were concerned in the affair. It is recorded, that on the night of the execution, there was an eclipse of the moon; a circumstance which serves to fix the date of this event. Herod's disease soon after became more violent; his sufferings were painful in the extreme; attended with ulcerations in the lower parts of the body, and strong convulsions. He was recommended by his physicians to try the warm baths at Callirrhoe; but not finding any benefit he returned to Jericho. His torments, instead of moving him to repentance, seemed rather to excite anew the cruelty of his temper; for, having collected together the Chiefs of the Jewish

Herod the Great. From A. M. 4668. to 4711. — B. C. 46. to 3.

His trial.

B. C. 4.

Sickness of Herod.

* Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. i. c. 33.

Biography. From A. M. 4668. to 4711. — B. C. 46. to 3.

nation, he shut them up in the Hippodrome at Jericho, and gave orders to Salome, as soon as he should be dead, to put them all to death; lest, in the joy at his decease, mourners should be wanted for his funeral. In the meanwhile the ambassadors returned from Rome, and brought the permission of Cæsar for the punishment of Antipater, either by exile or by death. The pleasure which Herod derived from the success of his embassy, for the moment, revived him; but his pains soon returned with such violence, that he made an attempt to commit suicide: the alarm created by the event ran through the palace, and was heard by Antipater, who, concluding that his father's death occasioned it, endeavoured to bribe the jailor to permit his escape; but the man was faithful to his trust, and communicated the proposal to the King, who immediately

Execution of Antipater,

gave orders for his death, attaching to it a command to bury him in an ignoble manner at Hyrcanium. Herod then, once again, made his will; giving the Kingdom of Judæa to Archelaus; the Tetrarchy of Galilee and Peræa, to Antipas; Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, and Batanea, to Philip; and the cities Jamnia, Azotus, and Phasaelis, besides very considerable sums of money, to Salome. To every one of his relations he bequeathed handsome estates and legacies, leaving them in the possession of affluent wealth; and his legacies to Augustus, and his wife Julia, were worthy the acceptance of Chiefs of the Roman Empire.

Death of Herod.

On the fifth day after the death of Antipater, Herod died, having reigned thirty-four years from the death of Antigonus, and thirty-seven from the time of his investment by the Romans. Before the report of his death was noised abroad, Salome and Alexas dismissed those who were imprisoned in the Hippodrome; but as soon as the event was known they assembled the soldiery in the Amphitheatre, and read to them the Will of Herod. The troops proclaimed Archelaus King, and rent the air with shouts of joy and prayers for his prosperous reign.

Herod the Great. From A. M. 4668. to 4711. — B. C. 46. to 3.

Josephus (xvii. 8) thus sums up the character of Herod: "He was a man universally cruel, and of an ungovernable anger; and though he trampled justice under foot, he was ever the favourite of fortune. From a private station, he rose to the Throne. Beset on every side with a thousand dangers, he escaped them all; and prolonged his life to the full boundary of old age. They who considered what befel him in the bosom of his own family, pronounced him a man most miserable; but to himself he ever seemed most prosperous, for, of all his enemies, there was not one whom he did not overcome." Such is the history of a Prince, whose name is familiar to us from our childhood, as the first persecutor of our blessed Lord, and the murderer of the infants at Bethlehem, events which will be considered in a more fitting place. The account here given of the transactions of his life will evince, that if, according to the judgment of the world, he who reigns splendidly and fortunately, in spite of all the difficulties opposed to his government, be entitled to the attribute of Greatness, that appellation has not been unjustly bestowed upon Herod.

His character.

TIBERIUS NERO CÆSAR.

FROM A. D. 14 TO 37.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

THE tyranny which was established by the successful ambition of Augustus, was concealed by his cautious dissimulation; accordingly the character of his government did not appear in all its deformity, till the reign of his successor. It is remarkable, that the power which Augustus secured by the cold-hearted calculating sacrifice of his early friends, and which was afterwards extended by the event of the battle of Actium, did not only "place a barren sceptre in his hand, No son of his succeeding," but did afterwards, by a coincidence of circumstances which no human sagacity could have foreseen, descend to the family of Antonius himself, who was once the partner, and afterwards the rival of his fortunes.

Birth and parentage.

Tiberius was a descendant of the Claudian family, the son of Livia Drusilla; he was born U. C. 712, forty-two years before the Christian era. His father, Tiberius Nero, was distinguished by his naval skill in the Alexandrine war under Julius Cæsar,* and subsequently excited a sedition in Campania, by flattering the passions, and promising to restore the property of those who had suffered in the Civil wars. This tumult, however, was soon quelled by the arrival of Octavius; and Tiberius, together with his wife, (Livia,) took refuge in Sicily and Achaia, till the establishment of the second Triumvirate made it safe for him to return to Rome. The young Tiberius, who had been the companion of his parents in exile,† was brought to the Capital to share their fortunes; and his mother, Livia, having engaged the affections of Octavius, Tiberius transferred to him the name and privileges of an husband.‡ The family thus surrendered by their natural guardian, seem to have experienced the protection and love of Octavius. We find Tiberius the elder of the two sons, commencing his career of public life at an age earlier than that prescribed by law,§ and

Early civil and military offices.

holding successively the office of Quæstor,‖ Prætor, and Consul, without the due legal interval of time. The first appointment, he received in his nineteenth year; and when a partial failure of the annual produce threatened Rome with the peril of a famine, the measures he adopted were judicious and effectual. Soon after this period he was sent with military power into the eastern Provinces. From the hands of the Parthian King he received the standards which were lost by Crassus, the melancholy memorials of a fatal enterprise; and when factions in Armenia had deposed Artaxias, the reigning Monarch, Tigranes,¶ his brother, was recalled from Rome, and placed on the throne by the agency of Tiberius. Whatever schemes of ambition might be suggested to the latter by the influence of his mother Livia, by his own military success, and by his personal interest at Rome, were now interrupted by an event which filled the Emperor with joy, and gave him a lineal descendant to inherit the power of the Cæsars. Two sons were born to his daughter Julia, and were transferred,* by the usual ceremonies of adoption, to the peculiar care of Augustus.

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37.

In the meantime the *Rhæti*, a savage intractable race, who, being originally of Tuscan origin, had migrated into that part of Swisserland now occupied by the Grisons, were molesting, by frequent incursions, the adjacent parts of Italy: they were joined by the *Vindelici*, and affairs assuming a formidable appearance, Tiberius and his brother Drusus were sent to repel the invaders.† Roman courage and discipline were opposed in vain by a fierce and numerous enemy, and by the strong mountain barriers with which nature had fortified their country. The enterprise was conducted with vigour and success, and has formed the subject of a beautiful Ode of Horace, in which the praises of the victorious generals are ingeniously blended with the finest compliment to the wisdom of the Emperor.‡

Rhætian campaign.

dius
Latèque victrices catervæ,
Consiliis juvenis revictæ,
Sensere, quid mens rite quid indoles
Nutrita faustis sub Penetralibus
Posset, quid Augusti paternus
In pueros animus Nerones.

Carm. ode 4. 4.

Tiberius had contracted in early life a marriage of affection with Vipsania, the daughter of Agrippa:§ this union, however, was dissolved, at the instigation of Augustus, who persuaded Tiberius to marry his daughter Julia, when Agrippa's death left her a widow;‖ and thus to promote his political interests by the sacrifice of his domestic happiness. The affairs of Pannonia now demanding his presence, he assumed the command of the legions; and that Province, together with Dalmatia and Dacia, was soon reduced to obedience. We forbear to dwell on these several expeditions, because they have already found a more appropriate place in the historical details of a preceding article. Subsequently he commanded in Germany, where he avenged the death and completed the conquests of his brother Drusus; and, on his return to Rome, he received from the hands of a grateful nation a second Consulship, and a second Triumph.

Marries and repudiates Vipsania.

Marries Julia.

On a sudden Tiberius demanded from the Emperor permission to retire to Rhodes; the request was urged with importunity, at first resisted with vigour, and at length granted with reluctance. Various circumstances have been mentioned by historians, as the causes of this extraordinary conduct. Some ascribe it to the overbearing pride ¶ and profligate infidelity

* Dion Cassius, lib. xlii.
† Suetonius, c. 6. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 75.
‡ Tacitus, lib. v. c. 1. § Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. Dion Cassius, lib. liii. ‖ Suetonius, c. 9.
¶ Dion Cassius, lib. 54. Josephus, lib. xv. c. 5.

* Dion Cassius, lib. liv. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, lib. lxiv.
† Strabo, lib. iv. Florus, lib. iv. c. 12. Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 97.
‡ Crevier, vol. i. § Tacitus, lib. i. c. 12.
‖ Suetonius, c. 7. ¶ Tacitus, lib. i. c. 53 Suetonius, c. 10.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

of Julia. Perhaps Tiberius was unwilling to provoke the jealousy, or oppose the pretensions of the young grandsons of Augustus; indeed Velleius Paterculus,* says, a condescending and noble generosity prompted him to retreat, that the maturity and splendour of his own reputation might not eclipse their rising fame: others suggest that he retired from public life, that the nation, by feeling his loss, might learn to appreciate his value. However this may be, he quitted Rome privately; and chose for his abode an island, the salubrity and beauty of which he had admired on his return from Armenia. In this spot he passed seven years, enjoying neither the activity and usefulness of public employment, nor the dignity and ease of literary leisure;† retaining no external indication of his former grandeur, and even exchanging the Roman dress for the peculiarities of the foreign garb. Sometimes he would share and regulate the disputations of the Sophists, or attempt to penetrate the secrets of futurity, by the assistance of the Astrologer Thrasyllus. At the expiration of a few years, he solicited leave to revisit Rome, and, when this was denied, he abandoned his usual occupations, secluded himself in the interior of the island, and shunned the sight of those who were induced by curiosity or kindness to interrupt or relieve his solitude. At length, in the eighth year of his residence at Rhodes, a residence at once wretched and contemptible, he was recalled by the influence of Livia, and passed the two succeeding years in privacy at Rome.

Retires to Rhodes.

Returns to Rome.

Adopted by Augustus.

The deaths both of Caius and Lucius Cæsar, the sons of Agrippa by Julia, left Tiberius without a rival, and accordingly he was adopted by Augustus. The wisdom and foresight of a declining Monarch might suggest strong reasons of policy for this adoption:‡ but far other motives have been attributed to Augustus; he is said to have made his choice, with a full conviction of the miseries he was about to entail on his subjects, in order that posterity might readily forget his faults, and duly appreciate his merits, when they were contrasted with the dark vices of his successor. Such is the hint thrown out by Tacitus,§ and Dion Cassius,|| but the idea is somewhat wild and extravagant; it seems one which Augustus would not have adopted, and which, at this time, the character of Tiberius would not have justified. It is, indeed, probable, that the Emperor was not uninfluenced by the arts of Livia, and not ignorant of the character of her son; yet he might reflect with just complacency on the military success and fame of Tiberius, whom it was certainly easy to discard, but not so easy to replace: Agrippa, Marcellus, and the two young Cæsars were dead; and though another grandson still survived in exile, yet his disposition and abilities qualified him rather for the labours of a mechanic than for the command of a mighty Empire. In the familiar epistles of the latter to Tiberius, there are many expressions of personal regard, which may induce us to believe that the motives of his choice were good, though its object and its consequences were afterwards unworthy and disastrous.*

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37.

The station which Tiberius now attained, was not a post of honourable inactivity, for when the unquiet spirit of the Germans broke out in fresh revolts, he was appointed to quell them. Of this war, Velleius Paterculus was both the historian and the witness: his opportunities of observation make his statement of facts valuable; but his estimate of character is very exceptionable; and whether his errors arose from a want of discrimination, or the bias of prejudice, his information is equally useless: we might instance the concise and somewhat contemptuous mention of Marcellus,† and the comparison of that connection which subsisted between Tiberius and Sejanus, with the virtuous friendship of Lælius and Scipio, of Agrippa and Augustus. His account of this campaign commences in a tone of ludicrous self-importance: *Proh Dii boni quanti voluminis opera insequenti æstate sub duce Tiberio Cæsare gestimus! Perlustrata armis tota Germania est.*‡ *Victæ gentes pæne nominibus incognitæ.* The fact seems to be, that these people were intimidated by the forces and the fame of Tiberius; and except a single attempt to surprise his army, nothing interrupted the conquest of the country from the Rhine to the Elbe. His next expedition was against Marodobuus, a Chieftain of the *Marcomanni*, who had established a Kingdom in Bohemia, and whom rank, popularity, talents, and a powerful force, rendered a formidable enemy to the Roman arms. Before, however, any encounter took place, news arrived of an extensive revolt in Pannonia and Dalmatia, and Tiberius was recalled to oppose the rebels. His circumspection, aided by the valour of Germanicus, his nephew and adopted son, reduced the insurgents in three years; but in the mean time, Varus and his legions being cut off in Germany, Tiberius was again sent thither, and he, having retrenched the luxury, and improved the discipline of the army, ravaged the country with his usual vigour and success. On his return to Rome, he triumphed for his victories, and the death of Augustus, which occurred soon after, left him sole Monarch of the Roman Empire.

German campaign.

Thus far the life of Tiberius was distinguished by singular vicissitudes: we have seen the son of a rebellious General, and a fugitive citizen, become the friend and companion of Augustus; we have observed him driven by discontent and domestic

Accession to the Imperial dignity.

* Lib. ii. c. 99.

† Suetonius, c. 11—14.

‡ In elective Monarchies, the vacancy of the Throne is a moment big with danger and mischief. The Roman Emperors, desirous to spare the legions that interval of suspense, and the temptation of an irregular choice, invested their designed successor with so large a share of present power, as should enable him, after their decease, to assume the remainder without suffering the Empire to perceive the change of masters. Thus Augustus, after all his fairer prospects had been snatched from him, by untimely deaths, rested his last hopes on Tiberius, obtained for his adopted son the Censorial and Tribunitian powers, and dictated a law, by which the future Prince was invested with an authority equal to his own over the Provinces and armies. (Gibbon, vol. i. *Oct.* p. 119.)

§ Lib. i. c. 10. || Lib. lvi.

* A similar view of the case is taken by Tillemont, the author of an elaborate *Ecclesiastical History*; speaking of Tiberius, he says, *Il sembloit avoir mérité cette élévation par les grandes services qu'il avoit rendu, dans plusieurs guerres où il avoit esté employé; sur tout dans la Pannonie, comme on le peut voir dans les auteurs qui ont fait l'histoire d'Auguste. Il estoit alors dans un grand estime qu'il s'estoit acquise par des actions grandes et belles en apparence.* Il en est cependant difficile qu'Auguste ne connust pas les vices d'un si mauvais naturel. Dion dit qu'il ne se resolut d'abord à l'élever après la mort que malgré lui et faute d'en trouver de meilleur.†* Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs, etc. Tibère.*

* Tacitus, lib. vi. c. 51. † Suetonius, c. 24.

† Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 93. ‡ Ibid. c. 106.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

misfortune from the honours and fatigues of public life, to the seclusion of a remote island; returning to be again invested with high military command; and justifying this confidence by the restitution of salutary discipline,* by the prudent vigour of his counsels, and by that active courage, which preserved the conquests, and extended the reputation of Rome. It would have been fortunate for his memory, if he had never lived to taste the pleasures, and abuse the power of Imperial greatness; for though we may have found in the preceding history of his life, little to excite admiration, yet some redeeming qualities might have softened the harsher features of his character, and at least he would not have been held up to the memory and detestation of posterity, as a monster of deceit, licentiousness, and cruelty. Tacitus† mentions the latter part of the Emperor's reign as a period exhibiting a dreadful uniformity of guilt; of savage mandates and incessant accusations, when friendship was without confidence, and innocence was no protection: the conduct also of his successor, presents too often an awful picture of vice and folly; yet a thoughtful mind may contemplate with advantage even times and scenes like these: mankind are too often dazzled by the splendour of external circumstances, and require to be reminded that happiness does not consist in rank, opulence, or authority. The lives of such men as Nero, Domitian, or Heliogabalus prove, more effectually than the precepts of the moralist, how wretched is the state of those "who have few things to desire, and many things to fear;"‡ whose passions are neither impeded by any opposition, nor regulated by any principle.

A. D. 14.

The vigilance and precaution of Livia concealed the death of her husband, till she had secured the power of her son. Tiberius himself immediately assumed the military functions of an Emperor; he gave the watch-word to the Prætorian guards, and despatches were sent in his name to the foreign troops. His conduct to the Senate was marked by useless dissimulation; he convened that body only, as he said, in right of his Tribunitian power, that the Will of Augustus might be read, and that their gratitude might decree to his memory the honour of an Apotheosis. These ceremonies having been performed, the Senate requested Tiberius to ascend the Throne: his usual dissimulation did not forsake him; to friends who urged him to yield to the general wish,§ he replied that Augustus alone had power to sustain the weight of government; that his limited experience had taught him how great was the responsibility of Empire, and how precarious its enjoyment; and that the duties of the State would be executed with greater fidelity, if they were divided among several of its illustrious citizens. This assumed diffidence deceived no one; and it was wittily observed, *cæteros quod polliciti sint tardè præstare, sed ipsum quod præstet tardè polliceri.*‖ At length the pretended reluctance of Tiberius gave way to the importunate and abject supplications of the Senate, who, together with the higher orders of people, ran headlong into servitude.¶

Dissimulation towards the Senate.

The causes of this degradation and debasement may be traced to that period, when Republican liberty had degenerated into faction, when faction had displayed itself in all the horrors of a Civil war, and Civil war had terminated in despotism. When Julius Cæsar overthrew the Constitution, his friends and enemies alike combined to honour him with extravagant privileges: the former hoped, by the grant of unlimited power, to satisfy his ambition; the latter, to promote his ruin. Thus, the national spirit was debased, and a people who would once have despised life, when separated from freedom, now became habituated to the meanest acts of submission, and no flattery, however gross, could want the excuse of precedent. During the latter years of the Republic, the riches of the principal citizens were immense: but under the Emperors, many of the sources of this wealth were stopped; the Senatorial coffers were no longer filled by the offerings of numerous and opulent clients; and the money levied on the Provinces, instead of being intercepted by individuals, found its way to the exchequer of the Prince: hence the higher classes of society sought, by every method, the personal favour of the Monarch, because this alone could enable them to support the luxury and expense which habit had rendered necessary. Such being the degenerate state of public feeling, a measure of Tiberius, which transferred the power of electing Magistrates from the People to the Senate, made the latter still more dependant on his will. He professed, indeed, to respect their rights, and was scrupulously careful to bring before their notice all questions relating to public affairs;* yet he left them only the exterior form of power, while all substantial authority emanated really from himself. "The name of this great Council, which had once dictated laws to the earth, was now employed to give a sanction to the acts of the Monarch, and was often prostituted to the vilest purposes of tyranny:"† not that Tiberius wished to degrade the Senate; on the contrary, he was the first to complain of their baseness and adulation;‡ but his wishes were inconsistent; he aimed at uniting impossibilities; he desired an assembly of men who would become the willing ministers of his cruelty, his fears, and his jealousy, at the same time that their integrity and talents might make his government respected.

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37.

Causes of national degradations.

The measure by which the People were excluded from electing Magistrates, seems to have passed with little resistance.§ The welfare of the State, and the distribution of its public offices, were no longer objects of patriotic interest; the bad example of the Senate had produced corresponding effects on the People, and public spirit was absorbed in selfish feeling.

Jam pridem ex quo suffragia nulli
Vendimus, effugit curas, et qui dabat olim
Imperium, fasces, legiones, omnia, nunc se
Continet, atque duas tantum res anxius optat
Panem et Circenses. Juv. *Sat.* 10.

The tranquillity, however, of the city did not extend to the camp. In Pannonia, J. Blæsus commanded three legions, and the commencement of a new reign provided a favourable opportunity for the intermission of the usual duties, and the indulgence of military festivities; but this indulgence was soon abused: exemption from military discipline, which had been granted as a temporary favour, was now demanded as a right; the minds of the army were irritated by the

Mutiny of the Pannonian legions.

* Suetonius, c. 18, 19.
† Lib. iv. c. 33.
‡ Lord Bacon.
§ Tacitus, lib. i. c. 10.
‖ Suetonius, c. 24.
¶ Tacitus, lib. i. c. 7.

* Suetonius, c. 30. Tacitus, lib. iii. c. 60. Dion Cassius, lib. lvii.
† Gibbon, c. 3. ‡ Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 87. Suetonius, c. 27. Tacitus, lib. iv. c. 8. § Tacitus, lib. i. c. 15.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

arts and eloquence of Percennius, who, in nightly meetings, expatiated on the severity of their officers, the length of their services, and the inadequacy of their pay, and contrasted their condition with the easy life and ample remuneration of the Prætorian guards. Discontent soon assumed the character of mutiny, till Blæsus restored a temporary tranquillity by his personal address and courage, and by promising that his own son should be sent to the Emperor, to state their grievances, and entreat redress. This success encouraged the mutineers, and Vibulenus spread among the outlying detachments the flames of tumult and sedition. When intelligence of these disturbances was brought to Rome, Drusus was sent into Pannonia, with two cohorts of the Prætorian troops, under Ælius Sejanus. The disposition of Drusus was naturally severe,* but he used his discretionary power with judgment; he addressed himself alternately to the hopes and fears of the disaffected: order was restored; and the ring-leaders having been put to death, he returned to Rome.

And of the armies on the Rhine.

At the same time, another revolt broke out among the two armies stationed on the Rhine; a revolt more dangerous than the former, better organized, more extensive, and aiming at nothing less than placing Germanicus on the Throne. Many transferred to him with alacrity the affection they had felt towards his father Drusus;† an affection founded on the opinion that, had he been the successor of Augustus, the Republican government would have been restored. But neither his own popularity, nor the consciousness that he was regarded by Tiberius and Livia with jealousy and suspicion, induced Germanicus to swerve from his duty: it was alike dangerous to exasperate the minds of the soldiers by too much rigour, or to encourage their demands by too great concessions. So atrocious and sanguinary were the outrages of the troops, that force alone seemed capable of checking the mischief; and yet to arm the allies of Rome against her rebellious legions, would again plunge the country into the miseries of

Quelled by Germanicus.

Civil war. The wisdom, integrity, and skill of Germanicus, overcame the difficulties by which he was surrounded: he reminded some that the very Emperor whom they were now deserting, had himself led them to battle, and rewarded their success; some, who pleaded long and laborious services, were suffered to depart; the clamour of others was appeased by immediate distribution of the bequests of Augustus; and those centurions who were found guilty of peculation or cruelty, were speedily and publicly cashiered. By degrees, the spirit of allegiance and subordination returned, and Germanicus led his troops against the *Marci*, that they might consume their dangerous valour upon the enemies of their country, and atone by present exertions for the guilt of past disloyalty. This expedition ended happily, and was followed by another against the *Catti*. The country at this time was divided into two parties, each having its respective leader: Arminius thought the discontents prevalent in the Roman camp, offered a favourable occasion for the recovery of independence; Segestes, supported by the less enterprising spirits, still preserved his fidelity. Cæcina was left with four legions, supported by five thousand auxiliaries, to check the *Cherusci*, while Germanicus proceeded to release Segestes from a close and dangerous siege.

* Tacitus, lib. i. c. 29. † Ibid. c. 33.

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37.

Tiberius viewed with mingled feelings of satisfaction and pain the career of his illustrious son; his fidelity was, indeed, beyond suspicion, but the jealousy of the Emperor was awakened by his military fame, by the wisdom with which he calmed the internal tumults which threatened the safety of the State, and by the courage with which he subdued those enemies who ventured to renounce her supremacy: nay, even by the pious and affectionate zeal which induced Germanicus to visit the spot where the legions of Varus were defeated, and to honour their mouldering bones with the decent solemnities of interment.*

Jealousy of Tiberius.

Campaign against Arminius.

In the mean time Arminius had induced some of the neighbouring nations to adopt his cause, and was conducting a dangerous and desultory warfare with unabated vigour, and occasional success: at one time he defeated the troops of Cæcina, when entangled in the intricacies of woods and morasses, while two legions under Vitellius, scarcely escaped destruction from the high tides of the German Ocean. Those who desire to be more acquainted with the circumstances of the several campaigns, may find them detailed in Tacitus: we will, however, extract one passage, because it seems admirably to illustrate the characteristic excellence of that historian; his power of communicating in few words, a livelier image than could have been produced by the most elegant and pathetic prolixity. Tacitus having mentioned that Arminius was obliged to retire from a city in which he had besieged Segestes, thus proceeds,† *Inerant fœminæ nobiles inter quas uxor Arminii, eademque filia Segestis, mariti magis quam parentis animo, neque victa in lachrymas, neque voce supplex, compressis intra sinum manibus, gravidum uterum intuens.* Nothing can be added to such a picture. Three years had now been spent in a difficult and unsatisfactory warfare. The Roman soldiers were superior in skill or discipline to the hardy barbarians, but their resources were exhausted by protracted winters, and their plans impeded or destroyed by the impracticable nature of the country. Hereupon Germanicus determined to transport the war into the heart of Germany: he sent Vitellius to collect subsidies in Gaul, and ordered a fleet of a thousand gallies to be speedily prepared, under the superintendence of Silius, Anteius, and Cæcina: some of these were adapted to the transportation of cavalry or military engines, and obedient to the oar or sail, as the nature of the navigation might require. *Insula Batavorum* was the point at which the forces were collected. When every preparation was made, Germanicus, passing along the canal, cut by his father Drusus, entered the Rhine, and crossing the Zuyder See, coasted the German Ocean till he came to the mouth of the Emse. Here he disembarked his troops, and hearing that the *Cherusci*, under Arminius, were encamped on the further side of the Veser, he crossed the river. Affairs were now manifestly drawing to a crisis; and Germanicus was anxious to ascertain the genuine sentiments of his army, their opinion of the expedition, and their confidence in himself: he felt that official reports are often erroneous, from accidental inaccuracy or intentional deceit, and he therefore determined to form his own judgment from the results of personal observation. Accordingly he traversed the camp in disguise; and,

* Tacitus, lib. i. c. 62. † Ibid. c. 57.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

in secrecy, heard from his soldiers every expression of confidence in their leader's skill, gratitude for his kindness, and ardour in his cause.* The same night an attack was attempted on the Roman camp, but the timely information of a deserter had occasioned particular precaution, and the Germans advanced in vain. The next day the two armies met in a plain, bounded on one side by the winding course of the Veser, on the other by the range of wooded hills, which lies near the town of Bremen. Arminius supported his own reputation, and animated his troops alike by his eloquence and example; but the Romans gained an important and easy victory, and a triumphal pillar commemorated, in the language of gratitude and superstition, the extent and authors of their success.† The winter, however, was now approaching, and the returning legions encountered the more formidable dangers of an unknown and tempestuous sea; some gallies were sunk, others were stranded on the continent, or driven with their terrified crews to the remote shores of Britain. Upon this, the Germans again resolved to try the chance of war; fresh insurrections led only to fresh defeats, and the Romans retired into winter quarters, having retrieved their late disaster by the acquisition of new honours.

Victories of Germanicus.

Tiberius viewed with more envy than delight the military celebrity of Germanicus, and therefore resolved to withdraw him from an obedient and attached army:‡ to this end the Emperor addressed at once his vanity and his moderation, by promising to the former the honours and duties of a new Consulship, and requesting from the latter that a few enemies might still be left to employ the arms, and establish the reputation of Drusus. Germanicus was not deluded by this artful pretext, but opposition was useless, and accordingly he returned to Rome.§ The recovered standards of the unfortunate Varus—the personal accomplishments of the victorious general—the rank and number of his captives—the nature and extent of his conquests, and especially the genuine expressions of popular affection and respect, which welcomed him to the Capital, all tended to increase the magnificence of his Triumph. But he was not destined to enjoy in tranquillity the distinctions he had acquired in war; disturbances arose in the East, Syria and Judæa petitioning for a lighter taxation; the small states of Commagena and Cilicia struggling for a change of masters.|| The regulation of these affairs was intrusted to Germanicus, and the next step taken by the Emperor was the removal of Creticus Silanus from the government of Syria. In his place was substituted Cneius Piso, whose family pride, augmented by an alliance with Plancina, and whose unyielding, impetuous temper, well qualified him to disturb the peace, and oppose the counsels of Germanicus. He adopted arts, the most unworthy and pernicious, to gain and secure popularity. The veteran officers, who still upheld military discipline, were superseded by the creatures of the new General; the minds of the soldiers were corrupted by bribery; licentiousness was allowed in the cities, and indolence in the camp.

Recal of Germanicus.

He is appointed to command in the East.

Arts of Piso.

Germanicus, on leaving Rome, stopped on the coast of Dalmatia, where Drusus was employed to watch and foment the dissensions of the German States. Arminius and Mandobuus were the rival leaders: the former was followed by the *Senones*, *Cherusci* and their allies, and the latter was King of the *Marcomanni*, with whom he had emigrated from the banks of the Rhine, and fixed himself in the centre of Bohemia.* Mandobuus was overpowered by a combination of foreign enemies and rebellious subjects, and passed his latter days, by the permission of Tiberius, in inglorious exile at Ravenna.† Arminius, the champion of German liberty,‡ who in war was unsubdued, and whom occasional failure never discouraged, at length himself invaded the rights he had fought so bravely to establish, and fell by the hand of his countrymen the victim of unprincipled ambition.

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37.

Death of Arminius.

The character and conduct of Piso were not unknown to Germanicus; but his arrival in Syria was delayed, because the affairs of Armenia seemed to require his presence. The nation had no King, but popular favour inclined to Leno, son of Polemo, the King of Pontus, and he accordingly was crowned at Artaxata.§ Cappadocia, about this time, became a Roman province on the death of Archelaus. Appian, indeed, places this event in the reign of Augustus, but he is contradicted by the evidence of other writers. This Prince, who by some neglect had incurred the hatred of Tiberius during his residence at Rhodes, was persuaded to ask pardon personally at Rome. The Emperor, who forgot no slight, however unintentional or remote, treated Archelaus with severity, and he soon fell a victim to age, sorrow, and indignity.

Arrival of Germanicus in the East.

Germanicus, having arranged the affairs of these provinces, proceeded to meet Piso, at Cyrrhus, in Cœle Syria; mutual discontent was fostered by the intervention of pretended friends; false charges were invented, or true ones exaggerated, they separated with disguised dislike, and Piso either omitted to attend the military tribunal of Germanicus, or came only to oppose his measures.

The next year, Germanicus visited Egypt, its lake, and pyramids, its majestic ruins and ancient records; and, combining the pursuit of knowledge with the discharge of duty, he penetrated as far as Syene, or the Cataracts of the Nile. He imitated the artful policy of Alexander in Persia, and Scipio in Sicily, and won the affections of the people by adopting their customs. But on his return from the expedition, he fell ill at Antioch, and in his thirty-fourth year this accomplished Prince perished by a tragical, premature, and mysterious death. The historical student who appreciates duly the character of Germanicus,|| will perceive that in the days of public oppression and private immorality, he shines with bright and solitary lustre. We have seen him invested with military power which he never abused, and adhering to an Emperor, who hated his excellence, and disparaged his services, even when the offer of a Throne tempted him from his allegiance. He acquired the esteem of the citizens, and the affection of the soldiers, without courting the favour of the one, or relaxing the discipline of the other. The harmony which existed

His death and character.

* Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 13. † Ibid. c. 22.
‡ Ibid. c. 5. § Strabo, lib. vii.
|| Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 42. Josephus, lib. xviii. c. 3.

* Strabo, lib. vii. † Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 63.
‡ Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 88.
§ Strabo, lib. xii. Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 56.
|| Josephus, lib. xviii. c. 8. Dion Cassius, c. 57. Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 72. Suetonius, in *Caligula*, lib. iii.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

between himself and Drusus, was interrupted neither by the feeling of personal rivalry, or the efforts of intriguing courtiers; in short, he was as amiable in all the relations of private life, as he was eminently distinguished in the discharge of public duty. Amidst the occupations of the General, he did not neglect the accomplishments of the scholar;* and we learn from the testimony of antiquity, that he had pursued with success the study of Eloquence and Poetry.

Nothing could equal the general sorrow and consternation with which Rome and the Provinces learnt the death of Germanicus. Piso, on the contrary, and Plancina, displayed the most exulting and indecent joy;† and thus, seemed to sanction the prevalent suspicion, that their machinations had contrived the catastrophe. Whether any marks of poison, visible in the body after dissolution, countenanced this report, historians are not agreed. Piso, having sent his son Domitius to Rome, immediately endeavoured to put himself at the head of the legions in Syria; this attempt was frustrated by the promptitude and courage of Sontius. Piso, having occupied a fort in Cilicia, called Celendris, was there besieged, and capitulated on condition of a free passage to Italy.

A. D. 20. Return of Agrippina.

In the mean time, Agrippina, bearing the ashes of her husband Germanicus, and attended by her two children, arrived at Brundusium. Sorrow in her case was natural and laudable, but she seems to have neglected the lessons of submission, which were inculcated by the last words of Germanicus,‡ and to have admitted more of sternness and revenge, than is consistent with the softness and delicacy of the female character. The soldiers who had served under the standards of the departed hero, the friends who were attached to his person, and many who knew only his reputation, flocked to the coast to meet Agrippina, and the widow's sorrow was mitigated by the sympathy of national feeling, though time alone could remove it. Funeral honours.

No funeral honours were omitted, which could adorn the memory of Germanicus; a mourning crowd, with unornamented standards and reversed fasces, attended his ashes; these were met at the entrance of the city by the Consuls, the Senate, and the People, and deposited in the tomb of Augustus, with the genuine, unaffected tribute of a nation's esteem and sorrow. Popular clamour now demanded that the manner of Germanicus's death should be ascertained by immediate investigation.§ Vitellius, Veranius, and Servæus conducted a prosecution against Piso. The Emperor was solicited to undertake the office of Judge, but he referred the affair to the cognizance of the Senate. The deep displeasure with which he witnessed the expressions of respect that greeted Agrippina, was cautiously concealed; but an edict from the Palace soon admonished the people that all virtue and ability had not perished with Germanicus. That however the State might deplore the loss of illustrious citizens, her internal resources could always repair it; and that national feeling should now be transferred from public sorrow to public festivity. At length the important trial came on, and the proceedings in the Senate were opened by a speech from Tiberius, which, however it might belie his real sentiments, was replete with good sense and impartiality; this was, perhaps, the impartiality of indifference rather than of justice; he was, probably, careless about the fate of Piso, and when popular indignation so loudly demanded a victim, interference was dangerous and useless. The speech of Tiberius was followed by an eloquent harangue from Vitellius, who accused Piso of corrupting the minds, and destroying the discipline of the army in the East; of having contrived and accomplished the murder of Germanicus; and of having risen in arms against the State itself. Six days were allowed for the accused to prepare his defence, during which interval, he escaped by a voluntary death the formalities of justice and the certainty of condemnation.* From the circumstances relating to this trial, which have come down to us, we learn there was a strong suspicion that Germanicus had been poisoned by Piso and Plancina with the consciousness and sanction of the Emperor and Livia. Perhaps, from the nature of the case, very rigid proof cannot in fairness be demanded; but to us the evidence does not appear sufficiently clear and satisfactory to fix the guilt on the accused parties; at least, we would not determine by peremptory decision, a question which Tacitus† acknowledged to be involved in obscurity and doubt.

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37. Prosecution of Piso. His suicide.

On one hand it may be urged, that the Emperor's feeling of envy and hatred against Germanicus is unquestionable: that his mission into the East, the removal of Piso,‡ and the appointment of Silanus, were consistent with these sentiments, and might be parts of the imputed plan; that most historians agree in their assertions, that Germanicus was poisoned by the agency of Piso, and that his subsequent conduct seemed to justify the suspicion: that when a question arose whether Piso should attempt to seize Syria, Domitius encouraged him, by suggesting that his conduct was known to the Empress, and secretly sanctioned by Tiberius. Tacitus also mentions a traditional report, that Piso had written documents containing this very sanction; and that unless Sejanus had contrived to obtain them by treacherous promises, they would have been produced on the trial. Besides, the testimony of Germanicus himself is valuable;§ he scruples not to call Piso his murderer, and the expression "*muliebri fraude*" points either to Plancina, or Livia, or both. Considerations on the death of Germanicus.

On the other hand it may be said, that the story of the written documents is only mentioned by Tacitus as a rumour, and there is no reason to suppose he believed it himself—that it is highly improbable that such documents should have been written by Tiberius or surrendered by Piso. Could an Emperor, who so well knew and practised the arts of dissimulation, find no safer mode of contriving an enemy's death than by writing an order for his assassination? Besides, neither Piso's character nor conduct make it likely that he should have been chosen by the wily Monarch, to be the accomplice and the perpetrator of such dark designs. He was, indeed, well calculated by his pride, ambition, and impetuosity, to thwart the projects and disturb the happiness of Germanicus: but had his instructions from Tiberius extended furthe.

---

* Ovid, *Fasti*, lib. i. c. 21.
† Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 75.
‡ Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 71.
§ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 13.

* Tacitus, lib. iii. c. 14.
† Ibid. c. 19.
‡ Josephus, lib. xviii. c. 3. Suetonius, *in Caligula*, 1. Dion Cassius. Pliny, lib. xi. c. 37.
§ Tacitus, lib. ii. c. 70, 71.

he would scarcely have awakened the suspicion and provoked the anger of his intended victim, by personal abuse, by indications of open enmity, by vexatious opposition, or by constant disobedience. It is true Germanicus ascribed his death to the machinations of Piso; perhaps this very conviction tended to accelerate his end; at least, he could furnish no proofs of the fact, since none were produced on the trial. *Defensio*, says Tacitus,* *in cæteris trepidavit;—solum veneni crimen visus est diluisse, quod ne accusatores quidem satis firmabant.* The story of Germanicus having been poisoned at his own table, is rejected by the same historian as an incredible absurdity; neither does his account justify Suetonius in saying, that the body of the deceased General exhibited manifest marks of poison. The passage in Dion Cassius is curious; "Germanicus died at Antioch by the insidious arts of Piso and Plancina; *for* while he was yet alive, there were found in his house the bones of men concealed in the earth, and leaden plates, on which was inscribed the name of Germanicus, connected with certain forms of imprecation." Dio. lvii. Here the accusation is made, and the proof adduced consists in certain incantations and charms, which, in days of ignorance and superstition, alarmed the imagination, and deluded the credulity of man. Upon the whole, that the death of Germanicus was contrived by Piso, is probable; that it delighted Tiberius is certain; but that he himself was privy to the plan or the execution, is neither certain nor probable.

Change in the character of Tiberius after the death of Germanicus.

The character of Germanicus had hitherto exerted a salutary influence over the conduct of Tiberius, who felt the power of that virtuous example which he had not wisdom enough to imitate. The early death of that accomplished Prince removed this restraint, and developed more decidedly the natural qualities of Tiberius. Before this period, there is something to extort respect in the splendour of his military prowess,† and even during the first years of his administration of Imperial powers, there is much that deserves commendation. Public magistrates were judiciously selected; merit was, in many cases, the avenue to office, and a faithful discharge of duty the only cause of its continuance. The condemnation of Capito and Silanus, who were accused of extortion by some Asiatic cities, showed that the Emperor was willing to respect the rights of his Provinces; they were exempted from new burthens, confiscation of property and personal punishment were forbidden; at home, the private estates of Tiberius were not extensive, and any question between himself and his subjects, was decided by the voice of law.‡ But the voice of law was always silent respecting the mysterious guilt of high treason. Here, indeed, a wide door was opened to the evils and abuses of caprice and cruelty, for this crime no skill could define, and no innocence avoid. Not only were those incautious expressions, which naturally arise in the social intercourse of domestic life, remembered with accuracy, and treacherously betrayed,—not only did a privileged set of base informers artfully pass the limits of cautious conversation, in order to detect in others something which might be considered criminal, and then communicate to the Emperor the very words which they had suggested or encouraged; but Tiberius publicly disclosed the vices of his own life, as if they had been tales invented by his enemies,* and imputed to them the relation of facts which, perhaps, they never knew, and certainly never mentioned. As, on the one hand, it was dangerous to condemn the character of the living, so was it, on the other, to eulogise the virtues of the dead; and thus, Cremutius Cordus was put to death for having introduced into a life of Augustus an encomium on Brutus and Cassius. The habit of attempting to penetrate futurity, which had occupied Tiberius, during his residence at Rhodes, did not abandon him when he ascended the Throne; and, if on casting the nativities, and calculating the fortunes of individuals, he fancied they were destined to be his rivals, the unfortunate objects of his speculations were soon made the victims of his power.†

Influence of Sejanus.

Many of these abuses may be traced to the influence of Ælius Sejanus. This man, who had risen to be Præfect of the Prætorian guards, combined with personal vigour, a spirit bold and daring in accusing others, artful and adroit in exculpating himself. His pride was not sufficient to prevent his exercising the arts of flattery; while luxurious indolence or vigilant activity were alternately employed, as they might best promote his ambitious projects. His first step was to collect in one spot the Prætorian troops, who had formerly been dispersed over the city, and whose favour he had secured by the arts of bribery and corruption. To Tiberius, whose habitual circumspection seems to have been eluded by his plausibility, he urged the facilities of discipline, which would result from such an arrangement, and the general confidence which the soldiers would feel from opportunities of mutual intercourse. The Throne was the ultimate object of Sejanus, but Drusus and the sons of Germanicus were still formidable opponents. He commenced his scheme against the former, by seducing the affections of his wife Livia, whom he persuaded to destroy her husband, in order to share with himself the honour of Imperial greatness. The death of Drusus was borne by his father with a calmness which his friends called patriotism, and his enemies insensibility; the people viewed the event with indifference, or perhaps were glad to see the avenue to the Throne lying open to the sons of Germanicus. The heir apparent being thus removed, permission to marry his widow was next requested; this, however, Tiberius refused, on the plea that the discord of the Imperial family would be fomented by so degrading an alliance; at the same time he expressed strongly his personal attachment to Sejanus,‡ the warmth of whose affection, and the value of whose services, no public honours could adequately reward. And indeed he had exhausted them all; the favour of the Prince had been followed by the flattery of the people; every morning brought to his gates the tide of morning worshippers: to him every public measure was communicated, through him every private request preferred, the day of his birth was commemorated as a national festivity, and his name was joined with the Emperor's, in the sacrifices and prayers of a corrupt and degraded people.

His design upon the Throne.

The progressive success of Sejanus was still farther advanced by a determination of the Emperor to leave Rome for ever: this plan was naturally promoted by

* Lib. iii. c. 14. † Tacitus, lib. iv. c. 6. ‡ Ibid. c. 7.

* Dion Cassius. † Ibid. lib. lvii. ‡ Tacitus, lib. iv. c. 40.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

Sejanus, whose interests and schemes it had a manifest tendency to promote. He had previously exerted every method to exasperate Tiberius against Agrippina and her sons, who, perhaps, were not so circumspect as the last words of Germanicus had advised, and their dangerous situation demanded. Nero was surrounded by the creatures of Sejanus: it was alike dangerous to speak or to be silent; the one seemed opposition, the other contumacy; every action was reported with malignant exaggeration, and insidious friends were employed to complete his ruin, by urging him to fly to the legions in Germany.

Tiberius retires to Capreæ.

In the mean time, Tiberius had quitted Rome with a small retinue, and becoming weary of the towns of Campania, hid himself at length in the Isle of *Capreæ*. Various causes have been assigned for this retreat; the spot selected, certainly provided the beauties of nature for his enjoyment, leisure for his declining years, and concealment for his habitual vices. His manner of life at Rhodes had inclined him to solitude, and the parental restraint of his mother had disquieted his residence at Rome.* Her death now gave new scope to his natural disposition; and the unfortunate family of Germanicus were among the first victims of his cruelty. His first letters on the subject embarrassed the Senate by their ambiguity; every one was afraid to proceed against the accused, lest Tiberius should wish to save in a moment of caprice those whom he had condemned in a moment of anger. Sejanus represented this to the Emperor as a contempt of his sorrows, and a disposition to revolt; a second letter from *Capreæ* repeated the former accusations, and the Senate showed themselves willing to execute whatever Tiberius might choose to ordain.† That part of the *Annals* of Tacitus is unfortunately lost which should describe the trial, condemnation, and punishment of Agrippina and her sons. But we know that Drusus was starved at Rome,‡ that the exiled Nero ended his days by famine, and that Agrippina met a similar fate in the island of Pandataria. Her memory was pursued with the most unfounded calumnies, and the Emperor claimed the praise of clemency, because she had not been publicly strangled, nor was the body drawn with a hook to *Gemoniæ*, where those of common malefactors were exposed.§

Destruction of the family of Germanicus.

Cruelty and dissimulation of Tiberius.

We forbear to give our readers a detail of the disgusting and wanton cruelties which now disgraced the reign, and developed the character of Tiberius. They differ from the sanguinary acts of any other ferocious tyrant, only by the strange dissimulation with which they were occasionally conducted. Thus Syriacus, who had passed a life of study, exempt alike from guilt or imputation, was executed for being the friend of Asinius Gallus. Gallus himself was courteously received by the Emperor as a guest, at the moment he was writing to the Senate to order his immediate condemnation.‖

The secession of Tiberius, augmented, as might naturally be supposed, the pride and power of Sejanus: it seemed as if he were Emperor of Rome, and Tiberius Monarch of *Capreæ*.¶ At length, intelligence was conveyed thither, that the favourite had abused the confidence of his master, and had formed a political party to usurp the Throne.* The conduct of Tiberius on this emergency, was completely characteristic: instead of hastening to his Capital, to crush the treacherous attempts of a rebellious subject, by rallying around him those who, from interest, gratitude, or principle, still retained their allegiance, he remained in his retreat, choosing rather to circumvent his enemy by fraud, than oppose him by open force. Accordingly, he wrote letters to the Senate the most inconsistent and contradictory; at one time, declaring himself to be at the point of death; at another, announcing his speedy return to Rome; now extolling Sejanus, and treating his friends with new distinctions, now reproving his conduct with severity, and exalting his rival Caligula. This artful conduct produced its intended effect; for, while some letters awakened the fears of Sejanus, and prepared his party to desert their leader, whenever it should be their interest to do so, others still gave him hopes of a continuance of the Emperor's favour, and this prevented his boldly taking arms in his own cause, which numerous adherents, and a strong interest with the Prætorian guards, might have enabled him to maintain with success. On a sudden, despatches arrived at night, by the hands of Macro, who communicated his private orders to Saco and Regalus, and with them the necessary measures were concerted. Sejanus was persuaded to join the assembled Senate, by the assurance that these letters contained an order from Tiberius to invest him with the Tribunitian power. Every one was now eager to offer his services and congratulations to the successful Minister. The letter was publicly read; it commenced about indifferent topics, and censured, as it were, incidentally, some parts of the conduct of Sejanus, again it digressed into irrelevant matter; it returned to the subject of Sejanus,† and concluded with an order for his immediate arrest. This singular composition, as it was characteristic of the disposition of Tiberius, so was it important to his interests. Had his intention been decidedly shown at the commencement of his epistle, the rebel might have escaped to his party, and Tiberius, not Sejanus, might have been the victim of contending factions; but escape was delayed till it became impossible; the confusion and perplexity of the Senate were succeeded by indignation and resentment; he who had used with cruelty and pride the power he had gained by guilt and meanness, was now their prisoner; the man whom they had lately attended as a Prince to the Senate, they now dragged as a criminal to execution;‡ popular execration exulting over his fall, and extending its merciless revenge to his innocent and unfortunate family.

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37.

Fall of Sejanus.

Jam stridunt ignes jam follibus atque caminis
Ardet adoratum populo caput et crepat ingens
Sejanus: deinde ex facie toto orbe secundâ
Fiunt urceoli, pelves, sartago, patellæ.
Pone domi lauros, duc in Capitolia magnum
Cretatumque bovem: Sejanus ducitur unco
Spectandus. Gaudent omnes. Quæ labra? quis illi
Vultus erat? nunquam si quid mihi credis amavi
Hunc hominem. Sed quo cecidit sub crimine? quisnam
Delator? quibus indiciis, quo teste probavit?
Nil horum: verbosa et grandis epistola venit
A Capreis. Bene habet; nil plus interrogo. Sed quid
Turba Remi? Sequitur Fortunam ut semper, et odit
Damnatos. Juv. Sat. x. 73.

* Tacitus, lib. v. c. 3. † Ibid. c. 5.
‡ Suetonius, c. 54. Tacitus, lib. vi. c. 23.
§ Tacitus, lib. vi. c. 25. ‖ Dion Cassius.
¶ Dion Cassius.

* Josephus, lib. xviii. c. 18. † Dion Cassius.
‡ Dion Cassius. Seneca, *de Tranquill.* c. 2.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

Perituros audio multos.
Nil dubium, magna est fornacula; pallidulus mi
Brutidius meus ad Martis fuit obvius aram.
Quam timeo victus ne pœnas exigat Ajax
Ut male defensus! curramus præcipites, et
Dum jacet in ripâ calcemus Cæsaris hostem.
Sed videant servi, ne quis neget et pavidum in jus
Cervice astrictâ dominum trahat. Hi sermones
Tunc de Sejano, secreta hæc murmura vulgi.
Juv. *Sat.* x. 90.

Indiscriminate punishment of his friends.

A deputation of Senators and Knights, with Regulus at their head, now solicited Tiberius to return to Rome; this, however, he refused, and though occasionally approaching the city, never entered the gates: his letters breathed only the spirit of cruelty, and involved every age, sex, and party in desolating, indiscriminate persecution. The friends of Sejanus were naturally the first sufferers: nothing could satiate the vengeance of the tyrant; the dead were exposed to every insult, and he, who pitied openly their fate, was punished as if he had been implicated in their fault.* Dion Cassius relates a curious story of Terentius Varro, who was saved by his boldness and ingenuity, when his innocence would have been unavailing. Instead of denying his having been a friend of Sejanus, he directly avowed the fact, and pleaded as an apology the example of the Emperor; "if," said he, "the penetrating wisdom of Tiberius has been deceived, surely my error is venial: a good citizen should always love the friends of his Monarch, without instituting any troublesome inquiries with respect to their worth or character."† This speech, as related by Tacitus,‡ assumes a more dignified tone, and contains a noble and manly remonstrance against the baseness and servility of the Senate, and against the absurdity of involving the personal friends of Sejanus in the same guilt as his political accomplices.

Perfidy of Tiberius.

In the mean time, Tiberius had lived in the indulgence of every vice which unbridled passions can desire, or a morbid imagination invent, and presented an awful and singular specimen of the degradation and abasement of which human nature is capable, and the wretchedness which accompanies its fall. His last illness seized him in his seventy-eighth year: he was returning to *Capreæ*, but was unable to proceed beyond *Misenum*; his confidence in the predictions of the Astrologer Thrasyllus, and a natural strength of his constitution induced him to neglect the progress of this disorder. He had wavered in his choice of a successor; the two candidates were Tiberius Nero, his lineal grandson, and Caius Caligula, the son of Germanicus. Suetonius says the Empire was divided between them by will;§ but the Senate excluded the former on account of his youth. However this may be, Caligula, who was at this time about the person of the Emperor, concerted his plans with Macro, and contrived by poison or by suffocation, to terminate the life of Tiberius.

His illness.

and death.

Such was the life, and such the death of this Emperor, whose character is thus summed up with brevity and candour, at the close of the VIth Book of the *Annals* of Tacitus. *Morum quoque tempora illi diversa: egregium vitâ famâque quoad privatus vel in imperiis sub Augusto fuit; occultum ac subdolum fingendis virtutibus, donec Germanicus ac Drusus superfuere: idem inter bona malaque mixtus incolumi matre: intestabilis sævitia, sed obtectis libidinibus, dum Sejanum dilexit timuitve: postremo in scelera simul ac dedecora prorupit, postquam remoto pudore ac metu, suo tantum ingenio utebatur.*

* Tacitus, lib. vi. c. 10.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lviii.
‡ Lib. vi. c. 8.
§ Suetonius, c. 76.

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37.

His education seems to have been conducted with care, nor was he destitute of a taste for polite literature. In Rhetoric he was instructed by Theodorus Gadareus, who observing, at an early age, the slow and savage disposition of his pupil, surnamed him πηλὸς αἵματι πεφυραμένος. On his father's death he delivered a Funeral oration, and when Varro Muræna and Fannius Cæpio conspired against Augustus, the prosecution was ably and successfully conducted by Tiberius.* His model in composition was Corvinus Messala, one of those who contributed, by deserting the school of Ciceronian eloquence, to vitiate the taste of his contemporaries. Tiberius highly esteemed the *Poems* of Euphorion and Parthenius, and in conversation studiously avoided the use of Greek terms; however, he composed some verses in that language. Astrology and Mythology were his favourite pursuits; grammarians and historians he was wont to ridicule, and when disposed to be facetious, he would ask the latter to state the name of Hecuba's mother, and enumerate the tunes which the Syrens sang. At times, however, his jokes were not so innocent: soon after the death of Augustus, as a corpse was borne along in the presence of Tiberius, a soldier drew near and seemed to whisper in the dead man's ear: when the Emperor asked the meaning of this action, the soldier replied he had desired the dead man to tell Augustus that his bequest to the Roman people had not been paid. Tiberius ordered the soldier to be paid and put to death, adding, "you may now go to Augustus yourself, and tell him you have had your share."

Character of Tiberius.

Immorality of his times.

The age of Tiberius was an age of dissoluteness, extravagance, and licentiousness. How impure and degraded must have been the state of public morals, when it was necessary to pass a law that no woman might adopt the profession of a prostitute, whose father, grandfather, or husband had been of Equestrian rank; so little efficacy had a period of intellectual greatness, in elevating the tone of public feeling, or controlling the progress of moral guilt; so necessary was that pure system of belief and practice, which was introduced at this time, by the great author and finisher of our holy faith, promulgated by his doctrine, recommended by his example, and confirmed by his death; a system intended to correct the errors of Philosophy, to disperse the darkness of Polytheism, and to form the happiness of man, by raising his hopes, and regulating his desires. Tiberius did, indeed, in some instances, exert his influence to check the foolish extravagance of his people. Markets and taverns were subjected to certain rules, that intemperance and gluttony might have less temptation; the number of matches of gladiators, and the extent of theatrical prodigality was reduced: he himself gave few public festivities. Occasionally in order to check the prevalence of idle profusion, he would suffer frugality to degenerate into the meanest parsimony; a plan conducted without judgment, and producing no effect: at other times his intemperance was so excessive, that his name was ludicrously altered into Biberius. Some money was distributed to the legions in Syria, some to the

* Suetonius, c. 8.

Biography. From A. D. 14. to 37.

Prætorian guards, as a reward for having deserted Sejanus; and, on one occasion, when many of the citizens had suffered by fire, their loss was alleviated by the Emperor. Perhaps the administration of his money is, upon the whole, the least exceptionable part of Tiberius's character; and there are instances of his having rebuked, with merited and salutary, severity the debts and extravagances of thoughtless spendthrifts, and the importunity of needy Senators.

Tiberius Nero Cæsar. From A. D. 14. to 37.

CAIUS CÆSAR CALIGULA.

FROM A. D. 37 TO 41.

Biography. From A. D. 37. to 41.

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D. 37. to 41.

Accession of C. Cæsar Caligula

Upon the death of Tiberius, Caius Cæsar, surnamed Caligula,* immediately assumed the Imperial power. He was one of nine children of the accomplished and popular Germanicus, by his wife Agrippina,† of whom two died in their infancy, one in his childhood, and six arrived at maturity; three daughters, Agrippina, Drusilla, and Livilla, born in three successive years; and the same number of sons, Nero, and Drusus, (who were condemned by the Senate as enemies to the State, at the instigation of Tiberius,) and Caius Cæsar, who was born during the Consulship of his father, and C. Fonteius Capito, A. D. 10.

His origin, and early life.

The place of his birth is uncertain; but Suetonius brings evidence that it happened whilst his mother was with the army;‡ and his earliest years were spent principally in camps. Upon his father's death he returned from Syria, and lived with his mother till her exile; when he removed to the house of Livia Augusta, his great grandmother, whose funeral oration he delivered in public, whilst he still wore the *prætexta*. He afterwards remained in the family of his grandmother Antonia, until his twentieth year, when, being invited to *Capreæ* by the Emperor, he assumed the dress proper to manhood, but without the customary ceremonies.

His disposition.

In the Court of his grandfather, his naturally mean and vicious temper appeared in a servile compliance with the caprices of those in power, in a wanton love of cruelty towards the unfortunate, and in the most abandoned and unprincipled debauchery; so that Tiberius observed, that he was breeding a second Phaeton for the conflagration of the world, and the courtiers remarked that the young Prince would make the best of servants, but the worst of masters.§

Will of Tiberius set aside.

Tiberius had, by his testament, appointed his two grandsons, Caius Cæsar and Tiberius Gemellus, successive partners in the Empire; but, as he had himself fraudulently disregarded the Will of his mother Livia, his own met with no greater respect. The first act of Caius Cæsar was the assembling of the Senate, for the purpose of declaring the invalidity of this testament;* an object which was readily effected by the influence of the same Macro, whom we have already seen worshipping the rising sun of Caligula and turning his back upon the setting rays of Tiberius,† the base and cruel wretch who prostituted his own wife to the former, whilst he attempted to poison the latter.

Popularity of the new Emperor.

The Will of the late Emperor being annulled, and Tiberius Gemellus declared unfit for the command, on account of his youth, (for he still wore the *prætexta*,) Caius Cæsar was immediately declared Emperor, amid the most unbounded demonstrations of joy; the Senate and the People vying with each other in extravagance, and the country towns, and even the Provinces exhibiting similar rejoicings. It has been calculated that upwards of sixteen hundred hecatombs were offered on the occasion; vows were publicly made for the safety of the new Emperor; individuals devoted their own lives to the infernal Deities, as a ransom for his whenever it might be in danger; others undertook gladiatorial combats to propitiate his good Genius, and advertised their loyalty in handbills. Nor was this general feeling of respect and good hope limited by the confines of the Empire; foreign Princes, who had slighted the profligate and vacillating government of Tiberius, showed an anxiety to cultivate a good understanding with his successor; and among others, the haughty and independent Artabanes, King of Parthia, condescended to cross the Euphrates, in order to offer his congratulations in person to the Consular Legate;‡ and he *adored* the Roman eagles and standards, and the "Images of the Cæsars."§

Auspicious beginning of his reign.

The commencement of the reign of Caius Cæsar appeared likely to realize the sanguine hopes which had been formed of him; although those hopes arose rather from interested views than from a true sense of patriotism, or an honest respect for virtue. The new Emperor had learned all the profound dissimulation of his wily predecessor; and he esteemed it prudent to assume the appearance of moderation, liberality, and justice, till he should be firmly seated on the Throne, and freed from all apprehension that the claims of the young Tiberius might be revived on any offence taken by the Senate.

---

* Or rather *nicknamed* Caligula, "the booted," or more literally "*Boots*," from *Caliga*, the boot much worn in the army, and in the country—*gelidos veniam caligatus in agros*. Juv.

† Daughter of M. Agrippa and Julia.

‡ *In castris natus, patriis nutritus in armis*. Suetonius, *Cal.* 8.

§ Suetonius, *Cal.* 10, 11. The two observations harmonize rather curiously; for fire is commonly said to be a good servant, but a bad master.

* Dion Cassius is here at variance with Suetonius; but Crevier gives satisfactory reasons for following the former, and Echard, a laborious author, appears to have come to the same conclusion.

† Tacitus, lib. vi. ‡ Vitellius.

§ Suetonius, *Cal.* 14.

Biography. From A. D. 37. to 41.

Accordingly he requested of the Conscript Fathers, that the late Emperor might be buried with the same honours which had been paid to Augustus. The wish was refused, nevertheless he attended the funeral in person, amid the acclamations of the populace, who cheered him with the most flattering titles; *Sidus et pullum, et pupum, et' alumnum,**—terms lavished by nurses upon hopeful children; and he completed his disgusting task by pronouncing an oration distinguished for its eloquence, in praise of the deceased. To afford a further demonstration of his piety towards his family, he visited, in dangerous weather, the islands of Pandataria and Pontia, in order to bestow the due honours upon the neglected ashes of his mother and elder brother, whose urns he brought with every show of affection to Rome, and deposited with great pomp in the cemetery of Augustus. The legacies left by Tiberius, although his Will had been declared null and void, were all exactly paid; and to these the new Prince added a largess from himself, upon pretence that he had assumed the manly garb without the gratuity usually bestowed among the populace on such occasions by persons of his rank. This therefore he ordered to be paid to the citizens, with interest. At the same time, all persons confined in prison were liberated; all exiles were recalled; and an immense file of papers were burned, which purported to be criminal proceedings and secret informations collected by Tiberius, and which Caius Cæsar declared that he had never read. The real documents, however, he carefully concealed, and diligently perused. He affected to be extremely mortified by the exclusion of his cousin Tiberius from the succession; and, upon his coming of age, he bestowed upon him the empty title of *Princeps Juventutis* with other honours, which were only a prelude to the execution of the design he had from the first entertained, to put him to death.† The People, meanwhile, were entertained with a succession of shows, Games, and theatrical entertainments, more magnificent than any which had ever before been exhibited; and of which the cost, added to an unbounded expense in all other departments, swallowed up in one year, the vast sums amassed by the avarice and rapacity of Tiberius during his long reign.‡ Nevertheless, the new Emperor, with seeming liberality, restored many of the confiscations of his predecessor.

His hypocrisy.

Reforms in the State.

At the same time that he was thus lavish to the people, he affected a great deal of moderation and humility in his own person, refusing all those pompous and high sounding titles which the Senate were impatient to confer upon him, and which he himself soon afterwards assumed, with many vain and ridiculous additions.§ And, notwithstanding the abominable depravity of his own life, he took upon himself to cleanse the city of the detestable receptacles of unnatural vices introduced by Tiberius.|| The conductors of these stews were condemned to be cast into the sea; and it was only on the most urgent entreaties, that the sentence was commuted for perpetual exile. And that he might not appear to punish vice without rewarding virtue, eighty thousand sesterces were granted to a freed-woman, for having resolutely endured the torture without betraying her patron.*

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D. 37. to 41.

He reviewed the Roman Knights, the most important class in the State, with a just severity, tempered with moderation; and deprived all those of the insignia of their rank, the horse, and the ring, whose crimes were a disgrace to the Order. Several valuable privileges and immunities were conferred upon the People, of which the most important were the independence of the Judges, and what would now be termed the freedom of the press. In the midst of these reformations, the Emperor made a speech to the Senate, setting forth, in such forcible language, the true principles of good government, that the Conscript Fathers passed a resolution to have it read once a year. They had offered him the Consulship immediately upon the death of Tiberius; but he, pretending an excess of modesty, declined that honour in favour of the ordinary Consuls; and it was not until the expiration of their statutable six months that he consented to accept the office, taking his uncle Claudius as his colleague. He retained this office rather more than two months, and then appointed the Consuls designated by his predecessor.†

He becomes Consul.

His pride, which was excessive, appeared at first chiefly in bestowing extravagant honours upon the members of his own family, which flattery dignified with the appellation of Piety: in these honours his grandmother Antonia, and his sisters, had the greatest share; and the names of the latter were added to his own,‡ in the forms of the oaths on admission to offices. But his attachment to his sisters had a worse incentive: he had in early life seduced them all; and this incestuous passion continued to be indulged under circumstances of disgusting depravity, over which it must be equally the wish of the historian and of the reader to draw a veil.§

His family pride and depravity.

Soon after he had resigned the Consulship, he had a dangerous illness, in consequence, as it is imagined, of a love-potion given him by his mistress, Milonia Cæsonia, (whom he afterwards married,) with a view to secure his inconstant affections; and such was still the public confidence in his good intentions, that the whole Empire put up supplications for his recovery, and individuals bound themselves by vows, which, contrary perhaps to their expectations, they were afterwards compelled to fulfil. From this period, whether weary of the restraints of hypocrisy, or actually deranged in his intellect by the inflammatory effects of the potion which

His sickness.

---

* Suetonius, *Cal.* 14.

† Dion Cassius, lib. lix.

‡ According to Suetonius, (*Cal.* 17,) the Treasury, at the death of Tiberius, contained two thousand seven hundred millions of sesterces—nearly twenty-two millions of English money. Other authors reckon the sum to have been two thousand three hundred millions of sesterces, or above eighteen millions of our currency.

§ *Vix. Pius, Pater exercitûm, Filius Castrorum, Opt. Max. &c.* Suetonius, *Cal.* 22.

|| *Sellarii et spintriæ.* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. vi. c. 1.

* About £650.

† Dion Cassius, and Suetonius, *loc. cit.*

‡ Suetonius, *Cal.* 15.

§ *Stupra sororibus intulit, ex unâ etiam natam filiam cognovit.* Eutropius, *in Caligula*, lib. vii. c. 7. Casaubon and the Abbé de Marolles, and indeed Pæanius, the Greek translator of Eutropius, understood *cognovit* in the obscene sense, although some copies (*conj. emend.*) read *agnovit*. But Barthius (*Adversar.* lib. xxiii. c. 9,) refutes this construction, and shows that the daughter could not be more than ten years of age when Caius Cæsar died. *Cognovit*, therefore, must be construed *acknowledged*,—a sufficient proof of impudent depravity.

Biography. From A. D. 37. to 41.

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D. 37. to 41.

he had taken,* the Emperor threw off all appearance of virtue and moderation, as well as all prudential considerations, and acted on all occasions with the mischievous violence of unbridled passion, and wanton power;† so that the tyranny of Tiberius was forgotten in the enormities of Caligula.‡

Tiberius Gemellus put to death.

One of his first atrocities was the judicial murder of the innocent Tiberius Gemellus, upon the poor pretence that he had taken an antidote against poison, and thus thrown a slander upon the character of the Emperor.§ The execution of Silanus, whose daughter he had married and repudiated, followed soon afterwards. This virtuous old man had declined to accompany the Court on an aquatic excursion, on account of his liability to sea-sickness: it was pretended that he made this an excuse for remaining on shore to carry into effect a treasonable conspiracy; and Julius Græcinus, a man of the most inflexible integrity, was ordered to become his accuser. Græcinus refused to obey, and both were put to death.‖

Antiochus and Agrippa restored

The restoration of Antiochus to the Kingdom of Commagena, of which he had been deprived by Tiberius, is placed by Dion Cassius in this year;¶ and about the same time, it appears that Agrippa, grandson of the celebrated Herod,** whom the late Emperor had imprisoned, not without some cause, was remunerated with the Kingdom of Chalcis, and several Tetrarchies in the neighbourhood. It is said that these two Princes had instilled into Caius Cæsar the most abominable principles, and had instigated him to murder his grandfather and his young cousin, that he might at once seize the Empire, and put them in possession of their respective dominions.††

A. D. 38.

On the first day of the new year, after his accession, the customary oaths were administered, enjoining obedience to the institutes of Augustus, and of Caius Cæsar, omitting his predecessor Tiberius; and it deserves remark, that the name of this Emperor was never afterwards admitted into the list which was annually appended to the oath.‡‡ Henceforth the life of Caligula becomes a series of atrocious crimes and infantine follies, involving no important historical events, and as uninteresting to the reader, as it is irksome and disgusting to the compiler: the writers who have recored his enormities, have been little careful to arrange, in chronological order, the unconnected sallies of a desperate maniac; and the only advantage to be derived from tracing them, is in the proof they afford of the degraded condition of the Roman people, and of the mischievous consequences resulting from an unsettled Government.

Monstrous cruelties.

His cruelties were so excessive and so wanton, that the endurance of his subjects is scarcely credible; for he not only gratified his sanguinary temper without remorse on the smallest provocation, but he took also an unnatural pleasure in shedding blood, and inflicting tortures.* He condemned many citizens to death, on the alledged evidence of those very documents which, at his accession, he had pretended to burn unread; he superintended the executions in person, giving directions to the officers to prolong the sufferings of the criminals, "that they might feel themselves die;" and such was his hatred of mankind in general, that he once was heard to express a wish, "that the whole populace of Rome had one neck, that he might be enabled to shed their blood at a single blow." When the number of gladiators was not sufficient to glut his appetite for slaughter, he would frequently oblige Roman Knights to combat on the *arena;* and a great number of valuable lives were sacrificed in this manner. He was particularly delighted with seeing criminals thrown to wild beasts, and admired the savage manner in which those animals tore them to pieces; and if it happened that there was not a sufficient number of condemned persons for his amusement, he made no scruple of ordering some of the spectators to be cast into the den; when, if they presumed to remonstrate against the injustice of the command, he silenced them by cutting out their tongues.

His endearments bore the same ferocious character; he used to clasp the necks of his favourite women, exclaiming, "How soon would one word from me sever this pretty neck from the body." He kept two lists, one entitled *Gladius,* and the other *Pugio,*† in which he inserted the names of such Senators and Knights as he intended to put to death; and it is asserted, that they contained the greater part of both those estates. As for the hatred of the people, he rather took pleasure in it, and was accustomed to observe, "*Oderint dum metuant,*"‡ let them hate me, provided they fear me. He valued himself particularly upon what he called his "*Adiatrepsia,*"§ meaning the indifference with which he could be a spectator of bloodshed and tortures; and he professed himself satisfied that the infant daughter of Cæsonia was his own child, because her first efforts were directed to scratch out the eyes of all who nursed or played with her.‖

Deaths of Macro and Antonia.

Among the numerous victims of his cruelty, was the infamous Macro, who well merited the death he suffered from any hand but that of Caius.¶ About the same time he put to the sword Ptolemy, the son of King Juba, his cousin, merely because he happened to be better dressed than himself,** and Ennia,†† whose services he ought not to have forgotten. Having been accidently disturbed by a concourse of people hastening to see some of his public shows, he caused above twenty Knights, and as many women of quality, together with a great number of meaner persons, to be beaten to death with bludgeons;‡‡ and soon afterwards he condemned to a similar punishment several respectable citizens

---

* ——*Avunculus ille Neronis*
Cui totam tremuli frontem Cæsonia pulli
Infudit.—— Juv. *Sat.* vi. 614.

† *C. Cæsar quem mihi videtur rerum Natura edidisse ut ostenderet quid summa vitia in fortunâ possent.* Seneca, *de Consolat. ad Helvium,* lib. ix. c. 779.

‡ *Sceleratissimus ac funestissimus et qui etiam dedecora Tiberii purgaverit.* Eutropius, lib. vii.

§ Philo, *Legat. ad Caium.*

‖ Tacitus, *Agric.* lib. iv. ¶ Lib. lix.

** Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xviii.

†† Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.* ‡‡ Ibid.

* See Suetonius, *Cal.* 27. &c. Dion Cassius, *in loco.*

† Suetonius, *Cal.* 49.

‡ Ibid. 30. § Ibid. 29.

‖ Dion Cassius. Suetonius, *Cal.* 25. Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xix. c. 1.

¶ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. vi. c. 1. Philo.

** Suetonius, *Cal.* 26.

†† According to Dion Cassius he obliged her to destroy herself, lib. lix.

‡‡ Seneca, *ad Polyb.* Philo.

Biography. From A. D. 37. to 41.

for not showing a sufficient eagerness to be present at the same entertainments.

His madness.

He treated his grandmother Antonia, whom at one time he affected to idolize, with so much harshness, as to occasion her death; at her funeral he conducted himself with the most indecent levity; and endeavoured to slander her birth, although in so doing he vitiated his own pedigree. When he banished two of his sisters, he reminded them that he possessed the power of inflicting not only exile but death; but upon the decease of Drusilla, who had been his mistress, and afterwards his wife, he exhibited the most extravagant symptoms of grief;* he left Rome on foot in the middle of the night, and retired into Sicily, whence he returned with his beard grown, and his hair uncombed, in sordid mourning, to celebrate the apotheosis of that wretched woman; and, in order to make it a pretence for the further indulgence of his malignity, he declared all those who appeared sad to be guilty of disrespect to her memory, because they rejoiced not in her translation to heaven; while those who rejoiced were held equally criminal, because they lamented not her loss; and a few who attempted to avoid every demonstration either of joy or sorrow, were accused of indifference to the interests and feelings of the Emperor. One man, who sold warm water in the streets, was condemned to death for impiety, in following his ordinary occupation on so solemn an occasion.† Thus, as Dion Cassius observes, he was in all things more contrary to himself than to any one else.‡

His profligacy.

Historians have been diffuse in relating the abominable and shameless debaucheries of this Emperor;§ but enough has already been told to prove, that decency had been from a very early period a stranger to his bosom; the licentiousness of his Palace spread itself rapidly through his dominions, contaminating whatever remained of the chastity of Roman women, or the honour of Roman families. Among his most flagitious offences of this kind, must be reckoned his five

And marriages.

marriages,|| which took place in the course of about as many years, with circumstances of the most revolting depravity. His first wife was Claudia, the daughter of the venerable Silanus, whom he put to death on the frivolous pretence already noticed; she died before he became Emperor. After his accession, he happened to be present at the wedding of C. Piso and Livia Orestilla; and, when the ceremony was concluded, he abruptly commanded the bridegroom, on pain of death, "not to touch the bride of Cæsar." Livia was accordingly conducted to the Palace, and the Emperor gave out, that "he had taken a wife after the manner of Romulus and of Augustus." She enjoyed her imperial honours but a short time; and, upon her being dismissed, she was reported to have returned to Piso. When the rumour reached the Emperor's ears, he immediately banished them both.

Soon after this, he annulled the marriage of his sister, Drusilla, with L. Cassius, that he might make her his own Empress; but he speedily married her to M. Lepidus, the associate of his most abandoned and nameless vices. His next wife was the unhappy Lollia Paulina,* who was in Macedonia with her husband, C. Memmius, an officer of high rank, when the Emperor, having heard it accidentally mentioned that her family were remarkable for female beauty, sent for her to share his Throne; but, as she did not equal his expectations, she was in a short time divorced, and prohibited from living with any other man for the future.

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D. 37. to 41.

In the following year he was married to Milonia Cæsonia, a woman with whom he had previously cohabited, who possessed neither youth nor beauty, and who was, before he became acquainted with her, the mother of three daughters. Of this abandoned woman, he was so ardently and constantly enamoured, that not only his Court, but himself also expressed surprise at the attachment; the courtiers attributing it to the effect of some love philtre which she had administered to him, and the Emperor often declaring, that "he should like to put her to the torture, to make her discover her art." She excelled all the women of her time in an exquisite perception of sensuality; and this detestable skill so besotted her voluptuous husband, that he delighted to exhibit her to his guards in a military costume, and to his intimates in shameless nakedness.†

Pride and envy of the Emperor.

His pride was equal to his debauchery; he affected to consider himself as of a different nature from his subjects, and was accustomed to argue, that "as a shepherd was not a sheep, nor an herdsman an ox, so neither is an Emperor a man."‡ And to maintain the superiority which he claimed, he endeavoured to destroy, or to drive into obscurity, every species of merit which he could not pretend to surpass; he made a ridiculous attempt to suppress the works of Homer and Virgil, that his own verses might be the best extant; and he used to speak slightingly of Livy as an historian, and of Seneca as a moral writer.

Being jealous of the fine person of a young man, who, from his stature and beauty, was called the *Colosseros*, or Colossal Cupid,§ he put him to death with the most cruel insults; and it is said, that he obliged those who had fine hair, to shave their heads, that no man's love-locks might be compared to his own. He was disposed to have deprived all his allies of their regal titles and authority, alledging the opinion of Homer:

Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη· εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω,
Εἷς βασιλεύς,

in order that he might be proclaimed and crowned King of the Roman dominions; and this most unpopular and dangerous attempt would have been made, had not his friends taken the alarm, and diverted him from it, by suggesting to him, that he was already so much above all Kings, that he could only degrade himself by assuming their distinctions. He would not

* Seneca, *ad Polyb.* Philo.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lix. ‡ Ibid.
§ See Suetonius, *Cal.* 36.
|| Ibid. 25. Crevier, *in Caligula*, lib. vii. c. 1.

* F. Norris (*Cenotaph. Pisan*, p. 189,) shows that Archbishop Usher is mistaken in his construction of Suetonius, *Cal.* 26. "*Deq; Lollià Paulinâ quæ C. Cæsari nupta fuerat, &c.*" The Archbishop applies these words to Augustus's grandson, (the son of Agrippa;) but this supposition cannot be reconciled with Suetonius, *Cal.* 25, where it is stated that Caligula married Lollia Paulina, and soon afterwards divorced her; nor with Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iv. c. 40, where it appears that "C. Cæsar, the grandson of Augustus, married Livia, the daughter of Drusus, and sister of Germanicus;" and that she survived him; for she was *afterwards* (*postea*) married to Drusus, son of Tiberius.
† *Amicis verò etiam audax.* Suetonius, *Cal.* 25. Echard quaintly remarks, that he made her a man and a beast.
‡ Philo. *Judæus, in loco.* § Suetonius, *Cal.* 35.

Biography. From A. D. 37. to 41.

acknowledge himself to be the grandson of Agrippa, on account of his Plebeian extraction; but by way of assuming a nobler origin, he feigned that his mother was the offspring of an incestuous intercourse between Augustus and his daughter Julia.*

He Deifies himself.

But all these, and a thousand similar extravagances, of which these are selected as specimens, were eclipsed by his erecting a Temple to his own Divinity, and instituting a College of Priests to officiate at his altars. Admissions into this notable Priesthood were purchased at an enormous price† by some of the first Senators in Rome, and among the successful candidates for sacerdotal offices were the Emperor's uncle, Claudius, who was kept as a kind of Court buffoon,‡ his wife, Cæsonia, his favourite Horse, and, to complete the impiety and folly of the concern, Caius Cæsar himself, who thus became Priest to his own Deity.§ What that Divinity was, it would have puzzled the most able Mythologists to determine; for he assumed the character and costume of all the Gods, male and female, in their turns, and sometimes of two or three at once. He would walk out by moonlight, and pretend to have enjoyed the favours of Diana, whom he addressed in the language of a lover; he seated himself between Castor and Pollux, and claimed all the honours which the people intended for those Divinities; he was often on friendly terms with Jupiter, and would whisper in the ear of his statue, and apply his own to its mouth, affecting to be satisfied or displeased with the answers he received; and he placed upon its knees the infant daughter of Cæsonia, declaring that if the child were his, it must be also "the offspring of high Jove."‖ But, as his ambition enlarged itself, he began to regard Jupiter as a rival for universal empire, and he contrived an artificial thunder to silence that of heaven; when it lightened, he hurled stones into the air, challenging the King of the Gods to mortal combat, to decide their respective claims.¶ And then affecting to be the victor, he passed sentence of banishment upon his adversary.**

But, notwithstanding these bravadoes, he was subject to fits of superstitious terror; and when he attempted to remove the image of Jupiter Olympius, he was terrified at the appearances of the divine displeasure, and betrayed the most childish cowardice.††

His horse.

All these puerilities were less offensive to the public, than the honours he lavished upon the Horse‡‡ which he had made one of his Priests, and which, by way of insult to the Republic, he had declared Consul. This animal was kept in an ivory stable, and fed from a golden manger; and when it was invited to feast at the Emperor's table, gilt corn was served up in a golden basin of exquisite workmanship.

Gaming and rapacity.

By his unbounded profusion, the Treasury was in a few months completely drained; and Caius Cæsar hesitated at no expedient to raise money. He obliged the most wealthy citizens to gamble with him for enormous sums, which he was sufficiently sure of winning;* and when they declared that they had lost all they possessed, he insisted upon their throwing for their lives, and redeeming them when lost, by solicitation among their friends; all places of honour and profit were set to sale, and the purchasers frequently were deprived of their situations in order that they might be sold again. Persons of fortune were daily accused of capital offences, that the Emperor might either confiscate their property, or commute their sentence into a ruinous fine. Taxes of all sorts, and of the most infamous nature, were multiplied upon the poorest classes of the community, and even the wages of prostitution (as in modern France) were subject to a tribute.† These new laws were written in a small character, and fixed up at so great a height, that it was scarcely possible for any one to read them, in order that the people might, through ignorance, become liable to surcharges;‡ and when it appeared on the collection of the revenue, that the profits of the bagnios were very considerable, the Emperor established a brothel in his own palace, and gave public notice of the nature of the accommodation. On the birth of his daughter,§ he was not ashamed to plead poverty, and to proclaim his readiness to receive new-year's gifts, to enable him to provide for her; and, when, by all these extortions, he had acquired a vast sum of money, he spread it upon the floor, and rolled himself upon it naked, in an ecstacy of gratified avarice.‖

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D. 37. to 41.

In the ensuing year, the Emperor caused himself to be nominated Consul with L. Apronius Cæsianus;¶ he resigned his own fasces after thirty days,** and appointed another Consul. But he did not suffer either of these Magistrates to enjoy their empty honours more than six months; and he deprived them of the Consulship in a manner truly characteristic. When the anniversary of the battle of Actium arrived, which was usually celebrated as a great national deliverance, by public thanksgivings and rejoicings, Caius Cæsar observed, that "as he was grandson both of Augustus and of Antony, the Consuls could hardly fail to affront him, whether they should omit to do honour to the victory of one, or appear to rejoice in the defeat of the other." The usual shows were exhibited and the Consuls were ignominiously deposed. The object of this wanton injustice was to make a vacancy for Domitius Afer, who, by a peculiar readiness and good fortune, had suddenly attained his height of favour, after escaping from the imminent risk of a cruel death. He was considered as the most eloquent speaker of his time, and was consequently an object of jealousy to the Emperor, who valued himself, not without reason, upon his own oratorical powers;†† Afer, unconscious of the brooding storm, or anxious to avert it, erected a statue in honour of Caius Cæsar, upon the pedestal of which he inscribed the words: "twice Consul *ætat.* xxvii." The Emperor pretended that the statement contained in this inscription, was

A. D. 39.

Story of Domitius Afer.

* Suetonius, *Cal.* 23.
† It is said £80,000. English. Suetonius, *Claud.* 9.
‡ Suetonius, *Cal.* 23.
§ Dion Cassius, lib. lix. c. 759, 761. Suetonius, *Cal.* 22. Josephus, *Antiq.*
‖ Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xix.
¶ Dion Cassius. *Ad pugnam vocavit Jovem, et quidem sine missione, Homericum illum exclamans versum ἢ μ' ἀνδρῶν, ἢ ἐγώ σε.* Seneca, *de Irâ*, lib. i. xvi.
** Εἰς γαῖαν Δαναῶν περαὸ σε.
†† *Nemo in audaciorem aut effrenatiorem Numinis contemptum prorupisse legitur; nemo tamen miserius trepidavit, cùm aliquod iræ divinæ indicium se proferebat.* Calvin, *Institut.* lib. i. c. 1.
‡‡ Suetonius, *Cal.* 55. Dion Cassius, lib. lix.

* Suetonius, *Cal.* 41.
† Ibid. 40.
‡ Ibid. 41.
§ Ibid. 42.
‖ Ibid. 42. Dion Cassius, lib. lix.
¶ *Al.* Cælianus et Cestianus. See Dion Cassius.
** Suetonius, *Cal.* 17.
†† Ibid. 53.

Biography. From A. D. 37. to 41.

intended as a censure upon him for having aspired to the Consulship before the age appointed by law; he accordingly impeached Afer before the Senate, and conducted the prosecution himself with surprising skill and fluency.* Domitius perceived his danger; and, instead of attempting a defence, he pleaded guilty, and declared himself wholly unable to reply to the able speech of his accuser, which, however, he reviewed in a masterly manner and with apparent satisfaction, declaring that Caius Cæsar the Orator was more to be dreaded than Caius Cæsar the Emperor. This gross flattery so delighted Caligula, that he not only procured his acquittal, but, deposing the ordinary Consuls,† made him Consul *suffect* with Callistus his freedman, who had been instrumental in the management of the Senate on this occasion. This body had long since lost all its dignity and authority, as well as all claim to respect; and appeared to have no other object than to propitiate the favour of the Emperor, by the most servile adulation and the most unprincipled compliances.‡ They readily acknowledged that they held their lives and property by no surer tenure than his clemency; and they did not hesitate to deprive any citizen of both, who might have become obnoxious to his jealousy.

lase temper of the Senate,

And People.

The same mean spirit pervaded the whole People of Rome, and no servility was too degrading for those who still affected to boast of their Republic, and to despise the subjects of Monarchical governments. If there were some exceptions to this baseness, they were distinguished by the puritanical cant of the Stoic Philosophy, more than by the generous bravery of former times, and served rather to point one of Plutarch's tales, than to prove that any portion still remained of "the old Roman virtue."

tory of ...rus ...lius.

Of this description is the story told by Seneca,§ of Canus Julius, a young pedant who chose to enter the lists of disputation with the Emperor, and to conduct the debate in such a manner as to ensure his own destruction. Accordingly, upon his taking leave, Caius Cæsar called out to him, "That you may not go away with a mistaken impression of the result of this conference, I tell you, fairly, that you are condemned to die." "I heartily thank you, most gracious Sovereign," was the reply of Canus; he affected the most perfect indifference during the ten days which the law allowed, between the condemnation and execution of the criminal; and when the centurion came to lead him away to his death, he was found playing at a game resembling chess, and jocosely desired the officer to bear witness that though he could not stay to finish his game, he had the advantage in it. To his friends he observed in a similar strain, "I am more fortunate than you; for you are tormented with anxiety to know that of which I shall be certified in a moment;" and he continued a scholastic discussion on the immortality of the soul, till the axe of the executioner put a period to his harangue.

ression the a.

Josephus,‖ and Philo,¶ are very copious in their accounts of the oppressions which, probably about this time, the Emperor began to inflict upon the Jews; and Crevier* has thought fit to copy, at great length, the details and the speeches which they have collected. But the circumstances of this persecution belong more to Jewish† than to Roman history, and wear the character rather of one of Plutarch's romances than of authentic narrative.

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D. 37. to 41.

Vast extravagance of Caligula's expenditure.

The enormous sums, which the vast extent of the Roman Empire, and the passive submission of the citizens continued to supply, were insufficient for the unprecedented expenditure of Caius Cæsar, who was as lavish in scattering money as he was covetous in amassing it, and defended his prodigality upon the principle that, "frugality becomes other men, but not an Emperor."‡ Suetonius possibly exaggerates the childish extravagances of his table and furniture, when he speaks of loaves of solid gold set before the guests, and of the prows of gallies decorated with diamonds;§ but he is supported by other testimony in his description of the excessive luxury of the entertainments given at the palace, some of which are said to have cost from fifty to a hundred thousand pounds of English money;‖ of the splendour of the baths and greenhouses, and other accommodations on board the Imperial yachts; and of the enormous waste of labour employed upon the Emperor's villas, in attempting to exalt the vallies and level the hills, to make the sea firm ground, and to cut the dry land into bays and lakes. Amid all this useless and mischievous profusion, some works and institutions were undertaken more worthy of the natural talents of Caius Cæsar, and of a refined and tasteful age; though all was done with that capricious violence, and arbitrary disregard for the rights of others, which marked the whole conduct of his reign. He instituted Public Games in Sicily and in Gaul; and at Lyons he established prizes for Eloquence, of which the conditions were, that the unsuccessful candidates should bestow the palm upon their competitors, and proclaim their success; and that they should either efface their own compositions with a sponge, or with their tongues, or be beaten with the ferule, or cast into the nearest water.¶ He completed several useful works which had been commenced by his predecessor;** and brought to Rome, at an enormous expense, one of those celebrated Egyptian obelisks which to this day remain among its noblest ornaments. He projected a commercial harbour at *Rhegium*,†† which would have been highly advantageous to the Alexandrian and Sicilian merchants; and he repaired the ruined walls and Temples at Syracuse. He had taken measures to cut a canal through the isthmus of Corinth, to enable the trading vessels to avoid the dangerous and tedious passage round the Peloponnesus; and, to facilitate the intercourse with Gaul, he intended to have built a city upon the summit of the Alps. At the same time he proposed to gratify his own taste by restoring the famous Palace of the for-

* Dion Cassius, *in Caligula.*

† *Both* Consuls however could not be *Ordinarii*, since Caius Cæsar himself was named on the first of January.

‡ Dion Cassius, *in loco.* Seneca, *de Benef.* lib. xi. c. 12.

§ *De Tranquill.* lib. xiv.

‖ *Antiq.* lib. xviii. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. ii.

¶ *Leg. ad Caium.*

* *Caligula*, book vii. A. C. 40.

† Some account of these transactions will be found in Tillemont, and in Archbishop Usher.

‡ Suetonius, *Cal.* 37.

§ Ibid. *et* 20, 21.

‖ Seneca, *ad Helv.* lib. ix. ten million sesterces. Dion Cassius, lib. lix.

¶ Suetonius, *Cal.* 20. Juvenal, l. 44.

** Ibid. 21.

†† Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xix.

Biography. From A. D. 37. to 41.

tunate Polycrates at Samos, and the Sanctuary of Apollo at Miletum.

All these undertakings were not sufficient to employ the morbid activity of a powerful but unsound mind; Caius Cæsar, from some motive, at which his contemporaries could only guess,* determined to build a bridge across the bay, from *Baiæ* to *Puteoli*, a distance of rather more than three miles and a half: a prodigious number of round-hulled vessels were put in requisition for this preposterous design, and many more were built; and as soon as a sufficient quantity were collected, they were anchored together, and a broad Roman road, formed of the usual materials, was carried over their decks. Upon the sides of this road inns were erected, supplied by conduits with fresh water; trees and shrubs were planted; and a high parapet defended the whole from the surge, and from the near view of the sea. The opening of this grand but useless work, was conducted in a style of magnificence corresponding with the boldness of the undertaking; the army, both infantry and cavalry, was marched dry shod over the ocean, the Emperor leading the van on horseback, and returning by the same road in triumph. Largesses, speeches, and feasting followed, which continued throughout the night; and so admirable was the contrivance for lighting the bridge, that, according to the inflated language of the Imperial flatterers, the absence of the Sun was scarcely perceived. The weather proved serenely calm, and Caius Cæsar indulged the belief, that Neptune stood more in awe of him that he had done of Xerxes on a similar occasion: but the complete gratification of his vanity and luxury could not calm his passion for cruelty; and part of the amusement afforded him, consisted in throwing the spectators over the parapet into the sea, and in running down, with ships of war, the numerous boats which crowded around the spectacle.†

The great bridge over the sea.

Ridiculous expedition of Caius Cæsar.

There was nothing for which the thoughtless impetuosity and selfish timidity of Caius Cæsar was less adapted than a military expedition; for although he had been bred in camps, and early accustomed to discipline, his irregular life and violent temper had totally disqualified him for the duties of a soldier. But his inordinate vanity was not to be satisfied without having gained at least the semblance of martial glory; and he set out for a German campaign with so little previous preparation, that all the activity of his officers, and all the resources of the Empire were insufficient to raise men, and to collect supplies as rapidly as he required them. Universal confusion and haste prevailed:‡ veteran cohorts and new levies were seen marching from every point to join the Emperor; the roads were thronged with waggons laded with enormous quantities of provisions and of ammunition; and the Prætorian guards were so exhausted by forced marches that, contrary to all precedent, they were constrained to lay their standards upon the baggage; when, on a sudden, the Emperor grew weary of this violent motion, and reclining on his litter, proceeded with all the pomp and luxurious leisure of an Oriental despot.

Severity of discipline.

Upon his arrival at head quarters, he assumed the command of eight legions, which had been stationed upon the banks of the Rhine since the reign of Augustus; and he began immediately to enforce the most rigid discipline. Those officers who failed to bring up their respective corps at the time appointed in the general orders, were either deprived of their seniority, or cashiered; and he dismissed from the army a number of veteran invalids who, according to the regulation of the service, were entitled to pensions and rewards.* But after all this parade and expense, there was as little disposition to face actual danger on the part of the Emperor, as there was in the Germans to offer him any resistance: he was obliged therefore to contrive a mock fight with some boys, whom he had concealed in a wood; after which exploit he congratulated his brave comrades on their important victory;† affected to treat with contempt those who had no share in the action; and wrote pathetic letters to the Senate, complaining that the People of Rome were indulging themselves in the lap of peace and plenty, whilst their Emperor was fighting their battles, and enduring every species of hardship and danger.

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D. 37. to 41.

About the same time an event occurred which contributed not a little to the gratification of his puerile ambition. Adminius, the son of Cunobellinus, a British Chieftain, having been banished by his father, arrived in Gaul with a slender retinue, and claimed the protection of Cæsar, who thought proper to represent this adventure as the submission of the whole island of Britain to his arms; and accordingly directed the bearers of his despatches to go to the *Forum* and to the *Curia* in a carriage of state, and to deliver them only to the Consuls in full Senate assembled in the Temple of Mars, as if some important addition had been made to the Imperial dominions.

Conquest of Britain.

In the midst of these successes, a trifling alarm induced the Emperor to return suddenly to Rome; and during his stay in the Capital, he discovered,‡ or affected to discover,§ a plot for his destruction, in which several of the principal Senators, and his two surviving sisters were implicated. Executions and confiscations followed of course; the Princesses were banished for life to the island of Pontia, and were deprived of all their property, the major part of which the Emperor carried with him on his return into Gaul, and sold by public auction;‖ and so great was the profit of the sale, that he was induced to send to Rome for a large quantity of his own splendid furniture and rich jewellery, for the same purpose.—But the display of wealth which the Gauls had made in these purchases was calculated to stimulate, rather than to satisfy the cupidity of Caius Cæsar; and that unhappy Province¶ was more cruelly impoverished by his rapine and exactions, than if it had been plundered by a conqueror. A great number of the most respectable and wealthy among the officers of the army, were sacrificed on suspicion of having been concerned in the alledged conspiracy; and among these were some who had held commands in the Province for many years, and had enjoyed ample opportunities of enriching themselves.**

Unsuccessful conspiracy.

* Suetonius, *Cal.* 19.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lix.
‡ Suetonius, *Cal.* 43. Dion Cassius, lib. lix.

* Suetonius, *Cal.* 44.
† Ibid. 45. Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.*
‡ Tacitus, lib. xiv. *Annal.* ii.
§ Dion Cassius, *in loco.*
‖ Suetonius, *Cal.* 39.
¶ Dion Cassius, lib. lix.
** Julius Sacerdos. Lentulus Getulicus. Marcus Lepidus. Dion Cassius, lib. lix.

Spoils of the Ocean.

It remained, however, to make good his undertaking in Britain; and with this view he marched his whole army, to the number of more than two hundred thousand men, towards the coast. But when he arrived upon the sea-shore, instead of preparing for the embarkation of the troops, he drew them up in order of battle; and while all men wondered what design the Emperor could be meditating, he ordered them to fill their helmets with shells, which he called "the spoils of the Ocean due to the Capitol and to the Palace."* After this exploit, he assured his soldiers that their toils and perils were at an end; and distributing a largess of a hundred *denarii* (about three guineas) to each man, he bade them "from henceforth be happy and rich."

Preparations for a Triumph.

He now turned his attention to the preparations for a Triumph; and not satisfied with a number of German hostages and criminals, whom he treated as prisoners of war, he compelled many of the tallest and most martial Gauls, without regard to their rank, to assume German names and habits,† and even to learn the German language, that he might pass them for captives of that nation. The transports which had been fitted out to convey him to Britain were dragged, at a vast expense, over land to Rome; and an enormous light-house was erected upon the beach, on which the shells had been gathered, as a trophy of his victory.

Attempt to decimate the legions.

His return to Rome was accelerated by an attempt of greater atrocity than any which he had before conceived. He resolved to massacre the whole of those legions which had mutinied against his father, upon the death of Augustus;‡ and though he was with great difficulty convinced of the danger of such a prodigious effusion of blood, he could not be dissuaded from punishing them by decimation. The troops, however, were not disposed to submit patiently to this unprecedented barbarity; and the Emperor, upon the first symptom of discontent, was seized with a panic, and fled to Italy in the utmost consternation. He had previously entered upon his third Consulship without a colleague.§

A. D. 40.

The Senate had descended to the most shameless adulation in their addresses to the Emperor, on the occasion of his pretended achievements, and on his escape from the treasons which had been brought to light; and they had decreed him an Ovation: but Caius Cæsar, who considered an ordinary Triumph as too little for his merits, was furiously indignant that they should presume to offer him an inferior honour; he refused to receive some of the Deputies from Rome, and forbade others to enter the Province; and they who were admitted to his presence, were treated with the grossest ignominy, and sent back to the Senate with the most alarming threats;‖ in consequence of which, no Magistrate durst convene the Senate, and all the business of the Empire was suspended till his return. He entered the city on his own birth-day, with the usual ceremonies of an Ovation;¶ but he had forbidden any of the Senators to meet him on the road, and fear kept many others from witnessing the procession; so that he had rather the air of a wild beast approaching the fold, than of a victorious Prince returning to his subjects.

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D. 37. to 41.

His bosom boiled with rage against the Nobility; and he studied to mortify, and, if possible, to extirpate them; he deprived all the ancient Aristocratic families of their heraldic honours,* and obliged those of the highest rank to submit to the most degrading offices; all eminence or merit, even in his own service, was equally dangerous; and no man could be commended but at the hazard of his life. As his despotism became more wanton, the servility of the Romans grew more base; and even Generals, who had distinguished themselves by their courage in the field, were found capable of the meanest flattery at Court. Vitellius, who had gained sufficient credit by his military conduct as necessarily exposed him to danger, eluded it by an ingenious reply, which, though it satisfied the self-love of the Emperor, must have been felt by the whole Court to be a severe and cutting sarcasm.† Caius Cæsar was boasting of his amatory successes in the heavens, and appealed to Vitellius, whether he had not seen him enjoy the favours of the Moon: the General, holding his hand over his eyes, as if to protect them from the bright rays of the Emperor, answered, that "the Gods are only visible in such situations to each other, and not to mortals."‡

Servility of the Senate.

Hatred and indignation of the People.

But although the independent spirit of true virtue was extinct in Rome, the natural passions of hatred, and revenge, and selfish fear, which can never be suppressed by tyranny, rendered the situation of the tyrant as dangerous as it ought to have been. Treasonable designs were formed; and more than one plot was prematurely discovered, and added to the long list of proscriptions, and of judicial murders, all who were obnoxious to suspicion, or capable of gratifying avarice. The accounts which have reached us of these conspiracies are, however, so vague and unsatisfactory, that their existence is rather inferred than related; and Suetonius and Dion Cassius differ so much from each other, and are both so deficient in arrangement and perspicuity, that the events of this reign are not to be adjusted without considerable difficulty, and must, after all, be subject to great uncertainty.

Conspiracy of Chærea. A. D. 41.

Caius Cæsar had entered upon his fourth Consulship,§ about a month, when that vengeance which, however odious in the perpetrator, is amply merited by such bloody and profligate oppressors, delivered the world from his cruel yoke. Among the officers of his guards was Cassius Chærea, a veteran of high character and tried courage, and shrewdly suspected of entertaining Republican opinions. The Emperor had been in the habit of taunting this brave man with having a feeble and effeminate voice, and had more than once called him "coward;" an insult never forgiven by a soldier; and whenever it came to Chærea's turn to wait upon him, in order to receive the watchword, he gave him some name‖ which could not be repeated by the officer to the soldiers, without exposing himself to ridicule and shame. Irritated beyond endurance by these repeated insults, Chærea sounded some others of the most disaffected persons

* Suetonius, *Cal.* 46. Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.*
† Suetonius, *Cal.* 47.
‡ Ibid. 48.
‖ Ibid. 49.
§ Ibid. 17.
¶ Ibid.

* Rollin, lib. iii. sec. 1.
† Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.*
‡ Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.*
§ Suetonius, *Cal.* 17.
‖ Ibid. 56.

Biography. From A. D. 37. to 41.

about the Court,* and particularly Valerius Asiaticus, who was known to retain a keen sense of the injuries he had received from Caius Cæsar; for the Emperor, not content with the seduction of his wife, had rallied him in public upon the subject, in the grossest and most offensive language.† The design which they were maturing, would have been crushed in its infancy, but for the constancy of Quintilia, an actress, who endured the rack without betraying Pompadius, a nobleman, with whom she had an intrigue, and whose imprudence had excited suspicion. The sufferings of this woman‡ served to incense the conspirators, particularly Chærea, who presided at her punishment, and to hasten the accomplishment of their purpose.§ It was, of course, preceded by the usual train of prodigies: the statue of Jupiter burst out into a horse-laugh, to the great terror of some workmen who were employed about it; several persons, and amongst others the Emperor himself, had ominous dreams; and an astrologer warned him to "beware of Cassius," which he interpreting of Cassius Longinus, then Proconsul of Asia, despatched orders for his execution, which were, fortunately, superseded by his own death.‖

Death of Caius Cæsar Caligula. IX. Cal. Feb.

It had been resolved to assassinate the Emperor during the Palatine Games. In the three first days no favourable opportunity occurred, and Chærea began to grow impatient and desperate; but he was restrained by the prudence of the other conspirators from attempting open violence.

On the fourth day of the Games, Caligula was oppressed by indigestion, and seemed inclined to remain in the theatre, instead of returning, as usual, to dinner, about one o'clock; but he was prevailed on to try the bath, and was actually going home for that purpose, when he was met in a narrow passage by a company of youths, who were to perform a scenic representation before him; his eagerness to enjoy this entertainment would have induced him to return to the theatre, had not the boys requested time to warm themselves:¶ at this moment Chærea struck him, and he was soon despatched; for above thirty wounds were found in his body; and Dion Cassius affirms, that the conspirators tore his flesh with their teeth.**

Thus perished Caius Cæsar in the twenty-ninth year of his age, and in the fourth year of his flagitious reign.* His character is sufficiently depicted in his conduct. Historians have assigned him a superiority of natural talents, powers of eloquence, and literary acquirements, which a life of debauchery could not wholly quench. His health had never been good, and his constitution impaired by his vices, was severely shaken in the illness which was attributed to Cæsonia's amatory potion. His disorder appears to have affected his intellects; and Suetonius relates,† that he was himself so impressed with this idea, as to have entertained an intention of retiring, perhaps to Anticyra, for the purpose of undergoing a course of medicine. In his habits of life, he was as irregular and inconstant as might be expected in a madman. He appeared sometimes in the dress of a female, and often in that of a barbarian; frequently he adopted the costume of the different male, or even female, Deities; and at other times he wore the uniform of a triumphant General, or the armour which he had taken from the tomb of Alexander the Great.‡

Caius Cæsar Caligula. From A. D 37. to 41. Character.

He devoted himself eagerly to low and degrading exercises, and was ambitious to excel in driving, and sword-playing, in dancing, singing, and even in acting.§

Death of Cæsonia and her child.

In the confusion which ensued upon his assassination, the Empress was stabbed by a Centurion, and her child dashed against a wall and killed;‖ the body of Cæsar was hastily interred, after being half burnt, in a private garden;¶ and was not honoured with the rites of sepulture till the return of his sisters from exile, when the persons who were employed to remove it, were said to have been alarmed by frequent apparitions.**

The news of his death was, for some time, distrusted, the people suspecting that it was an artifice to try their loyalty;†† but when the report was confirmed, the Senate met in the Capitol, not in the Julian *Curia*, which they regarded as the tomb of their independence, and ventured to deliberate upon the restoration of the Republic.

---

* Clemens, Cornelius Sabinus, Callistus Eparchus, &c. Dion Cassius, lib. lix.

† Seneca, *Con. Sap.* lib. xviii.

‡ Crevier, (*Caligula*, book vii. sec. 2,) seems to think that this is the same woman mentioned by Suetonius, *in Caligula*, lib. xvi. to whom the Emperor gave a reward for her fidelity to her patron; but as the accusation, in this case, was treason, the supposition appears very improbable.

§ Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xviii.

‖ Suetonius, *Cal.* 57. ¶ Ibid. 58.

** Dion Cassus, lib. lix. *sub. fin.* This is the mildest construction that can be put upon the words of Dion Cassius, ὁ μὲν γενόμενος ἐγεννάτο, which literally imply, as Crevier understands them, that they eat part of the corpse.

* He reigned three years, ten months, and eight days. Suetonius, *Cal.* 59.

† *Cal.* l. ‡ Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.*

§ Suetonius, *Cal.* 54.

‖ Ibid. lib. lix. Dion Cassius, lib. lix. *sub. finem.*

¶ Josephus says, by M. Agrippa.

** Suetonius, *Cal.* 59. †† Ibid. 60.

TIBERIUS CLAUDIUS DRUSUS CÆSAR.

FROM A. D. 41 TO 54.

Biography. From A. D. 41. to 54.

Interregnum.

THE spirited conduct of the Senate, upon the death of Caius Cæsar, produced even less important consequences than might have been anticipated. A few Republican speeches were made in the Senate-house, and in the *Forum*, for which the speakers afterwards suffered; but the Consuls wanted firmness, and the Senators had long ceased to be warriors; and though the few troops in the city submitted for the moment to their commands, they were only waiting the determination of the Prætorian cohorts and German guards, who were in fact masters of the Empire:* the populace, for the most part, were actuated by no political principle, but were ready to afford their acclamations to the prevailing party.

The first impulse of the Court party, and of the foreign guards, was to massacre all who had participated in the murder of the Emperor; and several persons of distinction,† who imprudently exposed themselves, became the victims of their fury.

T. Cl. Claudius made Emperor.

But this violence subsided upon their discovering Claudius, who had concealed himself in an obscure corner of the Palace, and being drawn from his hiding place, threw himself at their feet in the utmost terror, and besought them to spare his life. The soldiers in the Palace immediately saluted him Emperor, and the Prætorian cohorts and city troops agreed in supporting him; so that the Senate, after a feeble attempt at remonstrance, were forced to confirm the election, and the triumph of military despotism; and Claudius set the first example of paying the army for the Imperial dignity by a largess from the public Treasury.‡

Birth and early life of Claudius.

It is difficult to assign any other motive for the choice which the army made of Claudius, than that which they themselves professed, "His relationship to the whole family of the Cæsars." Claudius, who was now fifty years old, had never done any thing to gain popularity, or to display those qualities which attach soldiers. He had been a rickety child, and the developement of his faculties was retarded by his bodily infirmities; and although he outgrew his complaints, and became distinguished as a polite scholar, and an elegant writer,§ his spirits never recovered from the effects of disease and of severe treatment, and he retained much of the timidity and indolence of his childhood.‖ He was the second son of Drusus and Antonia, and consequently grand-nephew to Augustus, who treated him with great consideration, encouraged him in his literary pursuits, and, at his death, left him a considerable legacy.¶ But during the reign of Tiberius, finding himself regarded at Court with that mortifying contempt which always aggravates, and often generates intellectual deficiencies, he gave himself up to gross sensuality and to low company,* and consoled himself, under his degradation, with the security which it brought with it. Tiberius endeavoured by his Will to compensate for his neglect during his life, and added liberally to the fortune of Claudius. When Caligula succeeded to the Empire, his uncle had shrewdness to discover that his life depended upon maintaining his reputation for incapacity; and he not only yielded unresistingly to the natural phlegm of his temperament, but even affected an insensibility which he had not formerly exhibited, and suffered himself to become the butt of Court parasites, and the subject of their practical jokes.†

Tiberius Claudius Drusus Cæsar. From A. D. 41. to 54.

His conduct upon his accession.

The excitement of novelty, on his first accession, produced efforts of sagacity and prudence, of which none, who had previously known him, believed him capable. To have suffered Chærea to escape would have argued extreme weakness, and would have afforded a dangerous example; and the punishment of Lupus, who had assassinated the Empress Cæsonia and her child, was a debt to public justice which could not be remitted: these two criminals‡ were, therefore, condemned to suffer death; and Sabinus, not choosing to survive them, died at the same time by his own hand.

Deaths of Chærea, Lupus, and Sabinus.

Act of Amnesty.

But, having made these indispensable sacrifices to his own safety, Claudius immediately published an act of indemnity for the security of all those who had, during the two days of anarchy which followed his election, attempted to restore the Republic; nor would he suffer any man to be accused for having insulted or injured him when a private person; and he treated Galba with constant kindness and confidence, although he knew that he had been his competitor for the Empire.§

Mildness and moderation of Claudius.

He recalled the two sisters of Caius Cæsar from banishment,‖ and rescinded all the sanguinary and tyrannical edicts of that bloody despot. The Registers, entitled *Pugio* and *Gladius*, together with the criminatory documents of Tiberius, and the poisonous preparations which were found in the private cabinets of the late Emperor, were committed to the flames.¶ But although he laboured to render his administration in all things opposite to that of his predecessor, yet with a show of unusual, and perhaps exaggerated delicacy, he forbade the anniversary of his own accession to be kept, because it was also the day of Caligula's murder.

---

* Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, vol. i.

† Asprænas, Norbanas, Anteius, and some others of less note.

‡ Suetonius, *Claud.* 10. *quinadena.* H. S. £120. English, to each man. Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

§ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xiii. c. 3. Suetonius, *Claud.* 41. Dion Cassius, *passim.*

‖ Suetonius, *Claud.* 2.

¶ Ibid.

* Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

† Suetonius, *Claud.* 7.

‡ Ibid. 11. appears to intimate that others of the conspirators suffered.

§ Suetonius, *Galba*, 7.

‖ Dion Cassius, lib. lx. Agrippina and Julia.

¶ Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

Biography. From A. D. 41. to 54.

His Piety.

Claudius displayed much of what was then termed Piety, in the honours which he caused to be paid to the memory of his deceased relatives, even of those who, in his childhood, had treated him with unkindness and neglect.* But, although he appeared anxious to magnify the dignity of his ancestors, he was extremely moderate in assuming titles of distinction for himself, or for the living members of his family; he even declined the salutation of Emperor, and would not accept that of *Pater Patriæ*, till he thought that his public conduct had merited it.†

Constitutional administration.

He repealed the arbitrary law relating to High Treason, which had been perverted to such oppressive purposes in the two preceding reigns,‡ and he took every opportunity of limiting the power of the Crown, by giving weight and influence to the other branches of the Constitution. He revived the Privy Council which Tiberius had discontinued, and referred all matters of importance, even those by which the greatest popularity was to be gained, to the decision of the Senate; and when he thought proper to enter the Senate-house, with his usual escort of guards, he first requested the consent of the Conscript Fathers to the admission of the military.§ He evinced the same respect for the authority of the Consuls, to whom he paid in his own person no less marks of attention than they were used to receive from every common citizen;‖ and he observed the Constitutional privileges of all Orders in the State with scrupulous courtesy. The Tribunes of the People were highly gratified, on a public occasion, by his apologizing for having no seats to offer them;¶ and the populace were delighted to find the private property of the Emperor subject to the common law, and liable to the public burdens.** At the same time all the new taxes were remitted; and much of the property which had been unjustly confiscated, was restored to the rightful owners, or to their representatives; and, to prevent the injuries frequently offered to noble families by the selfish servility of the Courtiers, he procured an Act to be passed, declaring void all legacies to the Emperor, bequeathed by any person having an heir at law.††

And popularity.

These, and many other just and salutary regulations, which the Emperor was diligent in enforcing, and faithful in obeying, together with his affable demeanour, and generous temper, rendered him so popular, that upon a false report of his assassination, the mob assembled in a tumultuous manner, vociferating that the Senators were "parricides," and the army "traitors;" and a dangerous insurrection would have followed, if the news had not been speedily contradicted.‡‡

Capacity of Claudius.

An attachment so strong could hardly have existed, had Claudius been really "so silly an Emperor,"§§ (γέρων καὶ μωρὸς, Dion Cassius,) as historians have generally represented him; and indeed the great number of judicious and useful enactments made during his reign, which Suetonius,‖‖ and Dion Cassius have related in their usual desultory and unconnected manner, sufficiently prove that he was not only sincerely desirous to promote the public welfare, but moreover was well qualified to judge of the measures by which the great object might be secured. The magnificent works, and the noble sentiments which are ascribed to him, oblige us to attribute the fatuity which characterises some parts of his conduct to other causes than natural imbecility; and serve to show, that the most valuable qualities may become useless, and even contemptible, from the early and unlimited indulgence of sensuality.*

Tiberius Claudius Drusus Cæsar. From A. D. 41. to 54.

Uxorious disposition

He had been, at an early age,† betrothed first to Æmilia Lepida, with whom he refused to consummate his marriage, on account of some offence taken by Augustus; and soon afterwards to Livia Medullina, a young lady of very high extraction, who died on the wedding-day. He subsequently married Plantia Urgulanilla, whom he divorced with ignominy, on suspicion of adultery and murder; and Ælia Petina, from whom he was separated on slighter grounds. He then took to wife the infamous Messalina, whose revolting immodesty and abandoned profligacy have become proverbial;‡ and whose cruelty and falsehood prompted him to acts of oppression and injustice equally against his inclination and his judgment.

Governed by his wife and Ministers.

The influence of this wicked, but able woman, was supported by that of three favourite officers of the household, who from the base condition of slaves had been raised to situations of the highest trust and honour.§ Pallas was made Treasurer, Narcissus Secretary of State, and Callistus a sort of Minister of the Home Department; and this evil triumvirate so unblushingly enriched themselves at the expense of the public, that when the Emperor complained of the poverty of his Exchequer, he was told that he might be rich enough if he could prevail upon two of his freedmen to take him into partnership.‖ Into such hands the indolent habits and gross tastes of Claudius induced him to commit that power, which he was himself capable of exercising in the most beneficial manner; and abuses of the worst tendency were sanctioned by his authority, whilst he was indulging in the revelry of the table, preparing for renewed gluttony by the use of emetics, or sleeping off the effects of his intemperance.¶ It is added, that his torpidity and abstraction were greatly aggravated by soporific drugs, which the Empress administered in his drink, that she might securely leave her place by his side to be occupied by one of her maids, whilst she herself resorted by night to the public stews.** During the fits of languor which ensued, Claudius was perfectly indifferent to all that passed around him; and suffered his orders to be revoked, his appointments cancelled, and his friends of the highest rank treated with indignity in his presence. All the patronage of the Empire became the property of Messalina and of the Ministers; and whosoever presumed to remonstrate against their proceedings was sure to feel the weight of their vengeance.

Julia a Seneca exiled l Messal

Their earliest victim was Julia,†† the daughter of Germanicus, whom the Empress thought proper to accuse of incontinence, and who was, in consequence,

* Dion Cassius, lib. lx. Suetonius, *Claud.* 11.
† Suetonius, *Claud.* 12.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. lx.
§ Suetonius, *Claud.* 12.
‖ Ibid. 23.
¶ Ibid. 12.
** Dion Cassius, lib. lx.
†† Ibid.
‡‡ Suetonius, *Claud.* 12.
§§ Crevier, vol. iii. p. 160.
‖‖ *In Claud.* 17. 19. 23. 25. Dion Cassius, lib. lx. *passim.*

* Gifford, *Pref. Trans. Juvenal*, calls him "a pedantic sot, unable to govern himself."
† Suetonius, *Claud.* 26.
‡ See Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. and x.
§ Pliny, lib. xxxiii. c.10.
‖ Suetonius, *Claud.* 28.
¶ Dion Cassius, lib. lx.
** Juvenal, *Sat* vi. and x.
†† Suetonius, *Claud.* 29.

Biography. From A. D. 41. to 54.

first exiled, and afterwards put to death. Seneca, the Philosopher, was, at the same time, banished to Corsica as the partner in her guilt.* The real offence of the Princess was the unbending haughtiness of her temper, which would not permit her to stoop to characters whom she despised; that of the man of letters was the influence which his talents might be supposed to possess over the Emperor. There was no act in the whole reign of Claudius which tended so strongly as this did to reflect dishonour upon his administration, and to alienate those on whose suffrage depends the opinion of posterity.

Princes restored to their dominions by Claudius.

Dion Cassius places in the first year of Claudius the second restoration of Antiochus to the Kingdom of Commagena, of which the late Emperor deprived him, after having reinstated him in it.† About the same time the Iberian Mithridates was liberated from prison, and sent back to his dominions in Armenia; and Mithridates, of the Pontic family, received the Kingdom of the Cimmerian Bosporus; Palæmon, who was obliged to relinquish it, being presented with part of Cilicia as a compensation for his loss.

War in Germany.

Whilst these arrangements were in progress, a war broke out in Germany, in which Galba‡ gained great credit, rather by his judicious manner of restoring the discipline of his army, than by any very brilliant action; but Gabinius Secundus, who commanded in the north, distinguished himself by so many victories, that the Emperor conferred upon him the surname of *Chaucius*, from the *Chauci* whom he had defeated;§ an honour extremely rare under the Imperial Government.

And in Mauritania.

These successes brought the contest with the German tribes to a speedy termination; but a revolt, which occurred at the same period in Mauritania, was attended with more important consequences. It was occasioned by the death of King Ptolemy, whom Caius Cæsar had inhumanly put to death, and whose subjects rose in arms to avenge the treacherous murder of their Sovereign; but they were unable to resist the military skill and experience of Suetonius Paulus, who pursued them beyond Mount Atlas, hitherto the limit of the Roman arms. In the next year the war was concluded by Cn. Geta, and Mauritania was reduced to the form of a Roman Province. It was divided by Claudius into two Governments, each of vast extent.

A. D. 42.

The Emperor assumed the Consulship on the first of January, with the usual formalities, and held it two months, during which period he appeared anxious to gain popularity by his great moderation and courtly demeanour, no less than by an extraordinary attention to the duties of his office. He avoided all those pompous and expensive displays of power in which his predecessors had indulged; and even on the birth of T. Claudius Germanicus, better known by the name of Britannicus, the first son of a Roman Emperor born during his father's reign, he would not permit any more than the usual rejoicings.* He was careful to remove the disaffection which had spread among the Senators during the oppressive tyranny of Caius Cæsar, by his kind and familiar manner of visiting them, by consulting on all occasions their dignity and interest, and, at the same time, by rigorously insisting on their attendance in their places whenever business of importance was to be discussed in the Senate-house. He examined strictly into the department of the public accounts, and reformed many of the abuses which had prevailed in the appointment of Provincial Governors.† A great number of salutary regulations were made relating to the Police of the city, the supplies of the markets, and the preservation of the streets from fires;‡ and on one occasion the Emperor remained two nights in the neighbourhood of an alarming fire, giving orders with the greatest promptitude and judgment to prevent its spreading to the adjoining streets.

Tiberius Claudius Drusus Cæsar. From A. D. 41. to 54.

Famine and disturbances.

The badness of the season, notwithstanding all the diligence of Claudius, produced a great scarcity and dearness of provisions; and the populace, seditious from hunger, vented their rage upon the Emperor, wasting, in an attempt to injure him, as much bread as would have supported their families for some days.§ Claudius, however, escaped from the shower of loaves which was intended to overwhelm him, and, instead of resenting this ill-treatment, endeavoured to relieve the public distress. His difficulty arose, in part, from the want of a sufficiently secure and capacious harbour for the importation of corn at all seasons, and in all weathers. Caius Cæsar had intended to remedy this inconvenience, by the construction of a pier at *Rhegium*, a port peculiarly convenient for ships from Africa and Sicily, the great granaries of Rome; but the distance overland from the Capital, formed a serious objection to this plan, since the immediate supply of their wants was the only means of preventing tumult and sedition among the inhabitants of Rome. Claudius, therefore, resolved upon forming a harbour on a large scale, upon the right *embouchure* of the Tiber;‖ and, although the opinion of almost all the scientific men in Italy was unfavourable to the undertaking, he persisted in his design, and completed it in the most magnificent manner, and with the most entire success.

Great public works.

About the same time was completed the great aqueduct projected by Caius Cæsar, for supplying the whole city with water from reservoirs, above thirteen leagues distant. The expense of this undertaking, when its great extent and admirable workmanship are considered, was extremely moderate, not exceeding four hundred thousand pounds of English money.¶ Vast sums were also expended in making and levelling roads, and in building bridges, to facilitate the inland communication; and a breakwater was constructed to protect the Lucrine Lake from the swell of the Tyrrhenian Sea,** to which it had been laid open by Augustus, in forming the Julian Navigation. But a work of incomparably greater cost and labour was

* Dion Cassius, lib. lx.
† Ibid. Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xix. c. 5, 6.
‡ Suetonius, *Galba*, 8.
§ *In Claud.* 24. Crevier convicts Dion Cassius of two mistakes in his account of the German war. Both Dion Cassius and Suetonius wrote so carelessly, that their accounts of events are more like newspaper reports than authentic histories.

* Suetonius, *Claud.* 27.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lx.
‡ Suetonius, *Claud.* 18. 19. 20. Dion Cassius, lib. lx. *passim.*
§ Ibid.
‖ Pliny, lib. xvi. c. 40.
¶ *Sestertium ter millies.* Pliny, lib. xxxvi. c. 15.
** Ibid.

Biography. From A. D. 41. to 54.

the draining of the Fucine Lake, the failure of which, in the first instance at least, appears to have been attributable to the nature of the soil; though Pliny* seems to have thought that it might ultimately have succeeded, had Claudius lived to superintend it. The object of this prodigious undertaking,† which afforded employment for thirty thousand labourers during nearly twelve years, is not very distinctly pointed out by the authors who so warmly commend the design; nor is it easily to be conjectured: it might, not improbably, be intended, partly, to find occupation for a swarming population, too numerous for ordinary labour, and too dangerous to be suffered to remain in idleness.‡ It was not finished till towards the end of this reign, and no apprehensions appear to have been entertained of the result; for the Emperor took the opportunity of its completion, to treat the People with a mock sea-fight, and with a combat of gladiators, in which it is asserted that the incredible number of nineteen thousand criminals were engaged to destroy each other.§ The scene was unusually splendid; and the barbarous spectacle provided for the amusement of the populace, was highly gratifying; but after two attempts to open the channel, the water, either from the want of a sufficient fall, or from the choaking up of the tunnel, remained in its place; and the Lake exists to this day.

Treasonable practices against Claudius.

But whilst the Emperor was laying the foundation of future reputation in such useful and magnificent designs, he was at the same time bringing upon himself the hatred of his subjects and the contempt of posterity, by yielding to that timidity of character, which, perhaps, even more than determined wickedness unfits men for command. The slightest apprehension of personal danger, was sufficient to make him forget all his humanity, and love of popularity, and to obtain his ready consent to the most hasty and ill-timed executions. If any Nobleman had the misfortune to offend the Empress by being too virtuous, or the Minister by an appearance of integrity, a hint that he carried a dagger for the destruction of his Sovereign, was enough for Claudius—the death warrant was immediately signed—and to make his rashness and cowardice as notorious as possible, the Senate was instantly convened; and the Emperor in person attended to describe his dangers, and his terrors, with every symptom of infantine pusillanimity.‖ That some attempts of a treasonable nature were actually meditated by individuals, appears not improbable; but his suspicions were often founded upon the most imperfect evidence, or even upon the superstitious dreams of his wife and her accomplices in deception.

The apprehension of having incurred the displeasure of the ruling party, is thought to have been the motive which induced Vinicianus to form a plot for subverting the Empire, and restoring the ancient Constitution.* Several Senators and Knights were implicated in the conspiracy; and, among others, Furius Camillus Scribonianus who, at that time, held a considerable command in Dalmatia. This General was so infatuated as to summon the Emperor by letter, to surrender his power into the hands of the Senate and People, and to retire to a private station; and Claudius, whom fear always deprived at once of reason and of shame, actually took the opinion of his Cabinet, whether the mandate should be obeyed. The soldiers, however, who were by no means desirous of a change in the Government, took advantage of a pretended ill omen, to refuse obedience to Camillus, and rising tumultuously upon their officers, slew all those who had been active in promoting the rebellion. The Emperor, delivered from his alarm, was prodigal of his acknowledgments to the troops, and rewarded them with high honours,† although for nearly a week they had been actually in arms against him. Those soldiers who had murdered their officers were put to death for their mutiny, by the General who succeeded to the command,‡ with the single exception of Volaginius, who had assassinated Camillus in the arms of his wife.§ The audacity of the conspirators led to a natural conclusion that they had relied upon numerous and powerful accomplices in the city; and a great number of persons of quality were apprehended on suspicion, and examined by torture. Several were condemned to die, and their property was confiscated. Vinicianus escaped from justice by a voluntary death; and Cecina Pætus, better known as the husband of the affectionate and heroic Arria, followed his example. Junia, the wife of Camillus, though she denounced a number of her husband's accomplices, was banished for life; but Claudius would not suffer the children to be punished for the guilt of their parents; he pardoned the son of Camillus, and all the young men who were similarly circumstanced, and restored to them their family estates.

Tiberius Claudius Drusus Cæsar. From A. D. 41. to 54.

Rebellion of Fur. Camillus.

In most of these, and in a variety of less important trials, the Emperor presided in person, and frequently gave judgment; but as he permitted his worthless Ministers to be his assessors and prompters on all occasions, there was often a strange contrast between his natural lenity, and the severity which he exercised in compliance with their mercenary views; and the attempts which he made to excuse these inconsistencies, as well as his constitutional want of firmness and discrimination, rendered him contemptible in his judicial capacity. He chuckled with cowardly triumph in the condemnation of a traitor; but was disposed to be lenient in most other criminal cases; in Civil suits he occasionly displayed considerable acuteness, and one of his decisions has been compared to the celebrated judgment of Solomon; but he was, at other times, inexcusably negligent, and would decide a cause upon hearing only one side, or even without hearing either.‖ His want

A. D. 43. Conduct of the Emperor.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 56. *Destitutum successoris odio.* Pliny, *loc. cit.*

† Echard, *Claudius*, book ii. ch. iii. states that the object of the work was to increase the stream of the Tiber into which the Lake was to have been drained through a tunnel, under a rocky hill, three miles in length. The Lake is now called Celano.

‡ The population of Rome, in this reign, is stated at 6,844,000. One is tempted to believe this to be the number of Roman citizens, rather than of the inhabitants of the city. Echard, *loc. cit.*

§ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 56. Pliny lib. xxxiii. c. 4. Suetonius, *Claud.* 20, 21. 32. Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

‖ Suetonius, *Claud.* 13, 29, 36, 37.

* Suetonius, *Claud.* 13. Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

† Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.* Tacitus, *Annal* lib. xii.

‡ Suetonius, *Otho*, 1.

§ Pliny, *Epist.* lib. iii. c. 16.

‖ Seneca, *Apoc.*

ingnity. From A. D. 41. to 54.

of personal dignity frequently exposed him to affronts from the advocates, whom he knew not how to repress; and Dion Cassius* relates that an enraged pleader once threw the whole contents of his portefeuille in the Emperor's face, and escaped with impunity. But although Claudius was not well qualified for a Judge, his attention to the business of the Courts occasioned some important consequences. He inquired strictly into the qualifications of the Magistrates, and regulated the excessive charges of the lawyers, who had generally fallen into the custom of taking fees of their clients;† he scrutinized the claims of foreigners, who pretended to be Roman citizens, and he suffered no person to remain in office who spoke Latin with a foreign accent;‡ those who were detected in making false pretences to the rights of citizenship were punished with death;§ the privileges of the citizens were maintained with a high hand; marriages were encouraged, and immunities granted to those who had large families:‖ and the slaves were on the one hand kept in order by strict regulations, and, on the other, protected from the arbitrary caprice of their masters by equitable laws.

reign tity.

In what may be called the colonial departments the administration was equally mild and vigorous. The rights of patronage which Tiberius had violently usurped, were restored to the Senate; several States which had been deprived of their immunities, or laid under tribute were, upon proper submission, restored to their freedom; but the Lycians, on account of their inextinguishable intestine discord were deprived of their independence; and the Jews, whose animosity against the Christians disturbed the peace of the city, were commanded to depart from Rome.¶ Suetonius ascribes these and many similar measures, which he briefly mentions without any regard to dates, to the active influence of Messalina and the Ministry;

duct of alina.

but it is clear that the Empress employed herself in very different pursuits, and that her passions were too unbridled for mild and moderate counsels; and the freedmen who held the most confidential situations in the Court, were men of mean talents and vulgar sentiments. The truth appears to be that Claudius, when neither intimidated by evil counsellors, nor besotted by his own sensuality, possessed a sound judgment, considerable talents, and a gentle disposition; but when influenced by his fears, or his voluptuousness, he was easily induced to adopt the most oppressive, and the most contemptible line of conduct.

tion of im.

This supposition is powerfully confirmed by the behaviour of the Emperor in the expedition to Britain, which he was prevailed upon to undertake this year at the intercession of Vericus,** a fugitive Briton, who represented himself as having been extremely ill-treated by an opposite faction in his own country. Britain was at that time so little known, and so lightly esteemed, that no Emperor since Julius had thought it worth the expense of an expedition, and the soldiers loudly objected to be sent "beyond the limits of the world."†† Their murmuring, however, was little regarded; and Plantius embarked a large army for the coast of Kent,* where he landed without opposition or difficulty. The Britons, under the command of two sons of Cynobellinus, Caractacus and Trogodumnus, made a determined resistance, and availed themselves of the difficult nature of their country to harass the Roman legions and retard their progress.† After several advantages obtained by Plantius a battle was fought upon the banks of a river, probably the Medway, where the Roman army obtained the advantage by means of German troops, accustomed to ford and to swim across the great streams of their own wild country. In this action Vespasian, afterwards Emperor, and his brother Sabinus, particularly distinguished themselves; and C. Sidius Geta, after being nearly surrounded and taken prisoner, retrieved the fortune of the fight with so much skill and valour that, although not of Consular rank, he obtained the honour of a Triumph. The Britons, upon this defeat, retired to the marshy lands near the mouth of "a river called the Thames," and by their superior knowledge of the flats and tides, exposed their pursuers to such dangers, that Plantius became alarmed, and resolved to await the arrival of the Emperor, who was daily expected to take the command in person. His coming was delayed‡ by unfavourable weather, in which he twice narrowly escaped shipwreck; and he was, in consequence, obliged to reland and traverse great part of Gaul, till, embarking at Boulogne, he crossed the channel and effected a disembarkation on the British coast. Immediately upon his assuming the command, Claudius passed his army safely over the Thames, and engaging the Britons, defeated them with great slaughter, and pursued them to Camalodunum§ the Capital of King Cynobellinus which soon fell into his hands. Several of the neighbouring clans, at the same time, professed their submission to the Roman Empire.‖

Return and Triumph of Claudius

Claudius remained but a short time in Britain,¶ and returned to Rome highly elated with his success. The Senate readily gratified his vanity, and decreed him all the honours which he could desire. The soldiers saluted him as a Conqueror;** a magnificent Triumph in which the Empress was permitted to appear, was conferred upon him; Triumphal arches were erected; and the surname†† Britannicus was bestowed upon the Emperor and upon his son. The public rejoicings were celebrated with uncommon splendour, and an annual festival was instituted in commemoration of his atchievements.

During the three following years no events of moment occurred at Rome. The war was continued in Britain with great success: Vespasian is said to have

* Lib. lx.
† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 4. Quintilian, *Inst.* lib. xii. c. 7.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. lix. § Ibid. lib. lx.
‖ Suetonius, *Claud.* 19.
¶ *Acts*, ch. xxiii. ver. 2. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. iv. c. 43. Suetonius, *Claud.* 25. Dion Cassius, lib. lx.
** Dion Cassius, lib. lx.
†† *Penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos*

* *Crevier*, lib. viii. sec. 2.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lx. Suetonius, *Claud.* 17.
‡ Suetonius, ibid.
§ Maldon, or, according to some others, Saffron Walden in Essex.
‖ Dion Cassius, lib. lx. Suetonius differs from Dion Cassius, and ascribes the whole conduct of the campaign to Plantius. He makes Claudius arrive only in time to receive the homage of the vanquished Britons. Dion Cassius has been followed in this instance, on account of the superior clearness and probability of his narrative.
¶ Suetonius says, "but a few days,"—but as Claudius was six months absent from Rome on this expedition, it seems probable that his stay in Britain was more considerable.
** *Imperator.*
†† Juvenal calls him, *Generosus Britannicus, Sat.* x.

Biography. From A. D. 41. to 54.

commanded in thirty actions; to have taken twenty towns; and to have overrun the Isle of Wight, which was considered as an important acquisition.* Plautius, in the mean time, subdued the country now included in the counties of Kent and Essex, and reduced it to the form of a Roman Province; for which on his return, in the ensuing year, he was honoured with an Ovation, and with particular marks of the Emperor's favour and regard.†

A. D. 47.

These honours were conferred upon Plautius in the year in which Claudius, and the servile flatterer Vitellius were colleagues both in the Consulship and Censorship. In the latter office‡ the Emperor exerted himself with laudable activity to stem the torrent of luxury and debauchery, which threatened to overwhelm the small remains of Roman virtue. He met the fate of most reformers, and became the object of ill-will, misrepresentation, and ridicule; it is most likely that he was often injudicious, and inconsistent, and unequal in the exercise of his censures and punishments; and the habits of the times were ill suited for the revival of a jurisdiction, always invidious, and long since disused. Nor was his unpopularity the worst effect of his zeal for the public morals. Conspiracies were formed against him,§ which served as pretexts to Messalina and her minions for taking away the lives and properties of all who were obnoxious to them. Among these victims was Pompeius Magnus, the Emperor's son-in-law,‖ who suffered death with his father and mother,¶ and Valerius Asiaticus, one of the most virtuous and distinguished noblemen of his time, whose wife, Poppæa, had the misfortune to displease the Empress.**

The Jubilee celebrated.

Sixty-four years only had elapsed since Augustus held the centenary jubilee, to which all subsequent ages have been indebted for the *Carmen Seculare* of Horace; but Claudius, who, on most occasions, affected to take that Emperor for his model, was so desirous to celebrate the "Secular Games," as they were called, that he thought proper to reckon according to the old stile, in preference to the reformed Calendar; and thereby he brought the century to a close in the present year.†† The Games and shows were exhibited with great splendour, and the Emperor and Princes of the blood, and the most illustrious of the Nobility endeavoured by their presence and condescension to conciliate the affections of the People; but the popular favourite was the young L. Domitius, afterwards the celebrated Nero, the son of Agrippina, who distinguished himself by his affability and magnificence. It was remarked that a comedian named Stephanio appeared on the stage who had acted before Augustus at the last Jubilee.‡‡ The Emperor, always fond of literary trifles, thought it a favourable opportunity for adding three additional letters to the Roman alphabet;* but, as they proved of little service, they did not survive him.

Tiberius Claudius Drusus Cæsar. From A. D. 41. to 54. Commotions in Provinces.

While all Rome was intent upon the entertainments of the Jubilee, to which they attached an extraordinary importance,† the tranquillity of the Provinces was disturbed both in Asia and in Europe. The *Cherusci*, a considerable German tribe, had, by their frequent intestine broils, lost every member of their Chieftain's family, with the exception of Italus, whose father had been a Roman citizen, and who was himself a settled inhabitant of Rome.‡ The party attached to his family invited him to assume the sceptre, and Claudius sent him into Germany with a handsome retinue, and with rich presents; but his Roman education and connections rendered him unacceptable to the opposite faction, and the Civil wars of the *Cherusci* were renewed with increased violence. Claudius, however, adopted the policy of Tiberius, and forbore to interfere in the internal dispute of his allies, as long as they were confined to their own territories. The *Chauci* had not the prudence to keep within those limits; but taking advantage of the death of the Roman General§ who commanded in Lower Germany, they made incursions into that Province; and, under the command of Gannascus a Caninefate by birth, commenced a system of piratical depredations on the coast of Gaul, where long peace and commercial habits had rendered the inhabitants unfit for resistance, and at the same time tempting objects of plunder. The incursions were speedily repressed by the arrival of Corbulo to take the command: his men of war drove the privateers from the open seas, and he followed them into the shallows and estuaries, in light-armed vessels constructed for the purpose, which enabled him in a short time to destroy or take them all. The *Chauci*, however, though driven from the ocean, were still formidable by land; and Corbulo was sensible that in the relaxed condition of Roman discipline, his legions would be liable to surprise and defeat in the mountain fastnesses to which it might be necessary to pursue them. He resolved therefore to restore the rigour of the ancient discipline in his army, before he opened the campaign; and he effected his purpose with such extraordinary resolution and success, that the very reputation of his military character intimidated into submission the *Frisi*, who had for nearly twenty years maintained their independence of the Roman Government.‖ But Corbulo, though a good soldier, was of a base and selfish character; his object was to prolong and extend the war in order to increase his own opportunities of distinguishing himself; and he procured the assassination of Gannascus under the pretext of treating with the leading men among the *Chauci*.¶ Claudius, who perfectly understood his motives, sent him peremptory orders to conclude the campaign, and to retire behind the Rhine; and, as he

---

* Suetonius, *Vespasian*, 4. Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

† Suetonius, *Claud.* 24. Tacitus, *Agricola*, lib. xiv.

‡ Suetonius, *Claud.* 16. § Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

‖ He married Claudius's eldest daughter Antonia.

¶ Suetonius, *Claud.* 29.

** Tacitus gives a detailed account of the intrigues which led to this tragical event. *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 1. 4. lib. xiii. c. 45. &c.

†† The Chronology adopted by Crevier has been here followed as the most convenient, if not the best supported. See Crevier, *Claudius*, lib. viii. sec. 2. Considerable difficulty will be found in reconciling the best authorities as to the precise A. U. C.

‡‡ Pliny, lib. vii. c. 48.

* Supposed to have been F the Eolic digamma, Ψ *ps*, and *ts*. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 13. Suetonius, *Claud.* 41.

† The fondness of the Romans for all public amusements, is one of their remarkable characteristics.

Duas tantum res anxius optat,
Panem et Circenses. Juv.

‡ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 16, 17.

§ Sanguinius Maximus. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 18.

‖ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 19.

¶ Tacitus seems to excuse this baseness, on the ground that Gannascus had been himself a traitor

was not in a condition to refuse obedience, he left the barbarians at peace, and employed his soldiers in cutting a canal three and twenty miles in length to connect the Rhine and the Maese,* which is supposed to be still in use.† The Emperor to console him for his disappointment, allowed him the insignia of a Triumph, which his naval exploits had well merited; but the value of the honour was greatly lowered by its being shared with Q. Curtius Rufus, who commanded in Upper Germany without having come to action with the enemy.‡

A. D. 48. The Gauls admitted into the Senate.

Whilst these things were passing in the Provinces, considerable agitation prevailed at Rome, in consequence of a claim made by the Nobility of that part of Gaul, distinguished by the appellation of *Gallia Comata*,§ to be admitted into the Senate, an augmentation of which body was then in contemplation. The Cisalpine and Narbonnese Gauls had long since enjoyed this envied privilege; and as the others had also been admitted to the rights of citizenship, they were ambitious of attaining to seats in the Senate, and consequently to all the highest offices in the Empire. The ancient Roman families, descended, as they imagined, from the companions of Æneas, looked with great jealousy upon all Senators of foreign extraction; but they felt that to admit into their body men whom they still regarded as barbarians, would be an intolerable degradation; and they opposed it by all the means in their power. But Claudius, who saw the advantage of consolidating the interests of the Empire, and meditated a still further extension of the same privilege to all the Provinces, persisted in his liberal intentions; and in some degree reconciled the Senate to the measure, by a speech which, as it is reported by Tacitus,‖ is remarkable for sound reason, and elegant language; though Suetonius affects to show that it displayed some technical ignorance of legal distinctions.¶ At the same time, to conciliate the old Italian families, the Emperor created from among the noblest of the Senators, several new Patricians, the number of those added by Julius Cæsar and by Augustus having been greatly diminished.**

Infatuation of Messalina.

The credit which Claudius might have derived from his public conduct was completely destroyed by the scandalous circumstances of his private life. The Empress, whose monstrous profligacy is unfit either to be recorded or read, encouraged him in a course of low debauchery, which afforded her both opportunity and excuse for her own flagitious excesses; and she had long ceased to be restrained either by fear or shame in the pursuits of her pleasures.†† She had some time since formed an intrigue with Silius, a young Nobleman about the court, who was considered as the handsomest man of his time; and had obliged him to repudiate his innocent wife that she might have no rival in his affections:‡‡ but, as if this was not sufficiently notorious, she now resolved, during the Emperor's absence at *Ostia*, to contract a public marriage with her paramour; and she celebrated her nuptials with all the usual ceremonies, and with a pomp suitable to the rank of the parties. The wedding festivities were rather like Bacchanalian orgies, than decent rejoicings; but in the midst of their revelry, a sudden cloud overcast their merriment; a loose character who acted as a sort of Court buffoon, having climbed into a tree in the garden, upon being asked "what he saw there?" replied, "a terrible storm coming up from *Ostia*." And the guilty couple had not recovered from the effect of this speech, when intelligence arrived that the Emperor was actually on the road, with the full purpose of calling them to a severe account. All instantly dispersed; and the Empress, relying upon her habitual influence over her husband, hastened to meet him, and to avert the effects of his resentment.

There is some inconsistency in the accounts which all the historians give of the behaviour of Claudius on this trying occasion. Tacitus, who is by far the most candid, as well as the most authentic, attributes to him a strong feeling of just indignation struggling with a sense of shame, and of conjugal and parental affection; but he agrees with Suetonius and Dion Cassius in his description of the unaccountable apathy with which the Emperor rather suffered than directed the necessary steps to be taken; and the strange indifference which he afterwards manifested to all that had occurred.* The death of Silius, and of several other persons guilty of adultery with Messalina, was promptly decreed; and they submitted to their sentence with more fortitude than could have been expected from the tenour of their lives. The Empress, to the last, cherished a hope that the clemency, or the irresolution of Claudius, and the artful intercessions of her friends, would operate in her favour; but when she found that her condemnation was determined, and that her former associates in intrigue were now leagued against her, she made a feeble attempt to die by her own hand, and wanting resolution to complete it, she was despatched, in an ignominious manner, by the officer commissioned to perform the execution. Claudius, deeply affected by his conjugal dishonour, which he was the last man in Rome to discover,† publicly declared that nothing should induce him to venture upon another marriage.

Death of Silius, Messalina and others

The Emperor, however, from his habits of life, was unfit to govern himself; and his Ministers were perfectly aware that he would be more safely and readily managed by the intervention of a woman, than by their own direct influence. In the choice of a proper person to share the Throne, each of the three favourite freedmen was eager to secure his own interest, by recommending a lady who should feel herself indebted for her elevation to him alone: Narcissus was desirous that the Emperor should take back his divorced wife Ælia Petina, who was still living; Callistus proposed Lollia Paulina, once the wife of Caligula; and Pallas boldly maintained the policy of uniting the branches of the Cæsarian family by a marriage between Claudius and his niece Agrippina.‡ This lady, though

The Emperor marries his niece Agrippina.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 20. † Crevier, lib. viii. sec. 2.

‡ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. 24.

§ The part of Gaul conquered by Julius Cæsar, so called from the long hair worn by the Nobility. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 23.

‖ *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 24. ¶ *Claud.* 24.

** Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 25.

†† See Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. Suetonius, *Claud.* Dion Cassius, lib. lx. *passim.*

‡‡ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 12. Tacitus attributes the proposal of marriage to Silius. Juvenal implies that Messalina threatened his life to induce his compliance. *Sat.* x.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 38.

† Juvenal, *Sat.* lib. x. *Dedecus ille domus sciet ultimus.*

‡ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 2. Crevier (*Claud* lib. ix.) complains of the *obscurity* of the text of Tacitus in this place. He, however, gives the sense of it correctly.

Biography. From A. D. 41. to 54.

not charged with all the vices of the late Empress, was of a character sufficiently infamous; she had been, five years since, guilty of poisoning her second husband, the orator Passianus,* in order to become mistress of the vast property which he had bequeathed to her;† but her high birth, her suitable age and connections, and, above all, the artful blandishments with which she took care to allure her uncle, prevailed over every other consideration, and it was determined that she should be recommended to the Emperor. No sooner was this decision of the Cabinet known to Agrippina, than she employed Vitellius, a cunning politician and servile flatterer, to break off the intended match between Silanus and the Emperor's daughter Octavia, that she might strengthen herself by a double union of the families, and thus give to Domitius,‡ her son by her first husband,§ a claim, by marriage as well as by descent, to the Imperial purple. Vitellius, acting, though somewhat irregularly, in his capacity of Censor, degraded Silanus on a false and scandalous charge of incest; and the Emperor, shocked at the enormity of the guilt imputed to him, peremptorily commanded him to think no more of his alliance.‖ But the charge against Silanus, however plausibly supported, was not well chosen; it served to awaken the conscience of Claudius, and to suggest to him the disgraceful and dangerous consequences of an incestuous marriage; and he refused to celebrate his nuptials with Agrippina, till his doubts could be fairly set at rest. Vitellius was too wily to be foiled by this specious difficulty; he proposed a decree of the Senate to legalize the marriages of uncles with their nieces, "which, he observed to the Conscript Fathers, were common among other nations, and were, at all events, more creditable than forced marriages with other men's wives;"¶ alluding to the cases of Augustus and Livia, and of Caligula and Livia Orestilla, and Lollia Paulina. The law was easily obtained; and the People hailed it with their usual acclamations; but neither Patricians nor Plebeians were found to avail themselves of its sanction.** The Imperial nuptials, however, were celebrated; and Agrippina became, in effect, the arbitrary Sovereign of Rome.††

Disgrace of Silanus.

A. D. 49.

Nor was she remiss in exercising that power which she had been so active in attaining. The whole of the Imperial establishment was immediately placed upon a new footing; the utmost attention was paid to dignity and decorum; a strict economy was enforced, and the revenue and fiscal dues were closely exacted; the enemies of the Empress were banished or put to death, and their property was confiscated;‡‡ a vote of the Senate was procured, recommending the marriage of the young Domitius, now only thirteen years old, with Octavia; and Claudius was induced to adopt him, and thus to give him the rights of primogeniture, to the prejudice of his own son Britannicus, whom every one loved, every one pitied, and every one neglected.*

Tiberius Claudius Drusus Cæsar. From A. D. 41. to 54.

The Philosopher Seneca had been recalled, and appointed tutor to Domitius, who, in his fourteenth year,† assumed the *Virile* habit with the usual ceremonies and largesses to the populace, and appeared in public with a magnificent equipage, and nobly attended; whilst Britannicus was seen in his infantine dress, and with a mean retinue, the Empress having taken care, under frivolous pretences, to remove from the Court all who had served him in his infancy, or who were attached to his interest. Among these were Crispinus and Geta, the Præfects of the Prætorian guards, who were succeeded in their commmand by Afranius Burrhus, a good soldier, and a most devoted adherent of the Empress. At the same time Domitius was made *Princeps Juventutis*, and Proconsul, empty titles, which, however, served to add to his rank and dignity; and Agrippina obtained the *entrè* to the Capitol in her carriage, a privilege of the Priesthood so highly esteemed, that it added to the distinctions even of this illustrious lady, who was the daughter of an heir apparent to the Throne,‡ and the sister,§ wife,‖ and mother of Emperors.¶

A. D. 50.

A. D. 51.

Scarcity.

The scarcity of corn, which prevailed throughout Europe during the greater part of the reign of Claudius,** was particularly felt in Rome in the winter of this year; but the providential mildness of the season,†† and the admirable arrangements made by the Emperor for the importation of grain, prevented the fatal effects of famine.

Troubles in the Bosporus.

The transactions with Parthia are related in another portion of our work, wherein will be found the unsuccessful attempt of Meherdates, and the triumph of the tyrant Gotarzes. About the same time,‡‡ Mithridates, the descendant of Mithridates the Great, and an inheritor of his bold and indefatigable genius, whose restoration to his Cimmerian dominions we have already mentioned in the beginning of this reign, took advantage of the defenceless condition in which the Bosporus was left, to excite disturbances against the Romans, who it seems had again dispossessed Mithridates soon after they had replaced him, and had bestowed his Throne on Cotys, whose disposition was more subservient to their will. On the first attack of Mithridates, Cotys fled for protection to Aquila, the Roman Commander; but he, being in no condition to oppose Mithridates by force, had recourse to the assistance of Eunones, Chief of the *Adorsi*, who readily engaged to meet the enemy in the field, whilst the Romans were to besiege the principal fortresses. By this arrangement Mithridates was speedily reduced to the utmost distress; and Aquila obtained great credit for the able manner in which he had husbanded his resources, and gained

* Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 116.
† 200,000,000 sesterces, more than £1,500,000.
‡ Afterwards the Emperor Nero.
§ C. Dom. Ænobarbus.
‖ Silanus committed suicide, his sister, accused with him, was banished. Suetonius, *Claud.* 29.
¶ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 6.
** Suetonius, *Claud.* 29. affirms that if one or two marriages took place under the new Act, they were procured by the influence of the Empress.
†† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 7.
‡‡ Among these was Lollia Paulina, her rival for the hand of Claudius. She was banished with only five millions of sesterces, £40,000. and afterwards beheaded. The rest of her vast property, of which the jewels alone were estimated at more than £350,000. was confiscated. Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 22. Pliny, lib. ix. c. 35.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 26. 58. Dion Cassius, lib. lx.
† It was not customary to take the *toga virilis* till the *completion* of the fourteenth year; viz. in the fifteenth.
‡ Germanicus. § Caligula. ‖ Claudius
¶ Nero. Crevier, *Claudius*, lib. ix. sec. 1.
** *Acts*, ch. xi. ver. 28.
†† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. ‡‡ Ibid. c. 15.

From A. D. 41. to 54.

Surrender of Mithridates.

an almost bloodless victory.* The vanquished Monarch, distrustful of all his allies, and justly suspicious of Roman treachery, gave himself up to Eunones, on condition that his life should be spared, and that he should not be led in Triumph. Claudius, who was personally hostile to Mithridates, hesitated whether to accept his submission on these conditions; but, considering the expense and difficulty of renewing the war with a desperate enemy, and the uncertainty and fruitlessness of victory, he replied to the application of Eunones in favour of his captive, that "although Mithridates deserved the severest punishment, and that he possessed ample means of inflicting it, yet it was the custom of the Romans to spare the suppliant whilst they reduced the rebellious to obedience." Mithridates was according sent to Rome, and appeared before the Emperor with a haughty and dignified demeanour, saying, "I am not brought, I come hither; if you doubt it, set me at liberty, and take me again, if you can."†

Colony founded.

The Empress, meanwhile, desirous of handing down to posterity the reputation of her talents and influence, founded, at *Ubii*, the place of her birth, a Roman Colony, which was named after her, *Colonia Agrippina*.‡ Whilst this was in progress, the *Catti*, a people of Upper Germany, disturbed the peace of the Province by their predatory incursions; but they were speedily and signally chastised by L. Pomponius, who obtained for his successes against them the honour of a Triumph; "a slender addition," Tacitus observes, "to the fame of a man, who will be so well known to posterity by his Poetry."§

Dissensions in Germany.

But although Claudius was active in giving directions to repel every attack upon the territories of the Empire, he resolutely adhered to his policy of abstaining from any interference in the internal discussions of the petty States in Germany; nor could all the interest of Vannius, who had thirty years before been made Chieftain of the *Suevi* by Drusus Cæsar, and was at this time expelled by his subjects,‖ induce the Emperor to take any farther part in the quarrel, than to promise him a place of refuge and protection if he should be defeated by the rebels; and strict orders were sent to P. Atellius Hister, who commanded the Roman forces in the neighbourhood, to provide for the safe retreat of the vanquished party, and to prevent the incursions of the conquerors. Vannius and his adherents being thus left to their own resources, and to the precarious aid of their allies the Jazyges, were finally defeated and driven under the shelter of the Roman fleet on the Danube; and were soon afterwards peaceably settled in a domain in Pannonia, assigned to them by the Emperor. The Kingdom of the *Suevi* was divided between the two nephews of Vannius, Vangio and Sido, who had been most active in promoting the rebellion.

Attracted in Britain.

The war in Britain, which was renewed at this time, assumed a very different character. The superiority of the Roman armour and discipline, and the dreadful carnage which ensued from a contest between soldiers cased in iron panoply, and brave but rash hunters defended only by leather and wicker-work, could neither quench the indignant love of liberty which animated the Britons, nor deter them from throwing themselves, in thousands, upon the spears of their invaders. P. Ostorius, who had succeeded Plautius in the command, found several of the most powerful tribes prepared to make a formidable resistance to his operations; and, in order to cut off their communications, he fortified the country between the Nen and the Severn:* the *Iceni*,† and their allies, attempted to destroy these works; and a furious contest ensued, in which, after performing acts of heroic bravery, the unfortunate islanders were defeated with a slaughter almost amounting to extermination.

This victory enabled the Roman General to advance against the *Cangi* into North Wales, where he penetrated to the coast of the Irish Channel: his principal object appears to have been plunder; and he collected a vast quantity of cattle and provisions for the supply of his army, the Welsh not daring to show themselves openly, and making but feeble attempts to harass the foraging parties. From this expedition Ostorius was hastily recalled to repress an insurrection of the *Brigantes*,‡ in which he easily succeeded; but the *Silures*,§ a bold and numerous tribe, relying upon their own warlike character, upon the military skill of their leader, the celebrated Caractacus, and upon the difficult nature of their country, offered so determined a resistance to the tyranny of Rome, that Ostorius declared their utter extermination to be indispensable to the peace of the Province.

The event of such an avowal may easily be anticipated. The Britons displayed the most exalted courage, and devoted themselves in the cause of their country; but the defect of their tactics rendered their valour fatal to themselves, and the want of defensive armour calculated to resist the weapons of the Romans, made their losses for a long time irretrievable. The wife, the daughter, and the brothers of Caractacus, were taken captives; the Chieftain himself, with great difficulty, effected his retreat, and claimed protection from Cartismandua, Queen of the *Brigantes*, which she was pledged by a solemn promise to afford. This Princess was unworthy of the People whom she governed, and of the race from which she was descended.‖ She was an adulteress, and a rebel against the King her husband. In the present exigency she purchased the favour of Ostorius by an act of treachery worthy of the rest of her conduct. The great Caractacus was betrayed into the hands of his enemies, and carried prisoner to Rome, with all his family and dependents.

He appeared before Claudius and Agrippina with manly and dignified composure, neither wanting to himself, nor insolent to his victors, prepared to die, but not disdaining to live on honourable terms. The Empress, who appears to have taken the lead on the occasion, graciously condescended to pardon the crime

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 17. 21. † Ibid.
‡ Ibid. c. 27. *Hodiè* Cologne.
§ Pomponius was kept seven years in prison by Tiberius, during which time he wrote several Tragedies, of which Quintilian speaks in terms of modified approbation. *Instit. Or.* book x. c. 1. Pliny, *Epist.* vii. c. 17. records his deference to public opinion in preference to that of the critics. "*Provoco ad populum*," was his usual appeal when criticised by his friends.
‖ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 29, 30.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 31. Camden, *Brit.*
† Inhabitants of the country about the Bedford Level.
‡ People north of the Humber. Crevier.
§ People of South Wales.
‖ Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 32—39. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 45.

Biography. From A. D. 41. to 54.

of which he had been guilty, in defending to the last the Kingdom of his forefathers, against unjust and unprovoked invasion; and this clemency, as it was called, was extolled by the Senate and People, as rivalling the noblest acts of self-denial and generosity recorded in History. Such were the moral feelings of the Romans in the age of Claudius! But the *Silures*, as Tacitus gravely observes, were neither to be soothed by indulgence, nor quelled by severity;* enraged at the loss of their leader, they collected the scattered remains of their broken forces, defeated the Romans in several engagements; and reduced Ostorius to such embarrassments, that he is said to have died from the effects of vexation and alarm. Upon his death they obtained still greater advantages; and, during the command of his successor Didius, they were allowed to retain their independence, and to form a rallying point for all the weaker tribes who refused submission to the dominion of Rome.

A. D. 52.

Whilst these disasters were befalling the Roman arms in Britain, some of those phenomena, which the superstition of the ancients regarded as prodigies, perplexed the Government at home with fears of changes about to happen, and alarmed the Emperor for his own safety.† This suspicion might perhaps have had a more rational foundation in the intrigues which the Empress carried on, in order to secure the succession to her son, and to maintain over him that influence, by which she hoped to govern the whole Empire herself.

A. D. 53. Intrigues of Agrippina.

With this view she procured the accusation of Domitia, the sister of her former husband, who, having been particularly kind to the young Domitius during the disgrace of his family, retained a strong hold upon his affections, of which she was disposed to avail herself for the advancement of her own interests and political influence.* In this design the Empress was opposed by Narcissus, who, foreseeing that there could be no safe medium between abject compliance and successful hostility, boldly impeached her of adultery with Pallas, and of treasonable designs against the State. Claudius was strongly impressed with the truth of these charges, and was imprudent enough to avow his suspicions; but Agrippina had so well concerted her measures, that Domitia was condemned to death, and Narcissus received a timely intimation that the warm-baths of Campania would be more beneficial to his health, than the air of the Court. The removal of this vigilant Minister enabled the Empress to carry into effect a design which she had long entertained to free herself at once of her uncle, husband, and Sovereign. A stupifying poison was prepared by a wretched woman named Locusta, and administered in a dish of mushrooms, of which Claudius was known to be especially fond, and its effects were hastened by the pretended remedies exhibited by Xenophon, the Emperor's physician.† It was given out that Claudius had suffered from indigestion, which his habitual gluttony rendered so frequent, that it excited no surprise: and his death‡ was concealed till Domitius Nero had secured the guards and had quietly taken possession of the Imperial authority. The Empress, meanwhile, affecting the utmost concern and anxiety, under various pretexts, kept Britannicus and his sisters out of the sight, and, it appears, out of the recollection of the citizens.

Tiberius Claudius Drusus Cæsar. From A. D. 41. to 54. A. D. 54. Death of Claudius.

* *Atrocitate, loc. cit.*

† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 64. Suetonius, *Claud.* 46. Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

* Suetonius, *Nero*, 7. Dion Cassius, *loc. cit.*

† Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xii. c. 66, *et seq.* Suetonius, *Claud.* 43. *et seq.* Dion Cassius, lib. lx.

‡ He died October 13, 54, in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the fourteenth of his reign. Crevier.

NERO CLAUDIUS CÆSAR.

FROM A. D. 54 TO 68.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

THE cruelty and intrigue which had hastened the demise of the late Emperor, threw a deep stain on the beginning of Nero's Government. The death of Claudius was concealed several hours, either that Agrippina might secure the cooperation of trusty partizans, or that the accession of the young Prince might be delayed until the happy moment, indicated by the astrologers, should arrive; when the hidden powers of nature were supposed to acquire such influence over the destiny of man, as to secure success even for usurpation and bloodshed. Britannicus was in the Palace when his father expired; but Agrippina, unwilling that his presence should awaken the sympathy of the soldiers, detained the boy in her arms, pretending to soothe his grief, while her own son, who had been already received by the Prætorian guard, was proceeding to enjoy the acclamations of the People. Nero, upon finding his claims confirmed by the army, repaired to the Senate-house, where the members of that august body made haste to confer upon him all the titles of supreme power and of adulation which his extreme youth did not render positively ridiculous. They only reserved for his maturer merit, the proud appellation of *Father of his Country*.*

Nero raised to the Throne by the intrigues of Agrippina.

The funeral obsequies of Claudius occupied the first cares of his successor; and in conducting these Agrippina at once gratified her love of magnificence, and insulted the remains of her husband with that detestable hypocrisy, by means of which she had betrayed both his life and character. The genius of Seneca supplied the new ruler with a speech, which was much more remarkable for eloquence than for truth; while

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xii. c. 68. Suet. *Claud.* 45. and *Nero*, 8.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

the Senate, eager to promote the views of the Imperial family, decreed divine honours to the deceased; and thus, as a Roman historian expresses it, placed among the Gods, a Prince who hardly deserved the name of a Man.

The young Emperor makes a Funeral oration.

But the Funeral oration created disgust in the minds of the veteran Prætorians, for other reasons besides its gross and ironical flattery. The people of Rome had been accustomed to admire in their Governors the powers of a native and spontaneous eloquence; and could not, therefore, but feel themselves humbled, when they heard from the lips of their Emperor a succession of glowing periods, formed and rounded by the skill of a professional Rhetorician. They called to mind the polished and vigorous oratory of the Dictator Cæsar; the persuasive and dignified eloquence of Augustus; and the energetic style of Tiberius, whose command of words enabled him at pleasure either to perplex or to convince; and even with regard to Caligula and Claudius, they remarked, that the frenzy of the one gave vehemence to his harangues, while the imbecility of the other infused into his speeches an attractive mildness and a softened elegance. Nero was the first Sovereign of Rome, who consented to borrow the pen of another to compose an address meant for the ears of his subjects; and neither his youth nor his inexperience formed a sufficient apology for this want of industry or of talent.*

Ambition and cruelty of Agrippina.

It soon appeared that Agrippina, in setting her son upon the Throne, had no other object in view than to secure the exercise of power under the semblance of his authority. In pursuance of her ambitious plans, she obtained from the Senate the privilege of being preceded by two Lictors; to which was added, with ambiguous liberality, the dignity of Priestess to Claudius, whose life she had taken away. To relieve her apprehensions in regard to some of the descendants of Augustus, she began by procuring the murder of M. Silanus, the brother of Lucius, whose death and disgrace she had reason to fear the former would at no distant day avenge: after which, she let loose her resentment against Narcissus, the Secretary of the late Emperor, who had resolutely opposed himself to her selfish and cruel designs; and who, even at the moment when he was about to satiate her malignity by an act of suicide, determined to disappoint her vindictive intentions, by committing to the flames every official paper which might, on the remotest grounds, criminate any of her personal enemies. So strong, indeed, was her desire to govern, that she was ready to violate not only every feeling of humanity, but also the decorum which belonged to her rank, and the modesty which should have distinguished her sex. Resolved to know every thing which was done in the Senate, she prevailed upon the members to hold their meetings in one of the rooms of the Palace; adjoining to which was a private apartment, where, without being seen, she could hear every proposal that was made, and listen to every argument that was brought forward. On one occasion she even attempted to ascend the Throne, in order to divide it with her son, who was about to give an audience to the Ambassadors of Armenia; an extravagance which Seneca had the merit of preventing, by suggesting to the Emperor to step forward from his seat and receive his mother; and, under the semblance of filial respect, to obviate a most indecorous proceeding.*

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

The bloodshed and violence with which Agrippina deformed the opening reign of Nero, would have been carried to a much greater extent, had not Burrhus and Seneca united their influence to disarm her ungovernable passions.† The former of these distinguished persons was respected for his talents in war, as well as for an austere and unbending integrity; the latter had obtained celebrity as a master in that species of learning which most successfully connected the study of mind with the maxims of active life, and of political wisdom. The education of a Roman Prince could not have been intrusted to more accomplished tutors, than the Philosopher and the Soldier who directed the first year of Nero's administration; and it is universally acknowledged, that the wise and moderate steps which distinguished his Government till he passed his twenty-second year, were suggested or recommended by the faithful Ministers whom we have just described. To save their country from disgrace, and their Sovereign from destruction, they employed the weight of their powerful characters as a barrier against the dangerous influence of Agrippina, and a check to the fury of her impetuous temper.‡

The influence of Burrhus and Seneca.

Promises of Nero.

Agreeably to these patriotic intentions, Seneca composed a speech which Nero was to address to the Senate, setting forth the liberal principles on which the public business was to be conducted. He assured his grave auditors, that the lives and honours of the citizens should no longer be exposed to the caprice of favourites within the walls of the Palace; and that cases which required the deliberation of cool and impartial judges, should not any more be determined by the cabals of a domestic tribunal. He declared, as his most solemn and unalterable resolution, that neither money nor personal influence should ever procure, at his hands, any employment which ought to be the reward of merit; that the affairs of State, and the direction of his Household, should never be allowed to interfere with each other; that the Senators should enjoy all their ancient rights and prerogatives; and that the interests of the People should continue to enjoy all the protection which was afforded to them by the spirit and usages of their original Constitution.§

And good conduct.

Nor did his conduct in these respects fail to keep pace with the sentiments which he was taught to express. He encouraged the Senate to make many wise regulations, with the view of checking that tendency to expensive and cruel amusements which had already began to infect the inhabitants of Rome; and which afterwards marked the progress of their luxury and depravity, when the spirit of the Commonwealth no longer remained, either to excite a blush, or to impose a restraint. His forbearance, too, and self-denial, gave an air of sincerity to his professions. He declined the statues of gold and silver which were offered to him by the gratitude or flattery of the People; and he would not accept the compliment suggested by the Senate, to date the commencement of the year from

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 1. Suet. *Nero*, 9.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 5. *Ita specie pietatis obviam itum dedecori.*
† Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 2. Dion Cassius, l. lx.
‡ Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 2.
§ Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 4. Dion Cassius, *Epist.*

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

the month in which he was born.* The public ear, moreover, was delighted with anecdotes of his compassionate and gentle disposition. He refused to listen to accusations conveyed to him against a personal enemy; and when a sentence of death was brought for his signature, he uttered a fervent wish that he had never been taught to write. His love of popularity induced him to give a frequent attendance at the Games and other exercises, in which the People spent a great portion of their time; and thus, perhaps, paved the way for that excessive indulgence in Theatrical exhibitions, which afterwards degraded the Roman Emperor into a contemptible buffoon. In short, the first five years of Nero's reign were proverbial in succeeding ages, for the wisdom, clemency, and happiness by which they were distinguished; and Trajan himself declared that no Prince had ever attained to an equal reputation, during a similar period, for all the virtues which characterise a sage and prosperous Ruler.†

But the ascendancy which had been obtained by Seneca and Burrhus, was soon found to irritate the ambition, and disappoint the hopes of Agrippina, and thereby to render her the most formidable enemy with whom the peace and stability of the Empire had to contend. Nero, in the first year of his reign, united himself in marriage to Octavia, the daughter of Claudius; but his affections being seduced by Acte, a woman of low rank, whom he intended to raise to the Throne, he exposed himself to the bitterest resentment of his mother, who, under the pretext of virtuous indignation, gave vent to her private chagrin and malignity. She chid the Emperor in the most intemperate language; upbraiding him with his ingratitude, and the grovelling nature of his pursuits; and when he afterwards attempted to soothe her by sending some valuable ornaments, which he had selected from the jewels deposited in the Palace, she rejected them with the utmost rage and contempt, as a glaring affront offered to the descendant of Augustus. Nero, suspecting that the aspiring views of his parent were stimulated by Pallas, who had continued to hold the offices of Treasurer and Administrator of the Finances, to which he was raised in the time of Claudius, determined to divest him of these appointments, and thereby convince Agrippina that her furious invectives were no longer to be borne with impunity.‡

Marriage of Nero with Octavia, the daughter of Claudius. A. D. 55.

These steps, originating in vice and passion, hastened the fate of the young Britannicus, and first led Nero to think of accomplishing the objects, which seemed necessary to the security of his power or the gratification of his appetites, by secret murder and inhuman parricide. Agrippina, after reminding her son to whom he owed the Crown, intimated to him that the lawful heir of the Empire, was fast approaching the years of manhood, and would infallibly lay claim to the honours which belonged to his birth; and concluded by threatening, that she would forthwith confess before the world all the evils that she had, for his sake, inflicted on the unhappy family of Claudius; that she would conduct the boy to the camp; present him to the Prætorian soldiers; and by an affecting appeal to their justice and compassion, try whether the daughter

Death of Britannicus meditated.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 5. and 10. † Aur. Victor. *Nero.*
‡ Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. Suet. *Nero*, 26. Dion Cassius, *Epist.* Tacit. xiii. c. 14.

of Germanicus had not yet more influence with the armies of Rome, than an old lame General, and a prating Philosopher. Her hand and her action, says the Historian, kept pace with the fury of her words. She loaded the Emperor with all the opprobrious names which her imagination could suggest; invoked the avenging shades of Silanus and Claudius; and charged him with the guilt of all the crimes which she had committed to promote his advancement, and for which she had received so inadequate a recompense.

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

The rage of Agrippina had no other effect, than to deprive her entirely of the influence which she had hitherto maintained over the mind of Nero, and to mature the projects which had already occupied the Emperor's thoughts, for the removal of his rival. Britannicus himself had shown, during the festivities of a banquet, that he was neither ignorant of his rank, nor insensible to the injustice with which his infancy had been visited; and the remarks which he made on that occasion, sunk deep into the feelings of his adopted brother, who had penetration enough to perceive that his fate was thenceforth suspended upon the forbearance of the young Prince, and the capricious policy of Agrippina. He therefore resolved to cut him off by means of poison; and, for this purpose, gave orders to the infamous Locusta to prepare the most deadly of her mixtures, and to place it in the hands of a trusty confidant. The cup-bearer of Britannicus, at an entertainment given in the Palace, administered the fatal potion; the effect of which was so instantaneous and decisive, that the youth, as soon as he drank it, lost his speech, and dropped down senseless. The guests were alarmed, and some of them retired in confusion and dismay; but Nero, pretending to be ignorant of what had taken place, and affecting the greatest ease and indifference, assured his visitors that the boy had only fallen into one of those fits to which he had been subject from his earliest years. The funeral rites were performed during the night; and though, as Dion Cassius narrates, certain precautions were used to conceal the morbid effects of the destructive drug, a heavy shower of rain washed off the unguent with which they had anointed the body, and exposed the full extent of the crime which Nero had committed.*

And effected by means of poison.

Agrippina, who witnessed the death of Britannicus, was struck with horror and alarm. She could no longer doubt that her son was capable of the greatest cruelty and dissimulation; and the murder of a brother could not fail to be regarded by her, as a prelude to that of a parent, should her life appear incompatible with the fulfilment of his atrocious designs. She resolved, therefore, to strengthen her party in the Government, and to adopt such measures, in concert with her friends, as might secure her from the danger with which she was threatened. With these views, she courted the ancient and more powerful families of Rome; amassed large sums of money; and invited to her house every one who had either inclination or ability to oppose the Emperor, and thwart his Ministers.

Schemes Agrippi

The intrigues of his mother were not long concealed from Nero. To defeat her schemes, he began by

Consp against

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 17. Dion Cassius, l. lxi. Suet. l. vi. c 33.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

depriving her of the guard which had been appointed to attend her, and afterwards removed her from the Palace to a house at a considerable distance, which had been occupied by Antonia, the aunt of Claudius. Thither he sometimes repaired, accompanied by the principal officers of the army, to pay her a formal visit, as well, perhaps, as to satisfy himself that the reports communicated by his spies were not inconsistent with truth. In such circumstances of suspicion and mutual distrust, it was not to be expected that Agrippina could long escape the arts of the informer, and the snares of vindictive treachery. Junia Silana, who conceived herself injured by the Empress, seized this opportunity for gratifying her revenge; and that she might secure for her design every chance of success, she determined to accuse her enemy of the weightiest crime that could be committed against the head of the Government. Aided by two of her partizans, Iturius and Calvisius, she was prepared to charge Agrippina with an intention to dethrone Nero; and, by marrying Rubellius Plautus, a lineal descendant of Augustus, to ascend once more to the elevated station which she had formerly enjoyed. The Emperor was at supper when the intelligence of this imaginary treason reached his ear. His fears were only equalled by his rage; and it was with the greatest difficulty that he was prevailed upon to delay, for a few hours, the execution of an order, which he issued on the spot, to put both his mother and Plautus to a cruel death. Burrhus intreated that a little time might be allowed to inquire into the truth of the accusation; promising that, if Agrippina were found guilty, he himself would inflict upon her the punishment which a crime so atrocious demanded, and that all her adherents should be for ever rendered incapable of disturbing the tranquillity of the Imperial Throne.*

She vindicates her conduct.

Next day, Agrippina was informed of the accusations with which she was charged, while Burrhus and Seneca, on the part of the Emperor, waited to hear her defence, or to receive an explanation. But her haughty mind, conscious of innocence, would not condescend to enter into particulars. She desired an interview with her son, in whose presence alone she would consent to speak on a subject so painful to her feelings; and, upon obtaining this request, she did not spend a moment in justifying her own conduct, which could not, she imagined, be open to imputation, but proceeded at once to demand the punishment of her accusers, and a solace for those of her friends whose motives had been impeached. Nero was overcome by the force of truth and eloquence. Silana, Iturius, and Calvisius, were banished; and one of the more active emissaries of the plot, was put to death; while, to indemnify his mother's vexation, he appointed, at her desire, Fœnius Rufus Intendant of the Provisions, gave to Arruntius Stella the management of the Imperial Games, and promised to Anteius the important Government of Syria.†

to be- to be- ıe dis- ted.

But Nero, when relieved from the apprehension of conspiracy, did not devote all the time which the cares of Government left at his own disposal, to the pursuits of literature, or the lessons of Philosophy. The wisdom of Seneca, and the Republican austerity of Burrhus, were soon exchanged for the gay levity of Otho, and the mirthful dissipation of Senecion; and the Monarch of a country which extended from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, did not think it unworthy of his rank to pass whole nights in taverns, and even to engage in drunken brawls in the streets. Tacitus informs us, that as soon as it became dark, Nero and some other young persons as mad as himself, were wont to sally out into the public ways, to attack, insult, and even rob the most respectable individuals; to break into houses and shops, wherever plunder was to be found; and he adds, that the property which was thus stolen in the night, was next day sold by auction in the Palace, and the money divided among his companions. As he performed these achievements in disguise, he for sometime escaped detection, whilst he was occasionally roughly handled by those whom he thought proper to assail in the course of his frolics. In one rencontre he received so serious a wound, that he long bore the marks of it on his countenance; and in another, which he provoked with Julius Montanus, a man of Senatorial rank, he came off with a chastisement so extremely severe, that he was compelled to confine himself during some days to his bedchamber. But he had sense enough not to indulge any feelings of revenge; and it was not until Montanus wrote a letter of apology, and solicited pardon for his unpremeditated offence, that the pride of the Emperor was roused, and his dignity sustained an insult. The reply which was made to the Senator was conceived in the full spirit of despotism: "Did Montanus strike me, and is he still alive?" The practice of the times suggested the expedient to which the answer of Nero was understood to have a reference; and the unfortunate Roman was compelled to become his own executioner.*

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

A. D. 56.

Acts foolishly in the Theatres.

It next occurred to this foolish Prince, that the mad scenes which he had acted in the streets might, with greater safety to his person, be repeated in the Theatres. Joining in the riots which were created by his associates, he had recourse to the most violent and disorderly means for maintaining his influence among the mob; and on one occasion, it is said, he broke a Prætor's head, by hurling against him the fragment of a bench which he had aimed at some noisy antagonist, who stood near the Magistrate. But Nero at length discovered that the Theatrical factions were become too powerful, to be suppressed even by his Prætorian guards; and despairing of being able to check the extravagance, of which he had given at once the example and the encouragement, he resolved to banish the performers, and to prohibit the exercise of their art in all the towns of Italy.†

But permits the Senate to promote the public welfare.

Being wholly employed in these youthful excesses, Nero allowed the Senate to proceed in the correction of many abuses, and in the establishment of some good and necessary regulations. The rights of freedmen, at no period well defined, had recently overstepped all the boundaries of law; for without having the privileges of acknowledged citizens, that class of inhabitants possessed, in many cases, a greater influence than the former, and were subject to fewer Constitutional checks. The power of the popular Magistrates also, the Tribunes, and the Ædiles, was occasionally

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 18, 19.
† Ibid. c. 21, 22. Ibid. c. 27. Seneca, *de Clem.* l. i. c. 2. Suet. l. vi. c. 10, 11.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 25. Suet. *Nero*, 26. Dion Cassius, l. lxi.
† Suet. *Nero.* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 20. Suet. *Otho.*

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

found to degenerate into tyranny, and to interfere with the exercise of justice when administered by the Consuls and Prætors. To remedy these evils the Senate proposed a number of rules for regulating the emancipation of slaves, and for restricting the operation of Tribunitial authority. Nor was their care confined to the police of the Capital; on the contrary, they procured the consent of the Emperor to a measure for reviving the prosperity of certain decayed colonies in a remote part of Italy; and prevailed with him to issue an order for putting a stop to the practice adopted by the Governors of Provinces, and other inferior Magistrates, of giving splendid entertainments to the People, with the view of silencing their complaints, and of fomenting their just remonstrances. It is worthy of remark, too, that Nero listened so far to the counsels of his Ministers, as not to allow the amphitheatre to be stained with the blood either of gladiators or of criminals; and it was, perhaps, from motives founded on humanity that he imposed a tax on the sale of slaves; thinking, it may be presumed, that an impost of twenty-five per cent. to be paid by the seller, would tend to obviate all unnecessary change of masters. It is moreover mentioned by historians, as a proof of considerable generosity, that when upon entering his third Consulship, he learned that his colleague Valerius Messala was poor, he assigned him a yearly pension of four thousand sesterces, to enable him to support the splendour due to his name and family.*

And exhibits some tokens of generosity.

A. D. 58.

Judicious regulations in finance and commerce.

It has been likewise mentioned as a proof of Nero's kindness, or facility of disposition, that when he was importuned with complaints on the subject of the revenue, he seriously entertained the romantic project of relieving his people from all taxes whatever. The Senate interposed their influence to avert this ruinous innovation; and after some reasoning, which the Roman Historians think proper to give at considerable length, they prevailed upon the Emperor to commute the intended boon, for the more practicable and less expensive benefit that would result from checking the avarice of those who acted as the Ministers of Finance. For this purpose he gave orders, that the rates and amount of every tax should be posted up in some public place, and that no process should be instituted for the recovery of arrears that had been due more than twelve months. He also secured for his subjects, as well in the remotest Provinces as in Italy, the right of appealing to the Prætors and Proconsuls, against the unjust exactions of the farmers of the Revenue; abolishing, at the same time, an impost of two per cent. which had been surreptitiously laid on all goods carried by sea from one part of the Empire to another.

A. D. 57.

These regulations were received with great joy, and reflected on the Emperor a reputation for wisdom and humanity, which belonged only to those whose counsels he allowed himself to follow. But his generosity could never be rendered proof against the apprehensions which, from time to time, seized his mind, respecting a competitor for the Throne. It is indeed doubtful whether Burrhus himself, tired of admonishing the headstrong folly of his Prince, did not on more than one occasion listen to proposals for setting him aside; and, at all events, the rumour of such an intention in favour of Cornelius Sylla, the son-in-law of Claudius, did at an early period reach the ears of Nero. The character of Sylla, which was equally weak and unambitious, ought to have protected him from this suspicion; but the Emperor gave himself credit for discovering that he was in reality a person of aspiring genius, and that he only assumed the appearance of imbecility to cover his deep and traitorous designs. No sooner, therefore, did he obtain for his fears the form of a legal accusation, than he banished the unfortunate Patrician to the city of Massilia; ordering him to be confined within its walls, till greater boldness in crime suggested the expediency of taking away his life.*

A. D. 58.

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

Cornelius Sylla banished.

While these occurrences occupied the domestic thoughts of the Romans, other events of a more important nature engaged their armies in the East and North. Under the head of PARTHIA we shall give an account of the war which arose with that country, out of the conflicting claims maintained by Vologeses on the one hand, and the Roman Senate on the other, for the homage, and consequently for the disposal, of the Armenian Crown. The war in Germany had been brought to an inglorious issue by the capricious policy of Claudius; since which time, the Commanders who succeeded the brave Corbulo, finding that the honours of victory were now lavished on dissipated young men who had never been at the head of a legion, granted to the enemy that repose which they themselves were encouraged to enjoy. Pompeius Paulinus, whose Province stretched along the banks of the Lower Rhine, employed his troops in finishing the embankment which Drusus had begun about sixty years before; while Lucius Antistius Vetus, entering upon an undertaking still more magnificent, projected a canal between the rivers Moselle and Saone; which, by connecting the Rhone with the Rhine, would have effected a junction between the North Sea and the Mediterranean. This great work, not less useful than splendid, was thwarted by the jealousy of Ælius Gracilis, who commanded in Belgic Gaul; and who, imagining that it would prove more advantageous to the latter nation than to the Romans, obtained an order to have it interrupted.†

Wars in Parthia and on the Rhine.

To secure their northern boundaries from sudden invasion, it had become the policy of the Senate to keep in a waste and uninhabited state, an extensive tract of land along both banks of the Rhine. The *Frisii*, meantime, unwilling that so much good pasture should remain unoccupied, at first took possession of it with their numerous flocks; and finding that the soil was capable of a very profitable cultivation, they at length proceeded to build huts and divide the ground into farms, according to the wants of their several tribes. Vibius Avitus, who had succeeded Paulinus, reminded them that the real territory which they were about to colonize, belonged to the Romans, and that he could not allow them to take an undisturbed possession of it; upon which two of the Chiefs, whose names were Verritus and Malorix, and who, says Tacitus, at that period governed the *Frisii*, as far as German liberty would submit to be governed, undertook a deputation to Rome, with the view of obtaining from Nero a grant of the country. The barbarians were kindly received, both by the Emperor and Senate, and were even gratified with the honour

Movements of the Frisii, and other German nations.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 7.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 44. 47. Suet. l. vi. c. 13.
† Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 31. 35. Dion Cassius, l. lxii.

of Citizenship; but, as their request could not be complied with, they were charged with the unpleasant tidings that their nation must either retire at the command of the Proconsul, or expose itself to the more dreadful calamities of war. Some preferred the alternative of arms; but the greater part submitted to the award of the Senate, and retreated with undiminished numbers into their marshes and forests.*

Fate of the Ansibarii, and conduct of Bojocalus.

A more severe and protracted contest, originating in the same cause, took place very soon after, between the *Ansibarii*, another German nation, and the Roman Commanders who were serving on the Rhine. This people had been driven from their own territory by the *Chauci*, a powerful and ambitious race, and were now in quest of an asylum among a more civilized order of men; willing even, on moderate conditions, to acknowledge the Sovereignty of Rome, and to serve under the banners of the Emperor. Bojocalus, their leader, an old and faithful ally of the Romans, represented to Avitus, in very moving language, the suffering condition to which they were reduced; and intreated that, as the land was useless to the legions and citizens of Rome, he would give permission to the miserable fugitives under his care, to raise as much corn as would save their families from a horrible death. The Roman General replied, that they must submit to the law of force, and remove from the borders of the Rhine; that it was the will of the Gods that the Emperor and Senate should be supreme disposers of all things on earth; and that, therefore, they could give or take away at their pleasure, without being accountable to any one; but he concluded by assuring the German, in private, that though no part of the Province could be conceded to the Ansibarian nation, he should, in return for his services, have as much land as he chose for his individual wants. The generous barbarian rejected his offer with disdain. "We are deprived of ground, indeed," he exclaimed, "whereon to live; but we shall always find a spot of earth whereon to die."†

The neighbouring nations, pitying the hard fate of the *Ansibarii*, promised to assist them with their arms against the Romans. But no sooner did Avitus pass the river, and receive a reinforcement of some legions from the Upper Rhine, than those faithless allies abandoned the cause of Bojocalus, and left his tribes to fight their own battles. The *Ansibarii* were almost totally extirpated; the young men fell by the sword, and the women and children were made slaves. The name, however, still remained; for we find it in after ages among those formidable bands, which amply avenged the wrongs of Germany on the degenerate armies of the Imperial Government.

ppæa tains an endancy er Nero.

Nero had entered upon the fifth year of his reign, when a new enemy arose against Agrippina. The lewd and ambitious Poppæa, whom Otho had first debauched from the arms of her husband Crispinus, and then had himself married, now obtained over the Emperor such an irresistible ascendancy, that he no longer listened either to the admonitions of Seneca, or to the remonstrances of Burrhus. Having herself violated all the bonds of chastity and connubial faith, the mistress of the Emperor wished to become his wife; but as she could not hope to see Octavia repudiated

A. D. 59.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 63. † Ibid. *ut supra.*

while Agrippina lived, she employed every art of intrigue and falsehood upon the mind of her paramour, with the view of exciting suspicion against his mother, and of thereby paving the way for that act of parricide which has left on his character an indelible stain.

Stimulated by the jealousy of Poppæa, the weak soul of Nero readily acceded to the most atrocious designs against the life of his parent. He first thought of poison; but the surmises which had filled the public ear respecting the death of Britannicus, rendered that method of accomplishing his purpose both uncertain and dangerous; and, besides, it was generally believed, that Agrippina had adopted a particular regimen which would completely counteract the effects of the most deadly potion. In this crisis, the defects of his invention were supplied by the vindictive ingenuity of his Admiral Anicetus, who hated Agrippina, and was, at the same time, determined to spare no pains in securing the favour of the future Empress. He proposed that the mother of Nero should be invited to a pleasure party at sea; in preparation for which, he undertook to have a ship constructed in such a manner, that, upon a signal being given, it would immediately fall into pieces, and carry the Princess with it to the bottom.*

She incites him to kill his mother.

Attempt to drown Agrippina.

With the views now stated, Agrippina was invited from *Antium*, where she usually resided, to *Baiæ*, where was a country-house belonging to the Emperor, that she might partake of the festivities with which the rites of Minerva were celebrated by the wealthy Romans. It is said, that intelligence was conveyed to her of the meditated shipwreck, and that, for this reason, she declined to go by water to the place of entertainment; but this statement is rendered exceedingly doubtful, by the fact that she manifested no reluctance to go on board at night, to be conveyed to *Bauli*, where she was to sleep.†

Fails and exposes Nero to danger.

Tacitus informs us, that the moon shone with great splendour; and that the sea was perfectly calm, as if the Gods had intended that the crime should be palpably evident, and that even the possibility of its being imputed to accident should be entirely removed. Agrippina was stretched on a couch, conversing with Crepereius Gallus who stood near the helm, while one of her female attendants was leaning over her feet, congratulating her on the return of her son's affection, when, on a sudden, the signal being given, the deck fell in with a great crash; and masses of lead, with which it appears to have been loaded, were precipitated into the hold. The officer, to whom Agrippina was addressing her remarks, was bruised to death, and instantly expired; but, as some of the beams did not immediately give way, the Empress and her maid had time to escape, before the vessel went completely asunder; and, dropping gently into the sea, the two ladies, who had been accustomed to the exercise of swimming, directed their faces towards the land. The faithful Acerronia, perceiving that the life of her mistress was aimed at, had sufficient presence of mind to call out that herself was Agrippina; and, commanding the sailors to help the mother of their Emperor, she was soon despatched by the agents of Anicetus. Agrippina received no other injury, besides a slight

* Dion Cassius, l. lxi. Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. c. 1—3. Suet. l. vi c. 34.

‡ Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. c. 3—5. Dion Cassius, lib. lxii.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

bruise on the shoulder; and being picked up by a small ship belonging to the Lake *Lucrinus*, she was soon conveyed to her residence at *Bauli*.

New plot against her life.

Upon hearing that his mother had escaped from his snares, Nero was thrown into the greatest consternation and perplexity. Dreading the influence which she still possessed in the Government, and the power of her numerous partizans in all parts of the Empire, he is said to have had recourse to the wisdom of Seneca, and the courage of Burrhus, to relieve him from the perilous conjuncture into which his crimes had driven him. Tacitus is unable to deny that both the Philosopher and the General had been privy, from the very first, to the guilty intentions of the Emperor in regard to his mother; and Dion Cassius maintains, that it was the former who originally suggested to Nero the political expediency of putting her to death. At all events, their counsel was used on the emergency created by the failure at *Baiæ*; and when Burrhus had declared, in reply to a hint from Seneca, that the Prætorian soldiers would never consent to any deed of violence on the daughter of Germanicus, the task of completing the murder which he had devised, was finally imposed on the venal Anicetus.*

Agrippina at length murdered by the hand of Anicetus.

The admiral engaged two ruffians as ferocious as himself, and repaired with them to the house of Agrippina. When they entered her chamber, she addressed them with her wonted firmness, and prepared for her fate; while the swords of the assassins soon accomplished the wishes of Nero, and deprived of life the grand-daughter, the sister, the wife, and the mother of an Emperor. She was buried on the same night, without any ceremony; her obsequies being left entirely to the hands of servants. These faithful attendants, however, showed their affection for her, by several striking marks of respect. One of them stabbed himself, and then leaped upon the funeral pile; while the survivors erected a tomb to commemorate their attachment to her person, and to record the miserable end of one of the most accomplished females that gave celebrity to the house of Cæsar.

The act defended by Seneca in a letter to the Senate.

The consciousness of a crime, at once so atrocious and unnatural, inflicted upon the mind of Nero the most acute suffering. Tacitus describes him as passing the night in sullen silence, interrupted only by sudden starts of terror, which seemed to shake his whole frame; and waiting the return of day, as the commencement of that execration and loathing, which, he had reason to suspect, would be directed against him by every order of his subjects. But the stern virtue of ancient Rome no longer remained to take vengeance on the Imperial offender. On the contrary, the centurions of the Prætorian cohorts, at the suggestion of their Commander, presented themselves before the Emperor, to congratulate him on the escape which he had made from the treasonable designs of his mother, and to praise the zeal of the trusty servants, who had saved his life for the future glory and happiness of his wide dominions. Nor was Seneca less active than his military colleague. He wrote a letter addressed to the Senate, which Nero despatched from Naples, setting forth, that Agerinus, one of Agrippina's freedmen, had been detected armed with a sword, and prepared to assassinate the Emperor; and that she, conscious of her guilt in this nefarious undertaking, had inflicted punishment upon herself with her own hand. He next charged her with an intention to usurp the Government, and to reign over the Roman people, in his name; averring that she relied upon the obedience and cooperation of the Prætorian cohorts, and even upon the concurrence, or, at least, the connivance of the whole Senate.*

Nero Claudius Cæsar. A. D. 54. to 68.

The Philosopher is blamed for his subserviency to Nero.

Seneca was greatly blamed for giving the sanction of his character to the propagation of falsehoods at once so groundless and extravagant. But even the Senators, who were much inclined to ridicule the Philosopher, gave ample proof that their own courage and honour had not passed free from the malign influence of a corrupt Court. Each rivalled the other in his readiness to decree solemn thanks to the Gods, in all the Temples of the city; to appoint annual Games to be held during the feast of Minerva, at which celebration the plot had been discovered; and even to set up in the Senate-house an image of gold, in honour of that Goddess, to be placed by the side of the Emperor's statue. Nor could their loyalty be satisfied, until they had conferred upon Nero the very ambiguous compliment, of declaring that the day on which Agrippina was born, should thenceforth be marked in the calendar as inauspicious and unholy.

Flattery of the Roman People.

When the Emperor returned to his Capital, the Tribunes went forth to meet him, accompanied by the Senate, arrayed in robes of festivity and triumph. Choruses of women and children sang his praises as he passed, and extolled him as equally great and good. The roads were covered with platforms, whereon the people might have a view of the great head of the Roman world; and, in fact, all classes carried their flatteries to such an extent, that Nero himself could hardly conceal his disgust at their abject and dishonest servility. He concluded this scene of hypocrisy and falsehood by ascending the Capitol, and offering a sacrifice of thanksgiving to the Gods of Rome and of the Augustan family.

Remorse of the Emperor.

Tacitus, influenced by the principles of the Epicurean school, was disposed to infer from the tranquillity and success which continued to smile on the Government of the Emperor, that the Gods either approved his guilty conduct, or took no concern in such matters. Nero himself was, perhaps, inclined to adopt the views of the Historian; but, in order to secure the affections of his people, and regain the public esteem, he resolved to exercise the utmost clemency towards all those individuals who had been the objects of Agrippina's dislike and persecution. He accordingly recalled from banishment several distinguished persons of both sexes, among whom were Iturius and Calvisius, Junia Calvina, and Calpurnia. Silana herself would have enjoyed the same indulgence, had she not died some time before at Tarentum, where she had been permitted to fix her residence. Still, the agitation of his conscience could neither be soothed nor subdued. He confessed that the ghost of his mother continually tracked his footsteps by day, and that the whips and flaming torches of the Furies disturbed all the visions of the night. He had recourse to the skill of magicians, who under-

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. c. 8. Dion Cassius, l. lxi. Suet. *in Nero*

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. c. 10, 12. Dion Cassius, *ubi supra*.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

took, by mystic rites and unknown sacrifices, to appease the offended Spirit of Agrippina; and afterwards, when he went to Greece, he did homage to the authority of the great moral principle which Providence has implanted in the breast of every human being, by declining to be present at the Eleusinian Mysteries, from which a herald warned all wicked and impious persons to keep at a distance.

He resolves to appear on the Stage.

It is admitted by all the Roman Historians, that it was not until Nero had freed himself from the restraint imposed upon him by the authority of his mother, that he began to render himself ridiculous as a charioteer, a musician, and a player. His passion for the amusements of the Circus displayed itself at a very early period; and he appears to have also had a natural taste for Poetry and Music. To divert him from the absurd resolution of exhibiting his accomplishments in the Theatre, his Counsellors recommended that he should, in the first instance, limit his performances to the gratification of a select number of spectators, in a private garden. But the applause which he received from these partial judges, increased the appetite which it fed, until, at length, nothing less would satisfy the Emperor than the shouts and praises of all the people of Rome. The secluded valley of the Vatican, which had been enclosed and adorned for the learned exercises of the Imperial amateur, was accordingly abandoned; and the consent of Seneca and Burrhus was reluctantly given, that their master should no longer be prevented from appearing on the Stage, and taking a part of the labour in a public entertainment.*

When the happy moment arrived, which Nero identified with the most brilliant period of his life, and the curtain was withdrawn which concealed from the gaze of the multitude the performers who hoped to delight their ears, and to awaken the plaudits of their tongues, the Emperor appeared tuning his instrument with the greatest care, and entering with deep interest into all the technical arrangements by which he was to secure the success of his important enterprise. A cohort of Prætorians formed his guard; and his person was surrounded by Centurions and Tribunes, among whom was the severe and stately Burrhus, whose looks condemned the folly which he was compelled to praise.† ‡

His extravagances.

The extravagances of Nero are presented by several Historians in very lengthened and minute detail. He is said to have formed a legion, whose sole business it was to clap and applaud in the theatre. These persons, continues Tacitus, performed their duty with the greatest exactness; spending whole days and nights in making a noise, and in lavishing upon the Prince and his fine voice all the attributes of the Divinity. Every favour, he adds, due to virtue and merit, was bestowed upon these mean flatterers; and though none were at first received but young men of the Equestrian and Patrician Orders, the number was afterwards increased to about five thousand, taken indiscriminately from all ranks of the people, and requiring no other qualification than strength of lungs and a loud voice. But when we are told that the members of this singular body, who bore the honourable name of *Augustani*, were divided into separate bands, and were taught to shout in measure and harmony: we find out that their duty consisted in conducting the choruses of the theatre, and that they were in fact engaged to sing, and not merely to praise the performances of the Emperor. The chief of each chorus had a salary amounting to nearly four hundred pounds of our money.

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

But Horsemanship and Music did not employ all the time and talent which the cares of government left unoccupied to Nero. He also indulged in the delights of Poetry; and Tacitus remarks, that in order to obtain the reputation of that art without the pains of study, he used to assemble in his palace such of his friends as had a turn for writing verses, and to avail himself of their aid, and even of their contributions. Suetonius, on the other hand, assures us, that the Emperor was the author of several original pieces; which, though neither of much length, nor of very distinguished merit, prove at least that he could write with help, and produce without borrowing. His style was florid and ambitious; but as he could bear to be laughed at for his bombast, and could listen to the severest criticism, we may infer, that though he wrote verses, he was not weak enough to consider himself a Poet.

Becomes a Poet.

The character of his writings.

But we leave for a time the puerilities of Nero, to take a view of the conduct of his Lieutenants in the Province of Britain. The greater part of this island, southward of the Forth, was already in the hands of the Romans; and the conquest, which had not been attended with much difficulty, was held sufficiently secure, as long as the victors continued to temper their government with mercy and justice. But in the year of our era 61, the tyranny and exactions of the persons in authority, so completely exhausted the patience of the natives, as to lead them to a revolt; the immediate consequences of which were attended with a serious loss to the arms of the invaders, and even threatened the stability of their power throughout the whole country. "All that we gain by our submission," said the Britons, "is an increase of bad usage on the part of our masters. Formerly we had but one King; now we have two set over us, the Military Governor and the Civil Intendant; of whom the one assails our personal liberty, and the other deprives us of our food and clothing. At the hand of the first, we suffer all the outrages which the licentiousness of war can suggest; from the latter, we are condemned to endure rapine and insult. Nothing is secure from their lawless passions. In battle the right of plunder belongs to the strongest; but in our depressed condition, we are driven from our families and homes by cowardly despots, who tear away our sons to bear the arms which themselves can no longer wield with honour, and who seem to regard our endurance equal to any task but that of dying for our country."*

War in Britain. A. D. 61.

These sentiments, which have been embodied by the pen of Tacitus, were, it should seem, very generally entertained by the people of the midland and eastern districts. Prasutagus, the King of the *Iceni*, or inhabitants of Norfolk and Cambridgeshire, having in his last will named the Emperor as joint-heir with his two daughters, died in the hope that he had

Oppression inflicted by the Romans in that country.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. c. 15. Apol. Ty. l. v. c. 4. Dion, l. lxi. Suet. l. vi. c. 30.

† *Et mœrens Burrhus ac laudans.*

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. c. 29. *Vita Agric.* c. 14. Dion Cassius, l. lxii. Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. c. 15—37

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

thereby secured for his family and subjects a powerful protector, who would shield them from all unjust aggression. But the effect was altogether different from that which had been contemplated. The Roman commanders, interpreting the deed of inheritance so as to gratify their own selfish views, claimed the whole of the Icenian territory as the lawful domain of their master. The celebrated Boadicea, widow of the deceased Monarch, was treated with marked indignity, and her daughters were subjected to still greater violence. The chief men of the nation were robbed and reduced to slavery; and even the King's nearest relations were treated as bondmen attached to the soil, and considered as no longer worthy to enjoy either freedom or property.

It is reported that the miseries of the Britons were aggravated by the avarice of Seneca, who, according to Dion Cassius, had lent them forty millions of sesterces at an usurious interest; and who, by suddenly demanding the payment of that large sum, which the unfortunate debtors could find no means of raising, drove them at once to revenge and despair. The *Iceni* privately engaged their neighbours the *Trinobantes*, and some other nations of the Roman Province, whose spirits were not yet entirely subdued, to espouse the common cause, join all their troops, and make one brave attempt to recover their liberty.

The Britons take arms and gain advantages.

Nor was it long before the Roman Governor supplied them with a favourable opportunity for carrying their designs into execution. Suetonius Paulinus, an officer of high military reputation, had resolved to add the island of *Mona*, or Anglesea, to the dominion of the Emperor; and with this view he transported his legions across the narrow channel which divides it from the main land. The inhabitants resolutely opposed his inroad. The shore was covered with troops whose very looks, it was said, inspired terror and amazement. Amidst the crowded ranks of armed men were seen women running up and down, like Furies, with dishevelled hair, and blazing torches in their hands. At a little distance were Druids, who, lifting up their eyes to heaven, intreated victory for their countrymen, and curses upon their enemies. The Roman soldiers, astonished at the novelty of such a sight, remained some time without advancing; but soon, animated by the exhortations of the General, and encouraging one another not to fear a crowd of mad women and fanatical Priests, they proceeded to the attack, drove back the undisciplined barbarians, and, taking a number of prisoners, burnt them in their own fires: the rest dispersed and fled. Paulinus left a garrison in the isle, with orders to cut down the groves consecrated to the cruel rites of the Druidical superstition; for it was the custom of those people, says Tacitus, to sacrifice their captives at the foot of their altars, and to consult the will of the Gods in the entrails of their unhappy victims.

The Roman General takes the field.

While Paulinus was occupied with his new conquest intelligence was brought to him that the Britons were in a state of revolt, and had already ravaged the Colony of *Camulodunum*, (Colchester,) which had been recently founded by Ostorius Scapula. The natives had suffered much from the insolence and rapacity of the veteran soldiers, to whom that portion of territory was assigned. They likewise beheld a strong fortress erected in it, under pretext of a monument built in honour of Claudius; but which they could not help regarding at once as a token of Roman ascendancy, and as the means of perpetuating their own subjection and disgrace. These reasons determined them to make *Camulodunum* the object of their first attack.

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

The colonists were not altogether unacquainted with the intentions of the Britons. Their apprehensions, too, were increased by the appearance of several prodigies, which both Dion and Tacitus have taken the pains to relate. In the absence of Paulinus, the chief command was intrusted to the Procurator Decianus, to whom the veterans applied for a reinforcement of troops, as they themselves could not muster in sufficient numbers to resist the attack with which they were threatened. The Procurator sent them only about two hundred men, badly armed; upon which, being convinced that they could not meet the barbarians with success in the field, they fortified the monument or temple of Claudius, and collected with diligence all such means of defence as their situation enabled them to provide. The assault of the Britons was not less sudden than irresistible. The town was taken by storm, pillaged, and burnt; and the fortress, in which the soldiers had shut themselves up, did not stand out more than two days.

Preparations on both sides.

In this conjuncture of affairs, Petilius Cerialis, who afterwards obtained the character of an able General, marched to the relief of the colony with the ninth legion which was under his command. The Britons, elated with victory, met him on the road, attacked him with indescribable fury, cut his infantry in pieces, and put the horsemen to flight. Cerialis retreated to his camp, where he was assailed by the conquerors with so much resolution, that it was not without the utmost difficulty that he maintained himself behind his entrenchments, till they were pleased to retire.

In the mean time Paulinus arrived; and though his army was but small and ill appointed, he boldly forced his way through the enemy's troops, and arrived at London; which, although it had neither the title nor privileges of a colony, was even at that period greatly frequented on account of its commerce. He hesitated for some time whether he should not make it the head quarters of his legions; but, reflecting on the limited number of troops under his command, and the evils which had arisen from the defeat of Cerialis, he determined to sacrifice a city in order to save a Province. These considerations fortified him against the prayers and tears of the inhabitants. Such as were able to accompany his march, enjoyed the protection of his arms; but all who from age or sex were unequal to the fatigues of a rapid movement, were left to the mercy of the victorious Britons.

The Britons take several towns.

Verulamium (St. Albans) shared the fate of London; being taken, plundered, and destroyed by the insurgents. In the three places which fell into their hands, no fewer than seventy thousand Roman citizens and allies are said to have perished; for, as Tacitus relates, the fury of the barbarians was too great to allow them to think of taking prisoners, or to estimate the advantage which would have arisen from selling or exchanging them. On the contrary, they put all to the sword without distinction; and such as escaped the first heat of their rage, were only reserved for more cruel and ignominious deaths by fire, the gibbet, or the cross. It would indeed seem, adds the historian,

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

that the Britons, aware that they were soon to pay the penalty of their revolt, had resolved to revenge themselves beforehand on the indignant and helpless Romans.

No sooner had Paulinus assembled ten thousand legionary soldiers, than he proposed to engage the multitudinous army which had marshalled under the banners of the British Queen. In the number of combatants, there was, no doubt, a great disparity between the contending parties; though we must make a considerable allowance for the vague and exaggerated statements of the Roman Historians, who maintain that the host of Boadicea amounted to more than two hundred thousand men. But the discipline of the legions was of more avail in the hour of conflict, than crowded ranks and lengthened lines; and the experience of Paulinus gave to his little army all the advantages which a choice of ground and a wise disposition of horse and foot, of light troops and heavy, could secure for warriors accustomed to the evolutions of a protracted battle. He drew them up in a defile, backed by a thick forest; and knowing that his unskilful enemies would attack him with all their strength in front, he posted his legions in the centre, while he assigned the wings to the cavalry and provincials.*

Conduct of Boadicea.

The Britons occupied an immense tract of open country, which resounded with cries of revenge, and shouts of encouragement; and wherein their battalions and squadrons performed a thousand irregular movements. Confident of success they brought their wives to be the witnesses of their triumph, and to enjoy a share in the spoil, which, they hoped, was about to fall into their hands. Boadicea, seated with her two daughters on a chariot of war, went from rank to rank, exhorting them to behave like men who knew the value of the stake for which they were about to contend. She was tall, her look stern, and countenance martial; her hair hung down to her waist, and a military mantle was thrown over her shoulders. The heroine, addressing herself by turns to each of the nations of which her army was composed, reminded them that it was no new thing for Britons to receive in battle the orders of a woman; but added, that on the present occasion she did not wish them to regard her only as a Queen, descended from many illustrious ancestors, and claiming the rights and honours of her forefathers: "for," continued she, "were I a woman of no distinction or pedigree, should I not have a right to seek revenge for the loss of liberty, for the insults I have suffered in my own person, and for the dishonour of my daughters. The Romans have carried their violence to such a degree that they put us on a level with slaves, whom they punish by blows; they have respected neither the age of a Queen, nor the virtue of Princesses; and they now present themselves in the field to rivet our chains yet more firmly, and to subject us to oppression, contumelies, and insults still more galling and disgraceful. But the Gods at length declare for us, and favour our just revenge. The only legion that dared to fight was cut in pieces; the rest, far from being able to resist our strength, will not be able to bear the very shout of so many thousand heroes. Think how vastly superior our number is to theirs; think of the motives which have induced you to undertake this war: never was greater reason to hope for an easy and complete victory; never was so strong a necessity imposed to conquer or die. Such, at least, is the example which a woman is resolved to present you: let men, if they prefer it, live, and be slaves!"

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

The issue of the battle was fatal to the independence of the Britons. The furious onset of barbarian courage was speedily checked by the cool discipline of the legions; and Boadicea soon perceived that the numbers of which she boasted, were to prove the cause of their own defeat and dispersion. The lances of the Romans threw her ranks into confusion; the light-armed cavalry at once increased their dismay, and prevented them from rallying; and when, at length, their flight became general, they found that the waggons which they had placed in the rear, loaded with women and children, hemmed them in so completely as to occasion a more serious loss than was inflicted by the sword of the enemy. Eighty thousand Britons are calculated to have fallen in this memorable battle; while the Romans lost only four hundred men, and had about the same number wounded. According to Tacitus, the widow of Prasutagus put an end to her life by poison; but Dion relates that she died of a broken heart, occasioned by the defeat of her army, the desolate condition of her people, and the hopeless depression of her family.

The Britons defeated.

Cruelties of the Roman General.

Paulinus pursued his victory with as little regard to mercy as to the best interests of Rome. Having collected all his troops, and received a reinforcement from the army on the Rhine, he carried fire and sword into every part of the country; and, in many parts, wherein the natives would have returned to their allegiance, under a less severe Governor, they continued to present a menacing attitude, and refused to lay down their arms. But famine soon lent its aid to the depopulating measures of the Roman General, and the Britons had an enemy to combat whom neither courage nor obstinacy could subdue. So many evils pressing upon them at once would have compelled them to receive, unconditionally, the law of the conqueror, had not Julius Classicianus, the successor of Decianus, encouraged them to persevere in their opposition; assuring the Chiefs that Paulinus would shortly be recalled, and that they would find it more for their advantage to treat with a new General, who having never made war against them, would not look upon them as enemies, and who would therefore, in the conditions which he should propose, study less the pride of victory than the exercise of clemency and justice. Decianus, meantime, wrote to the Emperor that the war could not be brought to a satisfactory conclusion, so long as Paulinus commanded in Britain; and did not fail to impute to the rigour and mistakes of that General, all the calamities which had befallen the Roman army and the people under their protection, during his government in the Province.

Hisconduct inquired into.

The letters of the Procurator determined Nero to send into Britain a Commissioner, invested with full powers to conclude a peace; and to remove all causes of dissension between the General and his accuser. The person selected for this important mission was Polycletus, one of the Emperor's freedmen; who, combining in his character a love of magnificence with the most offensive haughtiness, became an object of dislike to the Romans, and of ridicule to the simple Britons.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. *ut suprà.* Suet. l. vi. Tacit. *Agric.* Dion Cassius, l. lxii.

These last could not comprehend how a man who had been a slave, should arrive at so much consequence; nor why the Commander of a victorious army should be compelled to render an account of his conduct to a person, who was equally destitute of hereditary honours and military reputation.

But approved.

It pleased Polycletus to make a favourable report of the Proconsul, as well as of the general state of the Province; for which reason Paulinus was continued in his command, till meeting with an accident at sea, he lost a few ships and men, and was, on that account, finally superseded by Petronius Turpilianus. This officer did not attempt to purchase fame at the expense of peace and human blood. On the contrary, he gave the Britons full permission to enjoy that tranquillity, which both their affairs and their inclination led them to seek; and for some years accordingly, the occurrences which, in that remote part of the Empire, employed the wisdom of the Governor, and the activity of the troops, make no figure in the history of Rome.*

Death of Burrhus. A. D. 62.

It was in the eighth year of his reign that Nero lost the services of Burrhus, his Prætorian Præfect, who died of a disease in the windpipe. Many were of opinion that his death was not natural, but that his end was hastened by a dose of poison, administered at the suggestion of the Emperor. But there is no reasonable ground for loading the memory of this Prince with the imputation of a crime which he had no motive to commit. Burrhus was an able and faithful officer, equal to all the duties of his rank, and ever ready to discharge them; but it does not appear that his scruples ever interfered so far with the amusements of his master, however puerile or licentious they might be, as to render his presence at Court at all disagreeable, or his death at all necessary to any plans of debauchery which might be in contemplation.

Seneca loses ground, and prepares to retire.

The demise of the Præfect was a great blow to the credit of Seneca. The Philosopher, no longer supported by the high character and frank honesty of Burrhus, soon felt that his influence over the mind of the Emperor was materially diminished. His immense wealth too, and the avaricious means which he employed for its still farther augmentation, turned against him the tongues of many; the profligate abused him as a time-serving hypocrite, who extracted riches from the credulity of the great, and from the wretchedness of the poor; while the friends of virtue regretted that a person, whose sentiments were supposed to be refined by the pursuits of Philosophy, should degrade himself by practising the worst arts of the usurer and extortioner. Nor was the ear of Nero altogether inaccessible to such strictures on the reputation of his tutor. He was rather inclined, on other grounds, to laugh at all masters of wisdom, whose grave and formal discourses he could observe, did not, in all cases, unfold the exact principles which entered into their conduct in the real business of life; and he wanted not penetration sufficient to perceive, that there was some slight discrepancy between the moral harangues of even Seneca himself, and the insatiable thirst for wealth which stimulated him to more than half his actions.

* Tacit. *Ann. ut suprà.* Dion Cassius, l. lxii. Suet. l. vi. *et Vita Ner.*

The increasing coldness with which the Emperor received the visits of his instructor, convinced the latter, that the time was at hand when his retirement from Court would prove not less necessary to his reputation than to his personal safety. With this intention he requested a formal audience of Nero, in the course of which he pronounced an elaborate encomium on his Imperial master, extolled his benignity and liberal disposition, and concluded, by offering to resign into the hands from which he had received them, his extensive lands and well filled coffers. He expressed a wish to end his days in the tranquil seclusion of private life, where the dedication of his mind to the pursuits of Philosophy, would occupy those precious hours which he had too long devoted to public business, and the cares of an increasing fortune.

Nero listened to this proposal with affected surprise and regret, and replied to it with equal insincerity. He bewailed the resolution by which he was to be deprived of his best friend, and the greatest ornament of his Court; and condescended to entreat that he would not yet leave him. "At my age," said the pupil of Seneca, "I may easily be induced to go astray; your wise counsels will keep me in the right road; for though my mind may have fully comprehended the doctrines of your Philosophy, your presence is still indispensable to teach me how to practise them. Were you to give up your riches and retire from the society of the Capital, none would praise your moderation or love of retirement, while I should certainly be accused of avarice and cruelty; and were you even sure of obtaining the approbation of the world, reflect whether it would become a wise man, like yourself, to seek applause at the expense of your friend's reputation."*

To these flattering expressions, Nero added every possible demonstration of regard and tenderness; but did not in the end seriously oppose the retirement of the Philosopher. Seneca accordingly withdrew himself from a scene, where his complaisance and accommodating maxims had more than once carried him to a participation in measures, which his better principles could not sanction; and he spent the remainder of his life in composing those Treatises on Morals, and on the Theory of Virtue, which continue to throw splendour on his name, and which afford to his character a less ambiguous support, than his counsels and cooperation in the Court of the Cæsars.

The passions of the Emperor, no longer restrained either by respect or fear, carried him to commit the most flagrant crimes. He remembered that Cornelius Sylla and Rubellius Plautus were still alive, though in a remote exile; and as he never could forgive those whom public favour at any time exalted to the condition of rivals, he issued secret orders that the two Patricians should be put to death. Having perpetrated this deed of low revenge, he addressed a letter to the Senate, setting forth the reasons why the rigours of Government had been extended to the lives of such individuals; representing them as turbulent, restless traitors, whose views were inconsistent with the tranquillity of the Empire, and directly hostile to the personal interests and safety of the Sovereign. The Senators, who were now willing to be deceived, resolved that thanks should be returned to the Gods for their unceasing care of the Emperor and his Peo-

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. c. 53.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

ple, and then proceeded to erase the names of Plautus and Sylla from the records of their illustrious body.

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

Relieved from the apprehension of public enemies, Nero determined to avail himself of the ascendancy which he had just acquired, to accomplish the purpose which he had long entertained of divorcing Octavia, and of raising the unprincipled Poppæa to the rank of Empress. The pretext for this harsh measure, was the barrenness of his wife; for whom, as a modest and very prudent lady, he still professed to cherish the utmost regard; and who, on account of her father's name, and the affections of the People, was justly esteemed as the main prop of his Government.

Nero repudiates Octavia, and marries Poppæa.

When Poppæa found herself on the Throne, she perceived the farther necessity of fortifying her greatness, by depriving of life the unfortunate daughter of Claudius. Nero, whom she already governed as she pleased, came readily into a design so agreeable to his own barbarous hatred; and both of them in concert, suborned one of Octavia's officers to accuse her of adultery with a musician, called Eucerus, a native of Alexandria. In consequence of this accusation, her women were put to the rack; some of whom, not being able to endure the torment, impeached their mistress; but the greater number courageously persisted in maintaining her innocence. She was treated however as if the crime had been fully proved; being, in the first instance, condemned to confinement in a retired part of Campania, and closely watched by a guard of soldiers.

Insurrections of the People;

Such unjust and odious proceedings did not fail to irritate the public mind. Men in place, and those whose rank and fortune made them conspicuous, murmured in private; while the common people, who are more apt to follow the impressions of nature, and are less scrupulous in their comments, because they have less to fear, complained so loudly, and with so much freedom, that Nero became apprehensive, and determined to reinstate Octavia in her former station and honours. The first notice of this resolution on the part of the Emperor, transported the people with joy; some ran to the Capitol to return thanks to the Gods; others tore down the statue of Poppæa; and all united in extolling the virtues of a Princess, who was endeared to them, not less by her personal qualities, than by the memory of her renowned progenitors. In their enthusiasm, they hurried to the Palace, begged that Nero would show himself, and receive, in his own person, their assurances of veneration and gratitude. They even forced their way within the gates, making the halls resound with shouts of joy and loyalty; when the soldiers, who appear to have acted at the instigation of Poppæa, fell upon them, striking them with their swords and other weapons, and finally drove them from the precincts of the Imperial dwelling.

d death Octavia.

The tumultuous delight which the people had manifested, paved the way for the ultimate ruin of its object. Her rival, who feared as well as hated her virtues, and apprehended that the weak mind of Nero might not long be able to withstand the solicitations of his subjects, so strongly expressed, determined, by alarming his jealousy of power, to drive him to commit an act which would for ever put an end to all the pretensions of Octavia. The artful Poppæa told the Emperor, that his former wife was at the head of a party in the State, whose seditious designs had been demonstrated, somewhat prematurely and thoughtlessly indeed, by the late mutinous conduct of the populace; and assured him, that if he did not take immediate steps to defeat her plans, the banished Empress would herself appear in Rome, escorted by a powerful army, to reclaim the right of Empire, which belonged to her family, and which she had brought as a dowry into his house. The murder of Octavia was forthwith resolved upon; and, to procure some plausible evidence of her guilt, Nero prevailed upon the infamous Anicetus, who had been the executioner of Agrippina, to declare that she had attempted to engage the Commander of the fleet at *Misenum*, to join her with the forces under his command; and of having, with that view, granted him the most criminal favours. She was condemned to have her veins opened; but such was the effect of terror on her delicate frame, that the blood refused to flow; and it was not until she was put into a hot-bath, that the sentence of her inhuman husband could be fully accomplished.

Nero recovers his popularity

The popularity of Nero, which received a great shock by the death of Octavia, was again confirmed among the lower orders, by the care which he bestowed upon the markets, and among the higher ranks, by the assiduity with which he ministered to their dissipation and amusement. Provisions were cheap and abundant, and the finances of the Empire were managed with equal skill and economy. The Senate, too, was still encouraged in pursuing every plan which seemed calculated to advance the prosperity of the People, and the authority of law; and thus it happened, during a considerable part of this Prince's reign, that his private life and his public conduct, formed to each other the most striking and melancholy contrast.

A daughter born to him, who dies in infancy.

Nero had been nine years on the Throne before his hopes of progeny were gratified by the birth of a child. He immediately conferred on both mother and daughter the flattering title of *Augusta*; and the Senators, who had made vows for the happy delivery of Poppæa, performed them with the greatest magnificence; dedicating a Temple to Fecundity, and appointing annual Games to commemorate the auspicious event. The death of the Princess, which took place before she was four months old, changed the nature of this Courtly adulation; and the infant of the vindictive Poppæa was raised to a place among the Gods, and supplied with the service of a Priest, and the honours of an altar.*

A. D. 63.

Nero goes to Naples to sing.

The war, which at this period raged in the East, did not disturb the tranquillity of Rome, the military genius of Corbulo compelled the Parthian King to listen to terms of accommodation; and we shall accordingly describe, under their proper head, the embassy of Vologeses, and the journey of his brother to Italy, to be crowned Sovereign of Armenia by Nero. In the meantime, the Emperor entertained his subjects, as well as the most distinguished visitors from foreign parts, with his musical performances on the stage. He went to Naples in order that he might publicly exhibit his powers; and as Tiridates, the Armenian Prince, arrived while the Emperor was discharging this pleasant duty to his people, the stranger had an opportunity of contrasting the studies which fitted

A. D. 64.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. c. 60—63. Suet. l. vi. c. 57.

* Suet. l. vi. Tacit. *Ann.* xiv.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

a man for the Throne, with those which were indispensable in the Governor of a remote Province. The grave, formal, descendant of the Arsacidæ was amazed at the frivolities of Nero; and could not help expressing surprise that the warlike Chief, who commanded in Syria, and who had spread the terror of his name over the whole Parthian dominions, should acknowledge as his master, an effeminate youth, who placed all his glory in the arts of a slave.*

Burning of Rome. The Emperor suspected as an incendiary.

But Nero has been charged with a greater crime, than that of debasing by trifling pursuits the dignity of Imperial power. The historians of Rome are almost unanimous in imputing to him the destructive fire which, in the tenth year of his reign, laid waste a great part of that city. Suetonius and Dion Cassius openly maintain the charge; while the more impartial Tacitus leaves it in doubt whether the calamity took place by accident, or through the wickedness of the Prince. We need hardly remark, that an occurrence, the origin of which was left undetermined by a contemporary annalist, is not likely to receive illustration from modern conjecture; but, taking into consideration all the circumstances of the case, it appears extremely improbable that Nero commanded the burning of Rome. It is not easy to discover a motive which could induce an Emperor, whose public cares were expended in securing for his subjects cheap bread, and a diminution of taxes, to consume more than one half of their houses, and thereby expose them to the most distressing privations. It is said, indeed, that he disliked the bad taste of the old buildings, and the narrow, crooked, dark streets which composed the greater part of the city. It is even added, that he had cherished the design of founding a new Capital, more worthy of the Roman Empire, to be called Neropolis; the chief ornament of which was to consist of a most magnificent Palace, surpassing in gorgeous splendour the loftiest imaginations of Eastern Kings. But it does not appear that these schemes of improvement entered into his contemplation prior to the accident with which he is charged; and, assuredly, we are not permitted to infer that, because he availed himself of an opportunity to display his skill in architecture, he was willing to purchase such an occasion at the expense of the greatest crime that a depraved heart could conceive. Nero was at *Antium* when the fire began, and remained there till he was informed that the flames were about to reach his own Palace. We are told that upon his arrival at Rome, he ascended to the top of a high tower, whence he could see the whole extent of the conflagration; and that, putting on a theatrical dress, he performed a piece of descriptive music, the subject of which was the sacking of Troy by the victorious Greeks. But, in all such cases, we are allowed to doubt the accuracy of personal anecdotes, particularly when directed against an unpopular character; and, in the present instance, our scepticism is completely justified by the fact that Nero acted towards the sufferers with great humanity and consideration; and therefore, unless we are ready to believe that the same man, on the same occasion, could conduct himself like a crazy buffoon and a wise ruler, we must hesitate before we admit the accusation with which his memory has been loaded. To accommodate the

Doubts on the subject.

His humane conduct.

families which had suffered by the fire, he threw open the extensive buildings which Agrippa had erected in the *Campus Martius*. His own gardens were likewise prepared for their reception; small huts being built for their temporary residence, and an ample supply of provisions and furniture being conveyed, by his orders, from the public stores at *Ostia*. In short, his proceedings throughout the whole of this calamity, were equally humane and patriotic.*

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

The new city it is allowed, even by his enemies, was built with care and judgment. The streets were made wide and straight, and the houses were all confined to a certain height. Every dwelling was supplied with a court or yard, for the comfort of the inhabitants; and on the outside a portico extended from one end of the street to the other, which gave to the whole an air of elegance and tastefulness. Nero was himself at the expense of these ornaments, as well as of clearing the ground whereon the proprietors of houses were to build; and that the work might be carried on with greater spirit, he proposed rewards, according to the different stations and wealth of the people, for such as should finish their labour within a limited period. He ordered quantities of rough stone, of the proper quality, to be procured from a distance; and as the Alban and Sabine quarries afforded a species which resisted better than any other the action of fire, he instructed the architects to substitute that material for wood, in all parts of the houses wherein stone could be introduced. Proper arrangements were likewise made for the regular distribution of water throughout the city; and that a sufficient quantity might at all times be ready, in case of unforeseen accidents, every householder was obliged to have a cistern constantly full, placed within a few yards of his door. As a further precaution against fire, the houses were built at a little distance from each other; while, to render assistance more available, in the event of any casualty, the roofs were made flat and easy of approach, both from within and without.

The city repaired with taste and elegance.

The fire which reduced to ashes so large a portion of Rome, took place on the nineteenth day of July, in the sixty-fourth year of Christianity, the same day of the same month on which the Gauls set fire to the city, four hundred and fifty years before. The conflagration raged six days and seven nights; and it abated at last only from want of fuel, after having destroyed every thing, from the great Circus at the foot of Mount Palatine, to the farther end of the *Esquiliæ*; where a prodigious number of buildings were thrown down to prevent its more extensive ravages. After being partially extinguished, the fire burst forth again and continued its destructive fury two days longer; and on this occasion, though the loss was less considerable in amount, the buildings consumed were of a much more valuable order; including some venerable Temples of great antiquity, and several magnificent porticoes, which at once adorned the city, and ministered to the convenience and relaxation of all classes of the people. Tacitus mentions, that among the ancient buildings which were destroyed, his countrymen bewailed the great altar, (*Ara Maxima*) which Evander is said to have erected and dedicated to Hercules, when he was honoured with a visit from that

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. c. 24. Dion Cassius, l. lxii.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. c. 33, 34. Suet. l. vi. c. 19. Dion Cassius, l. 62.

God; the Temple of *Jupiter Stator*, built by Romulus; the Palace of Numa; together with the fane of Vesta, in which the household Gods of the Roman people were kept. To this devastation we must add, the various spoils which had been taken from the most celebrated nations of Europe, Africa, and Asia; the master-pieces of Grecian painting and statuary; the writings of ancient authors; and the other monuments of past times: a loss for which, in the estimation of the learned and curious, the beauty of the new city, and the convenience of its buildings, formed but a poor compensation.*

Execution of the Christians at Rome.

There is an occurrence connected with the burning of Rome, too important to be omitted in the most abridged history of Nero's reign. We allude to the persecution inflicted upon the Christians by command of that Emperor; who, according to Tacitus, was desirous to avert the public indignation from himself, as the supposed author of the recent calamity, to a set of men who had already become objects of suspicion, as dissenting from the national superstition. Some of them were arrested, and, upon being interrogated, confessed that they belonged to the new sect; but, the historian remarks, it was more difficult to convict them of being incendiaries, than of entertaining an inveterate hatred against all mankind. Their punishment, however, was resolved upon; and, with much barbarous ingenuity, it was converted into an amusement for the People. Some were covered with skins of beasts, and, in that disguise, devoured by dogs; others were crucified; while a third portion, wrapped up in clothes covered with pitch and brimstone, were burnt in the night by way of torches. The scene chosen for these horrid spectacles was the Emperor's own gardens; where he, at the same time, diverted the multitude with chariot-races, mixing with the crowd in a coachman's dress, or seated on a car, and holding the reins. Thence, concludes the Philosophical Historian, arose the pity which was felt for a description of persons, really guilty and deserving the severest of punishments; but who, on that occasion, were sacrificed to the inhuman pleasure of one, and not to the good of the whole.†

Character of it by Tacitus.

The conduct of Nero towards the Christians is not more easy to be explained, than the judgment which was formed of them by Tacitus; who was himself not less remarkable for his love of virtue, than for the acuteness of his observations, and his knowledge of mankind. It is well known, no doubt, that many groundless calumnies were propagated against the first believers in our holy faith; and that, in consequence of these misrepresentations, they were regarded, in several parts of the Roman Empire, as equally infatuated and dangerous; as bad reasoners in Religion; and as persons extremely disaffected towards the established Government. The charge of Atheism, with which they were also attacked, creates indeed neither surprise nor difficulty in the mind of any reader who is acquainted with the opinions of those times; and yet it was principally upon the ground of that very charge that the People of Rome rested their main suspicions, respecting the moral character and political views of the early Christians. Tacitus opened his ears to the rumours and surmises which employed the superstitious credulity of his countrymen; and affecting a thorough contempt for the religious revolution, with which the world was about to be visited, he loaded with execration a system of belief which he had not condescended to study, and a class of men to whose manners and principles he was an entire stranger.

Conspiracy against Nero. A. D. 65.

In the eleventh year of his reign, Nero was on the point of becoming the victim of a formidable conspiracy, the knowledge of which extended to several of the most distinguished persons in Rome, and even to some of his principal officers, both Civil and Military. It was proposed to raise to the Empire a Senator, whose name was Piso; and who, besides being greatly esteemed for his personal virtues, was related to the most ancient and powerful families in the Commonwealth. Subrius Flavius, the Tribune of a Prætorian cohort, and Sulpicius Asper, a Centurion, were among the most zealous of his partizans; but the plot soon embraced in its designs the celebrated poet Lucan, and Plautius Lateranus, one of the Consuls elect. It is said that Lucan's disaffection originated in a literary jealousy; and that he considered Nero as no longer fit to reign, because the latter esteemed his own verses more highly than the epic strains of the *Pharsalia*. Lateranus, it is added, had no private pique against the Emperor; love of his country, and regard for the public good, being the sole motives which induced him to hazard his life in the doubtful conflict of a Civil war. Two Senators, Flavius Scævinus and Afranius Quintianus were likewise roused to a sense of honour and revenge; the former on general grounds as a disinterested patriot; the latter because he had lampooned the satirical Muse of the Emperor. To these were joined Tullius Senecion and Antonius Natalis, both distinguished members of the Equestrian Order, and Fænius Rufus, the Præfect of the Prætorian cohorts.

Suspicions excited.

Subrius proposed to consummate their treason by attacking Nero whilst singing on the Stage, or in the course of one of his midnight rambles in the city. The danger which attended this mode of procedure, caused it to be rejected; and while the leading conspirators were deliberating on the means of effecting their object with smaller risk, or waiting the occurrence of a favourable accident which might throw the life of the Emperor into their hands, the latter received information of the intended assault upon his person and Throne. A female, named Epicharis, had been made acquainted with the plot; and, in her zeal to accomplish the object of her friends, she undertook to tamper with the chief officers of the fleet at Misenum, not doubting but that she would be able to draw them over to a participation in the measure. The Tribune Volusius Proculus, whom she selected for her confidant, no sooner learned that a design was entertained against the life of Nero, than he hastened to the palace, and communicated all that he had heard. Epicharis was immediately arrested and thrown into prison; but as she had abstained from mentioning the names of the conspirators, the fears and suspicions of the Emperor could not fix on any object, nor be gratified with any victim.*

After debating a long time, the partizans of Piso at

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. c. 42—44. Plin. l. 33. c. 3.
† Tacit. *Ann.* xv. c. 44. Suet. *Nero.*

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. c. 48. Plin. l. ii. c. 25. Dion Cassius, l. lxii. Tacit. *Ann.* xv. c. 56—60.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

last agreed to execute their design during the Games in the Circus, which were celebrated on the twelfth of April, in honour of Ceres. Lateranus undertook to secure the person of Nero, by throwing himself at his feet under pretext of presenting a petition; intending, while on the ground, to lay hold of his legs with so much force as to pull him down, and thereby expose him to the daggers of his confederates. Scævinus begged that he might be allowed to give the tyrant the first stab; having destined to that use a poignard which he had taken out of a temple, and always wore about him as consecrated to some patriotic or generous deed. Piso was to wait the event in the Temple of Ceres; whence the Præfect Fænius was to convey him, should they succeed in their attempt, to the camp of the Prætorian cohorts, and proclaim him Emperor. To consolidate their scheme still further, they had, says Pliny, obtained the consent of Antonia, the daughter of Claudius, who was prevailed upon to revive her pretensions to the Throne, by marrying Piso; and who had promised to secure for him the favour of the People, and the cooperation of the army, as soon as he should clear the way, by the death of Nero, for her return into the palace of her father.

Plans of the conspirators.

Conspiracy detected and punished.

The agitation of Scævinus, the night before the deed was to be done, betrayed the secret to his freedman Milichus; who immediately hastened to reveal the intended murder to the Emperor in person. The principal conspirators were instantly apprehended; and the application or threatening of the rack soon drove them to a breach of fidelity in disclosing the names of all their accomplices, as well as that of the person in whose behalf the plot had been formed. Natalis was the first to yield; and not satisfied with implicating those who had bound themselves to take an active share in the treason, he exposed to the fury of Nero a number of individuals who were merely supposed to approve its object. Among these last was Seneca, who, finding that he could not reform the Emperor, consented to have him deposed; although Tacitus is of opinion that Natalis accused the Philosopher with the view of gratifying Nero, who had long hated him, and that he was not even privy to the design of raising Piso to the Throne. Most of the conspirators atoned for their crime by a violent death. Seneca expired in a vapour bath, imitating, in his last moments, the firmness and eloquence of Socrates; and Lucan, whose veins were opened, beguiled the pains of mortality by repeating from his own *Pharsalia* the following verses, which describe a lingering death, similar to that inflicted upon himself:

Death of Seneca and Lucan the poet.

> ——— *Pars ultima trunci*
> *Tradidit in letum vacuans vitalibus artus.*
> *At tumidus quâ pulmo jacet, quâ viscera fervent*
> *Hæserunt ibi fata diu: luctataque multum*
> *Hâc cum parte, viri vix omnia membra tulerunt.*

The city, says Tacitus, was filled with funerals, the Capitol with victims; for the fathers, the brothers, the relations, and friends of those who had perished, found it expedient to return thanks to the Gods, to adorn their houses with laurel, as if a great victory had been obtained, and to throw themselves at the Prince's feet, congratulating him on his happy escape.*

The death of the infamous Poppæa, which occurred about this time, is attributed to an ungovernable fit of passion in Nero, who kicked her while in an advanced state of pregnancy. Tacitus acquits him of the charge of poisoning her, and assigns as his reasons for disbelieving that her death was intended, that the Emperor was both uxorious and anxious for children. Her body, contrary to Roman custom, was not burned, but embalmed; and Nero himself pronounced her funeral oration.*

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

No sooner were his fears relieved, than Nero resumed his theatrical amusements, and the cultivation of his musical talents. So completely did he identify himself with the professional character, that he accepted an engagement to perform at the Games, which were to be exhibited by a Roman citizen named Larcius, and even allowed his treasurer to receive the fee of a million of sesterces, by which the wealthy commoner had promised to reward the exertions of his Imperial master. To extend his fame as a performer, he made a journey into Greece; where he contended for all the crowns and other prizes which were given by the several States to stimulate the genius of their artists. The Olympic Games were by his orders postponed two years, that he might have an opportunity of competing for the honours which so distinguished an assembly had to confer; and, having obtained the wreath of victory from the hands of the most accomplished judges in the world, he proceeded to challenge all the talent which appeared on the stage or hippodrome, at the Isthmian, Pythian, and Nemæan solemnities. The number of crowns, which, during his stay in Greece, attested the rare skill, or commanding influence, of the Emperor, amounted to no fewer than eighteen hundred.†

Nero goes to Greece and gains 1800 crowns, & prizes, at the national Games. A. D. 66.

Upon his return to Italy he resolved to commemorate his success, in a manner becoming his signal achievements. His first triumphal procession was reserved for Naples, because it was in that city that he made the first public trial of his voice and acting. A part of the walls was thrown down; and, according to the custom observed in honour of victors at the sacred Games of Greece, he made his entry through the breach in a chariot drawn by white horses. He entered Antium, where he was born, in a similar manner, and conferred the same distinction upon the ancient city of Alba; but it was at Rome where he intended to enjoy the full splendour of his Triumph, and to astonish his subjects by the magnificence of his exploits. The eighteen hundred crowns were all carried before him, with inscriptions denoting the Games, and the nature of the combat in which they had been gained, and the more celebrated of the antagonists who had been vanquished in the contest; and a scroll, bearing large letters, set forth, for the information of the people, that Nero Cæsar was the first Roman, who, since the world began, had ever obtained those brilliant rewards consecrated to transcendant merit and unrivalled talent. Next followed the Conqueror himself, seated in the same car which Augustus had used in his Triumphs. He was clothed in a robe of purple, with a mantle covered with stars of gold. On his head he wore the Olympic crown, composed of wild olive, while in his right hand he displayed the Pythian garland, formed of the envied laurel. A musician sat by his side, the worthy companion of such

Triumphal entry at Naples & Rome.

* Dion Cassius, l. lxii. Tacit. *Ann.* xv. c. 60.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xvi. c. 6.

† Suet. *Ner.* 23, 24. Apol. v. 7.

ography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

a victor. The Senate, the Equestrian Order, the Prætects and Centurions joined the pompous train, and rent the air with their repeated acclamations. A part of the great Circus was thrown down that the Imperial chariot might find a ready way to the Temple of Apollo; for, though other conquerors were wont to deposit their laurels in the Capitol, Nero had resolved to lay up his in the presence of the God of Arts.*

tempt to t the hmus of rinth.

The visit to Greece, which we have just mentioned, was signalized by an attempt, made at the command of Nero, to cut through the Corinthian Isthmus. The arrangements effected for this purpose, and the views contemplated by the Emperor, were such as to create in our minds some doubt whether he had not in his eye higher objects than olive wreaths and laurel crowns. He certainly improved the Constitutions of some of the Grecian States, and granted to several cities privileges which were highly prized both by Plutarch and Pausanias. He declared the whole country free, and exempted it from the payment of tribute; confiding the government, in every particular community, to native Magistrates and the authority of their own lawgivers. In short, we find here, as well as in other parts of his history, that the character of Nero has not been very candidly exhibited; and there is reason to suspect that his biographers, disgusted with his vices and frivolities, have too hastily passed over the proofs of wisdom and humanity which mark some portions of his reign.†

sidex re- ia, and ices ha to him in osing antho- of Nero A. D. 68.

At length Caius Julius Vindex, who commanded the legions in Gaul, was filled with indignation at the puerile excesses of Nero, and determined to relieve his country from the disgrace of acknowledging a master so unworthy to rule. He communicated his designs to Galba, the Governor of Terragonia in Spain, an officer of unsullied reputation, and whose high birth entitled him to aspire to the most elevated situation in the Empire. Galba required a little time for deliberation, and to consult his friends; but Vindex, who was, probably, satisfied in regard to the real intentions of the veteran Governor, unfurled the standard of revolt, and soon found himself at the head of a hundred thousand Gauls. Nero was at Naples when the intelligence was conveyed to him that his General was in arms to oppose his authority; and he listened to the tidings with very little emotion. But when the news arrived that Galba had likewise thrown off his allegiance, and had issued proclamations in the name of the Senate and Roman People, his weak mind was distracted by a number of contending passions. He hurried to Rome, and made preparations for meeting the rebels in the field; forming his marines into a legion, and calling in all the detachments that were within a moderate distance of the Capital. Otho, the former companion of his pleasures, was the first to declare for Galba; and his example was followed by all the Commanders and Governors of Provinces, except two, namely, Clodius Macer in Africa, and Virginius Rufus who was serving on the Rhine. The latter even marched against Vindex, and defeated him with great slaughter; turning for a moment the current of events in favour of Nero who continued trembling in Rome.

Unable to determine, and incapable of a firm resolution, the Emperor spoke at one time of flying into Egypt, and actually gave orders to have a fleet prepared for the voyage; nor was it until he saw himself deserted by the Prætorian cohorts, that he felt the necessity of running from his palace, to take refuge in the cottage of one of his freedmen, at the distance of four miles from the city.*

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

As soon as it was known in Rome that the Prætorians had declared for Galba, and that Nero had fled, the Senate assembled; and assuming the exercise of supreme power, they pronounced the fugitive Emperor a public enemy, and gave orders that he should be punished to the utmost severity of the ancient laws. At the same time, Galba was acknowledged as the Sovereign of the Roman People, and all the titles and powers which belong to that high dignity were conferred upon him, with the full consent and approbation of all orders of men. The city resounded with shouts of joy, the Temples smoked with incense, and every one allowed himself to believe that the liberty of the Commonwealth was completely restored.

Galba proclaimed Emperor.

Meanwhile Nero, who had despaired of being able to retain his life, was meditating on the various means which presented themselves of terminating a miserable existence. We are unfortunately deprived of the assistance which would have been supplied by the discriminating judgment of Tacitus; and we have no better guide to a knowledge of the manner in which the Emperor met death, than is afforded by the malignant credulity of Suetonius, or by the scanty details of Dion and Pliny. It appears that when he learned his retreat was discovered, and that there was no longer any chance of escape, he plunged a dagger into his throat. The weakness of his arm, however, rendered the blow quite ineffectual; so that it became necessary for Epaphroditus, one of his attendants, to assist him in the act of suicide. He was still alive when the Centurion arrived, who was charged by the Senate with the duty of carrying him to Rome; and, recognising the person of that officer, he reproached him bitterly with his treason and disaffection, after which he almost immediately expired.

Death of Nero.

Before his death he requested that his head might not be delivered to his enemies, but that his body might be buried entire. His request was in this particular readily complied with, and his ashes were conveyed, by two of his female domestics, to the tomb of his paternal ancestors. In Nero perished the last of the family of Augustus; whose misfortune it was to labour for a posterity unworthy of him, and to give to the Empire, in all the successors of his blood, none who were not scourges of his people, and objects of horror or contempt to mankind.

It is very difficult to arrive at a just estimate of the character of Nero. That he was suspicious, cruel, and regardless of human life, admits not of any doubt; but that he was the ferocious monster described by certain historians, and so extremely depraved in his appetites as to have become incapable, as St. Augustine expresses it, both of the vices and virtues of mankind, is not by any means so clearly established. Suetonius, who was said to display in his writings all the sensuality and coarseness which his

* Dion Cassius, l. lxiii. Suet. l. vi. c. 24. Apol. Ty. l. viii. c. 14. Paus. *in Ell.*

† Dion Cassius, l. lxiii. Plin. l. iv. c. 4. Suet. c. 19.

* Tacit. *Hist.* i. c. 90. Suet. l. vi. c. 40. Dion Cassius, l. lxiii. Plut.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

last agreed to execute their design during the Games in the Circus, which were celebrated on the twelfth of April, in honour of Ceres. Lateranus undertook to secure the person of Nero, by throwing himself at his feet under pretext of presenting a petition; intending, while on the ground, to lay hold of his legs with so much force as to pull him down, and thereby expose him to the daggers of his confederates. Scævinus begged that he might be allowed to give the tyrant the first stab; having destined to that use a poignard which he had taken out of a temple, and always wore about him as consecrated to some patriotic or generous deed. Piso was to wait the event in the Temple of Ceres; whence the Præfect Fænius was to convey him, should they succeed in their attempt, to the camp of the Prætorian cohorts, and proclaim him Emperor. To consolidate their scheme still further, they had, says Pliny, obtained the consent of Antonia, the daughter of Claudius, who was prevailed upon to revive her pretensions to the Throne, by marrying Piso; and who had promised to secure for him the favour of the People, and the cooperation of the army, as soon as he should clear the way, by the death of Nero, for her return into the palace of her father.

Plans of the conspirators.

Conspiracy detected and punished.

The agitation of Scævinus, the night before the deed was to be done, betrayed the secret to his freedman Milichus; who immediately hastened to reveal the intended murder to the Emperor in person. The principal conspirators were instantly apprehended; and the application or threatening of the rack soon drove them to a breach of fidelity in disclosing the names of all their accomplices, as well as that of the person in whose behalf the plot had been formed. Natalis was the first to yield; and not satisfied with implicating those who had bound themselves to take an active share in the treason, he exposed to the fury of Nero a number of individuals who were merely supposed to approve its object. Among these last was Seneca, who, finding that he could not reform the Emperor, consented to have him deposed; although Tacitus is of opinion that Natalis accused the Philosopher with the view of gratifying Nero, who had long hated him, and that he was not even privy to the design of raising Piso to the Throne. Most of the conspirators atoned for their crime by a violent death. Seneca expired in a vapour bath, imitating, in his last moments, the firmness and eloquence of Socrates; and Lucan, whose veins were opened, beguiled the pains of mortality by repeating from his own *Pharsalia* the following verses, which describe a lingering death, similar to that inflicted upon himself:

Death of Seneca and Lucan the poet.

> ——— *Pars ultima trunci*
> *Tradidit in letum vacuans vitalibus artus.*
> *At tumidus quâ pulmo jacet, quâ viscera fervent*
> *Hæserunt ibi fata diu: luctataque multum*
> *Hâc cum parte, viri vis omnia membra tulerunt.*

The city, says Tacitus, was filled with funerals, the Capitol with victims; for the fathers, the brothers, the relations, and friends of those who had perished, found it expedient to return thanks to the Gods, to adorn their houses with laurel, as if a great victory had been obtained, and to throw themselves at the Prince's feet, congratulating him on his happy escape.*

The death of the infamous Poppæa, which occurred about this time, is attributed to an ungovernable fit of passion in Nero, who kicked her while in an advanced state of pregnancy. Tacitus acquits him of the charge of poisoning her, and assigns as his reasons for disbelieving that her death was intended, that the Emperor was both uxorious and anxious for children. Her body, contrary to Roman custom, was not burned, but embalmed; and Nero himself pronounced her funeral oration.*

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

No sooner were his fears relieved, than Nero resumed his theatrical amusements, and the cultivation of his musical talents. So completely did he identify himself with the professional character, that he accepted an engagement to perform at the Games, which were to be exhibited by a Roman citizen named Larcius, and even allowed his treasurer to receive the fee of a million of sesterces, by which the wealthy commoner had promised to reward the exertions of his Imperial master. To extend his fame as a performer, he made a journey into Greece; where he contended for all the crowns and other prizes which were given by the several States to stimulate the genius of their artists. The Olympic Games were by his orders postponed two years, that he might have an opportunity of competing for the honours which so distinguished an assembly had to confer; and, having obtained the wreath of victory from the hands of the most accomplished judges in the world, he proceeded to challenge all the talent which appeared on the stage or hippodrome, at the Isthmian, Pythian, and Nemæan solemnities. The number of crowns, which, during his stay in Greece, attested the rare skill, or commanding influence, of the Emperor, amounted to no fewer than eighteen hundred.†

Nero goes to Greece and gains 1800 crowns, prizes, at the national Games.

A. D. 66.

Upon his return to Italy he resolved to commemorate his success, in a manner becoming his signal achievements. His first triumphal procession was reserved for Naples, because it was in that city that he made the first public trial of his voice and acting. A part of the walls was thrown down; and, according to the custom observed in honour of victors at the sacred Games of Greece, he made his entry through the breach in a chariot drawn by white horses. He entered Antium, where he was born, in a similar manner, and conferred the same distinction upon the ancient city of Alba; but it was at Rome where he intended to enjoy the full splendour of his Triumph, and to astonish his subjects by the magnificence of his exploits. The eighteen hundred crowns were all carried before him, with inscriptions denoting the Games, and the nature of the combat in which they had been gained, and the more celebrated of the antagonists who had been vanquished in the contest; and a scroll, bearing large letters, set forth, for the information of the people, that Nero Cæsar was the first Roman, who, since the world began, had ever obtained those brilliant rewards consecrated to transcendant merit and unrivalled talent. Next followed the Conqueror himself, seated in the same car which Augustus had used in his Triumphs. He was clothed in a robe of purple, with a mantle covered with stars of gold. On his head he wore the Olympic crown, composed of wild olive, while in his right hand he displayed the Pythian garland, formed of the envied laurel. A musician sat by his side, the worthy companion of such

Triumphal entry at Naples and Rome.

* Dion Cassius, l. lxii. Tacit. *Ann.* xv. c. 60.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xvi. c. 6.

† Suet. *Ner.* 23, 24. Apol. v. 7.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

a victor. The Senate, the Equestrian Order, the Prætorian Prefects and Centurions joined the pompous train, and rent the air with their repeated acclamations. A part of the great Circus was thrown down that the Imperial chariot might find a ready way to the Temple of Apollo; for, though other conquerors were wont to deposit their laurels in the Capitol, Nero had resolved to lay up his in the presence of the God of Arts.*

Attempt to cut the Isthmus of Corinth.

The visit to Greece, which we have just mentioned, was signalized by an attempt, made at the command of Nero, to cut through the Corinthian Isthmus. The arrangements effected for this purpose, and the views contemplated by the Emperor, were such as to create in our minds some doubt whether he had not in his eye higher objects than olive wreaths and laurel crowns. He certainly improved the Constitutions of some of the Grecian States, and granted to several cities privileges which were highly prized both by Plutarch and Pausanias. He declared the whole country free, and exempted it from the payment of tribute; confiding the government, in every particular community, to native Magistrates and the authority of their own lawgivers. In short, we find here, as well as in other parts of his history, that the character of Nero has not been very candidly exhibited; and there is reason to suspect that his biographers, disgusted with his vices and frivolities, have too hastily passed over the proofs of wisdom and humanity which mark some portions of his reign.†

Vindex revolts, and induces Galba to join him in opposing the authority of Nero A. D. 68.

At length Caius Julius Vindex, who commanded the legions in Gaul, was filled with indignation at the puerile excesses of Nero, and determined to relieve his country from the disgrace of acknowledging a master so unworthy to rule. He communicated his designs to Galba, the Governor of Terragonia in Spain, an officer of unsullied reputation, and whose high birth entitled him to aspire to the most elevated situation in the Empire. Galba required a little time for deliberation, and to consult his friends; but Vindex, who was, probably, satisfied in regard to the real intentions of the veteran Governor, unfurled the standard of revolt, and soon found himself at the head of a hundred thousand Gauls. Nero was at Naples when the intelligence was conveyed to him that his General was in arms to oppose his authority; and he listened to the tidings with very little emotion. But when the news arrived that Galba had likewise thrown off his allegiance, and had issued proclamations in the name of the Senate and Roman People, his weak mind was distracted by a number of contending passions. He hurried to Rome, and made preparations for meeting the rebels in the field; forming his marines into a legion, and calling in all the detachments that were within a moderate distance of the Capital. Otho, the former companion of his pleasures, was the first to declare for Galba; and his example was followed by all the Commanders and Governors of Provinces, except two, namely, Clodius Macer in Africa, and Virginius Rufus who was serving on the Rhine. The latter even marched against Vindex, and defeated him with great slaughter; turning for a moment the current of events in favour of Nero who continued trembling in Rome.

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. D. 54. to 68.

Unable to determine, and incapable of a firm resolution, the Emperor spoke at one time of flying into Egypt, and actually gave orders to have a fleet prepared for the voyage; nor was it until he saw himself deserted by the Prætorian cohorts, that he felt the necessity of running from his palace, to take refuge in the cottage of one of his freedmen, at the distance of four miles from the city.*

Galba proclaimed Emperor.

As soon as it was known in Rome that the Prætorians had declared for Galba, and that Nero had fled, the Senate assembled; and assuming the exercise of supreme power, they pronounced the fugitive Emperor a public enemy, and gave orders that he should be punished to the utmost severity of the ancient laws. At the same time, Galba was acknowledged as the Sovereign of the Roman People, and all the titles and powers which belong to that high dignity were conferred upon him, with the full consent and approbation of all orders of men. The city resounded with shouts of joy, the Temples smoked with incense, and every one allowed himself to believe that the liberty of the Commonwealth was completely restored.

Death of Nero.

Meanwhile Nero, who had despaired of being able to retain his life, was meditating on the various means which presented themselves of terminating a miserable existence. We are unfortunately deprived of the assistance which would have been supplied by the discriminating judgment of Tacitus; and we have no better guide to a knowledge of the manner in which the Emperor met death, than is afforded by the malignant credulity of Suetonius, or by the scanty details of Dion and Pliny. It appears that when he learned his retreat was discovered, and that there was no longer any chance of escape, he plunged a dagger into his throat. The weakness of his arm, however, rendered the blow quite ineffectual; so that it became necessary for Epaphroditus, one of his attendants, to assist him in the act of suicide. He was still alive when the Centurion arrived, who was charged by the Senate with the duty of carrying him to Rome; and, recognising the person of that officer, he reproached him bitterly with his treason and disaffection, after which he almost immediately expired.

Before his death he requested that his head might not be delivered to his enemies, but that his body might be buried entire. His request was in this particular readily complied with, and his ashes were conveyed, by two of his female domestics, to the tomb of his paternal ancestors. In Nero perished the last of the family of Augustus; whose misfortune it was to labour for a posterity unworthy of him, and to give to the Empire, in all the successors of his blood, none who were not scourges of his people, and objects of horror or contempt to mankind.

It is very difficult to arrive at a just estimate of the character of Nero. That he was suspicious, cruel, and regardless of human life, admits not of any doubt; but that he was the ferocious monster described by certain historians, and so extremely depraved in his appetites as to have become incapable, as St. Augustine expresses it, both of the vices and virtues of mankind, is not by any means so clearly established. Suetonius, who was said to display in his writings all the sensuality and coarseness which his

* Dion Cassius, l. lxiii. Suet. l. vi. c. 24. Apol. Ty. l. viii. c. 14. Paus. *in Ell.*

† Dion Cassius, l. lxiii. Plin. l. iv. c. 4. Suet. c. 19.

* Tacit. *Hist.* i. c. 90. Suet. l. vi. c. 40. Dion Cassius, l. lxiii. Plut.

Biography. From A. D. 54. to 68.

countrymen showed in their habits and mode of life, took pleasure in recording every popular calumny which reached his ear; and in composing his biographical sketch of Nero, he appears to have had no other object in view, than to excite in the mind of his reader the mingled emotions of disgust, horror, and execration. His description, for example, of the indignities offered by the Emperor to the corpse of Agrippina; the history of Sporus; and the assertion that incendiaries were employed by Nero to effect the destruction of Rome, are generally suspected to have no foundation in fact.

The Fathers of the Church, too, who denounced Nero as the first persecutor of the Christians, laboured to avenge their sacred cause, by assailing the reputation of that Prince. Augustine speaks of him as the most finished pattern of wicked rulers; as the first of that order of detestable men, who love power and despise glory; who are neither good, nor desire to appear so; and who, having no respect for the opinions of the world, are always ready to commit the greatest crimes. We find, moreover, in the pages of Sulpitius Severus, that, about the beginning of the IVth century, an opinion prevailed among divines, that Nero was either to appear in the character of Antichrist in the latter times of disaffection and infidelity; or that he was to reign in the West, and give a new establishment to idolatry, while the true Antichrist should set up his Kingdom of error and delusion in all the countries of the East. A passage in the Apocalypse was found to support this absurd expectation; and it had, accordingly become an article of belief, among the ignorant and credulous, that the son of Agrippina was not actually dead, but was reserved in some secret place by the care of Providence until the measure of human iniquity should be accomplished.

Nero Claudius Cæsar. From A. A. 54. to 68.

But Nero was not so much detested by all his contemporaries, many of whom were zealous to honour his memory and to defend his reputation. Some of them continued for years to deck his tomb with flowers and other offerings of affection; to adorn his statues; and even to receive edicts, as if published by his authority, and as if he were shortly to appear, in order to resume the exercise of the power from which his enemies had driven him. Several impostors assumed his name, and thereby made a strong impression both on the army and the common people. A false Nero appeared in Greece, and another in Parthia; each of whom alarmed the jealousy of the reigning Emperor, and nearly involved the nation in a bloody war; facts which go far to establish the popularity of the infatuated Prince, whose name was borrowed, among a large portion of his subjects.

Enough still remains, however, to justify the severity with which the memory of this Emperor has been usually visited. As General of the Roman armies, he found his country placed under martial law; and the lives of all ranks of men were in his hand. The Constitution of the Government which he was called to administer, almost necessarily made him a tyrant, because it compelled him to be a despot; and that he very frequently, in the latter part of his reign, abused his power to gratify personal resentment, or to satiate his boundless avarice, has been made manifest by a series of transactions, which will never fail to create in the breast of every one who reads his annals, the deepest sentiments of pity and indignation.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXV.

OF PARTHIA.

FROM U. C. 701. B. C. 53. TO U. C. 818 A. D. 64.

History. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

We have already brought the details of the history of Parthia, (HISTORY, Chapter XXIII.) down to the period at which Crassus was defeated, and his army driven from Mesopotamia with great loss and disgrace. We now resume the historical outline of that celebrated Kingdom, with the intention of giving a more connected view of the wars and negociations which its rulers carried on with the Romans, about the commencement of the Christian era, than can possibly be derived from the brief incidental notices of these occurrences, which have been introduced into the crowded annals of the Imperial Government.

The immediate consequence of the victory gained over Crassus, was a resolution on the part of Orodes to invade Syria; and, ultimately, should he succeed in that undertaking, to expel the Romans from all their Asiatic Provinces. Surena accordingly crossed the Euphrates with a considerable army, hoping to find the enemy's country in a state of panic and confusion, and entirely destitute of all means of defence. But fortunately for the interests of Rome, it fell to the spirit and zeal of Cassius to meet the pressure of this formidable inroad. This distinguished officer, who had acted with so much prudence and bravery during the late campaign, made haste to collect the feeble remains of the vanquished legions, and such other troops as the exigency of the time could supply; and, advancing to meet the invaders, he assumed a position at once so strong and commanding, as to render it expedient for them to retrace their steps across the desert.*

he Parthians inside Syria.

e repulsed by sius.

But the Parthian Monarch, though thwarted in his first attempt, did not relinquish the intention of subduing Syria. Early in the following year he renewed his preparations, placing his son Pacorus at the head of a powerful armament, with orders to carry on the war with the utmost vigour; and that the inexperience of the Prince might be assisted by the wisdom and valour of a tried commander, the duties of Lieutenant-general were confided to Osaces, who at that period was esteemed one of the ablest leaders in the East.

new the ampt.

To oppose these hostile demonstrations, the Roman Senate appointed to the Government of the Syrian Province, the Proconsul Calpurnius Bibulus; a man who was equally undistinguished in military as in Civil affairs, and who is only known to history as the inactive colleague of Julius Cæsar. His inertness or his subserviency has been commemorated in a distich preserved by Suetonius:

Non Bibulo quicquam nuper, sed Cæsare factum:
*Nam Bibulo fieri Consule nil memini.**

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

The new Governor soon found himself compelled to abandon to the ravages of the Parthian cavalry, the rich plains which extend from the shores of the Mediterranean to the eastern wilderness, and to seek protection for his Eagles within the walls of Antioch. After some delay, he was relieved from the miseries and disgrace of a siege by Cicero, the renowned Orator; who, having been invested with a military command in Cilicia, had at his disposal fifteen thousand men, whom he instantly resolved to conduct into the neighbouring Province to the assistance of the unfortunate Bibulus.† Upon penetrating the rocky boundary of Amanus, he beheld the devastation committed by the victorious Parthians, who having wasted Syria, were already threatening the fertility and repose of all Asia Minor. But his appearance at the head of so strong a reinforcement completely checked their progress. They forthwith raised the siege of Antioch; and adopting, as usual, a hurried and tumultuous retreat, they fell into an ambush prepared for them by the vigilance of Cassius, in which Osaces and a great part of his army were cut to pieces. It was with difficulty that Pacorus himself, the heir of the Parthian Crown, was saved from falling into the hands of the conquerors; while the effects of this signal overthrow were so severely felt throughout his father's dominions, that no attempt was made by him to disturb the Roman power in Syria, during the space of ten or twelve years.

Are feebly opposed by Bibulus.

And driven out by Cicero and Cassius.

The protracted struggle maintained by the members of the second Triumvirate for the sovereignty of Rome, necessarily threw the remoter Provinces into weakness and perplexity. Nor did Orodes remain

Labienus excites the Parthians to invade Syria.

* Livii *Epit.* cviii. Velleius Paterculus, ii.

* Suet. *Jul.* 20.
† *Epist. ad Attic.* v. 10. Plut. *Crass.*

History. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

long ignorant, either of the neglected state into which the Eastern Governments had fallen, or of the dissolute and unsoldier-like habits, which already began to stain the reputation of M. Antonius, and to alienate the confidence of his friends. But the ambition and revenge of the Parthian King were chiefly inflamed by the representations of Labienus, a son of a General of the same name, who had espoused the popular interest during the Civil wars, and who himself appears to have led a contingent of troops, supplied by Orodes to cooperate with the Republican army under Brutus and Cassius. This Roman assured his new master, that the discontents which prevailed in Italy, and the feebleness of the Provincial authorities in Asia, afforded him a most favourable opportunity for extending permanently the boundaries of the Parthian dominions to Egypt and the Ægean Sea. The advice thus given was not addressed to unwilling ears. To the King it appeared to be both wise and practicable; while by Pacorus, who was eager to revenge his defeat, it was received with all the enthusiasm of a young and warlike spirit.*

U. C. 715. — B. C. 39.

The early successes of Labienus, and the occupation of Syria, Cilicia, and Asia, by the Parthians; their subsequent defeat by Ventidius; and the dicomfiture and death of Pacorus have already been related, (Life of AUGUSTUS, Part I. p. 330,) and it is from this point that we shall resume our narrative, beginning with those events which distinguished the reign of Phraates, and which hitherto have been only slightly touched upon. (Ibid. Part II. p. 359.)

Antonius joins his army before Samosata, and grants a capitulation.

The successes of his Lieutenant were communicated to Antonius at Athens, having advanced so far on his return to the East. Upon hearing that Ventidius had laid siege to Samosata, the Capital of Antiochus, in Commagene, he sent instructions to that officer not to listen to any terms of capitulation, till he himself should arrive to take the command of the army. The great fame of the Triumvir had not raised him above a feeling of jealousy towards his inferior; and he displeased the soldiers by interfering with the operations of a siege, from which they expected both honours and emolument, and finally, by accepting a smaller ransom from Antiochus than their revenge or avidity had dictated. Ventidius was sent to Rome to enjoy the honours of a Triumph; and the Proconsul of Asia returned to Greece, where Octavia awaited his arrival, prepared to resume those pleasures and amusements, which were now his greatest recompence for the anxious fatigues of war.†

Phraates ascends the Parthian Throne. U. C. 717. — B. C. 37

The repose which Antonius had hoped to enjoy in the West, was soon disturbed by the unwelcome intelligence, that a new King of great energy and ambition had assumed the Throne of Parthia. This tyrant, who reigned under the title of Phraates IV., had opened the way to sovereign power by murdering his father, his brothers, and his own son; and as he was known to cherish the most violent hatred against the Romans, it became expedient to anticipate his designs, and to carry war into the heart of his Kingdom. Antonius, accordingly, at the head of a hundred thousand men, of whom twenty thousand were cavalry, began his march towards the Euphrates; but

Expedition of Antonius.

learning that Phraates was strongly posted on the opposite bank of the river, accompanied by the tributary Prince of the Lesser Media, the Roman General determined to signalize the campaign by the reduction of Praaspa, a fortress belonging to the latter of these Sovereigns. In this undertaking, Antonius relied on the cooperation of Artavasdes, King of Armenia, the hereditary ally of the Republic, and then actually at war with the Satrap whose troops augmented the Parthian camp; but although the Armenian promised to send into the field a reinforcement of 16,000 cavalry, it does not appear that he was animated by any sentiment of zeal for the Roman cause, or that he really contributed to assist their views, either by his arms or by his counsel.

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

Leaving behind his heavy battering machines under the protection of two legions, the Roman commander advanced to Praaspa by forced marches, hoping to surprise that valuable stronghold before the Parthians could afford it any assistance. But the rapidity of his movement could not deceive so active an enemy. Phraates attacked the two legions which composed the rear-guard, and cut them in pieces, notwithstanding a vigorous effort made by Antonius to arrive with a part of his army in time to save them. But this loss did not check the resolution of the Triumvir. He made a rapid movement upon Praaspa, hoping that he would be able to carry it by assault before the garrison could arrange their means of defence; and even when he failed in this attempt he had recourse to the more dilatory operations of a siege, in which he persevered till all the surrounding country was completely exhausted, and his troops reduced to considerable distress. In a battle which ensued, he put the Parthians to the rout; but the walls of Praaspa still resisted his most determined endeavours to force them, till at length the approaching scarcity of a Northern winter, placed before his eyes the unavoidable necessity of relinquishing his undertaking, and of providing for the safety of his soldiers in a milder climate.

Siege of Praaspa.

Antonius treats with the Parthian King

But his retreat already depended upon the forbearance of the Parthian King. To secure, therefore, the most favourable terms that his situation allowed him to expect, he sent an embassy to Phraates, informing him of his resolution to return into Syria, to withdraw the war from Media, and finally to desist from his attempt to extend the Roman power beyond the banks of the Euphrates. The son of Orodes received the messengers in the field, seated on a magnificent throne, and holding in his hand a bent bow, the inauspicious emblem of Parthian activity and revenge. He upbraided the Romans with their selfish and ambitious views, denounced them as the enemies of Asia, but concluded by expressing his willingness to allow them to retreat unmolested, provided they would pledge their faith to refrain from all hostilities.

And begins his retreat into Syria

Antonius without delay withdrew his army from before Praaspa, and began to retrace his march towards the Syrian Province; and at the same time the cavalry of Phraates put themselves in motion to cut off all supplies, to attack his flanks, to drive in his foragers, and to waste the whole country through which he was to pass. In the course of twenty-seven days, the contending parties engaged in eighteen battles; and though victory in general declared for the Romans, the greatest loss was on their side, and

* Dion Cassius, xlviii.
† Dion Cassius, *ubi suprà*.

History.

From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

more than twenty thousand of their best troops fell a sacrifice to the obstinacy of their own commander, and to the perfidiousness of their barbarian enemies. The pursuit was not continued beyond the boundaries of Armenia; the King of which, though affording no assistance in the field, appears to have interposed his good offices in favour of his allies, and to have obtained for them a relaxation of that harassing warfare, in which the Parthians excelled all the nations of antiquity.

We need not repeat our account of the contest between Phraates and Tiridates for the Throne of Parthia, (Life of Augustus, Part II. p. 359,) which is the first event connecting that country with Rome after the repulse of Antonius. The restoration of the captured Roman Eagles secured Phraates in his ill-gained Sovereignty, and the bribe which Augustus received for a gross violation of equity, has been handed down to posterity as one of the most glorious incidents of his reign.

The Romans give a King to Armenia.

B. C. 20. — U. C. 734.

After these transactions, nearly twenty years elapsed before the arms of Parthia threatened to disturb the tranquillity of the Roman Provinces in the East, and the following was the cause of renewed dissension. The Kingdom of Armenia had depended by turns on the descendants of Arsaces, and on the great Western Republic; but in the time of Augustus it was become customary for the Armenians to receive a ruler from the nomination of the Senate. About two years before the commencement of the Christian era, for example, the Roman Emperor awarded the Crown to Artabases; who did not refuse to acknowledge the obligation under which he stood to his powerful and ambitious benefactors, and even to cooperate with their several Lieutenants, in confirming their power along the western boundaries of the Parthian dominions. Phraates could not tolerate the existence of a State dependent upon the Romans, in the immediate neighbourhood of his own territories, for which reason he fomented a conspiracy which was formed against the new Sovereign, assisted his subjects in expelling him, and finally took up arms to support Tigranes, his more popular successor.

An army sent against the Parthians.

Augustus was disconcerted at this resolute conduct on the part of the enemy. He was unwilling to embroil his people in a new war; but as it was a maxim of policy with him, never to brook an insult offered by a neighbouring nation, he considered himself as placed, by the daring behaviour of the Parthians, under the necessity of inflicting upon them a severe chastisement. With this view he resolved to send an army into Armenia, the command of which he intrusted to his son Caius, a youth of nineteen, assisted by M. Lollius, an officer whose cunning greatly exceeded his military talents. The Emperor took leave of the young General in these remarkable words: "My son, I wish you the valour of Scipio, the popularity of Pompey, and my own fortune;" a paternal benediction of which no part was realized.

Parthia.

From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

subdued his pride, and disposed him to listen to an accommodation. He met the Roman General on an island in the Euphrates, where the terms of a treaty were negociated, and the limits of their respective dominions amicably determined; on which occasion, the perfidy of Lollius was exposed to Caius by the Parthian, who appears to have become acquainted with his avaricious dealings and traiterous intentions.* Falling into disgrace, he relieved his shame by suicide.

Caius proceeds into Armenia.

The protection of the Parthians being withrawn from the usurper of the Armenian Throne, that Prince found himself unable to oppose the Romans, and therefore had recourse to entreaty; and as Artabases, whom he had supplanted, was dead, he imagined, that, in the absence of every other lawful competitor, he would be allowed to retain the Crown. But the views of Caius were directed to a different object, and he forthwith made known his determination, that Tigranes should be stripped of the sovereignty. The pretensions of either party came now to be decided by arms; and the Roman camp was accordingly moved into Armenia, where the usurper had collected all his forces, and assembled his remaining allies. The son of Augustus, more courageous than prudent, pushed the enemy to a battle; in which he exposed his person with so little caution, that he received a severe wound, the consequences of which proved fatal at no distant period. But death did not overtake him until he had fully realized the objects of the expedition. Tigranes was deposed and reduced to an obscure condition; and the Armenian Crown was given to Ariobarzanes, a Mede by birth, and an avowed adherent of the Roman ascendancy. Caius, whom the anxiety of his father had induced to set out on his return to Rome, died at Limyrum, in Lycia; leaving Augustus without a male heir to the succession of that Imperial power, which it had cost him so much toil, and so many sacrifices of friendship, blood, and principle, to attain and secure.†

Tigranes is deposed.

Caius is wounded and dies.

U. C. 752. — B. C. 4.

It was not till about seventeen years after the death of Caius, that the peace of the Eastern Provinces was again interrupted. In the meantime, indeed, the Parthians had set aside Phraates the Younger, in order to make way for Orodes, a Prince who derived his descent from the Arsacidæ, and who, after a short elevation, fell a victim to the caprice or indignation of his barbarian subjects. Being now without a King altogether, and having exhausted their strength and rage in a bloody Civil war, they turned their thoughts to the sons of the elder Phraates, who had been confided by that Sovereign to the care of Augustus. With this view they sent to Rome an embassy, composed of the chief men of Parthia, to request that Vonones, the eldest of the Royal youths, might be sent back into his native country, where they had prepared for him an easy accession to the Crown of his fathers.‡ The Roman Emperor, desirous to place on the throne a Monarch who had imbibed the maxims of civilized life, dismissed the grandson of Phraates with many expressions of affection, and loaded with valuable presents; hoping that the relations of peace and amity between Rome and the

Vonones returns to Parthia.

U. C. 769. — A. D. 16.

The Throne of Parthia was now filled by a grandson of Orodes, who like his father had stained his accession to royalty by the horrid guilt of parricide. This younger Phraates was exceedingly haughty and imperious, assuming to himself the lofty title of King of Kings, while he employed towards Augustus no higher an epithet than that of Cæsar. But the approach of Caius at the head of a powerful army,

* Suet. *Tiber.*

† Velleius Paterculus, ii. 102. Suet. *August.*

‡ Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 3.

History From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

Parthian and Syrian Provincials would thereby be confirmed and perpetuated.

But the ardour with which the barbarians received their new King, soon gave way to the feelings of suspicion and contempt with which his foreign education inspired them. They reproached themselves with having sent to Rome for a Sovereign who knew not how to exercise authority over a free and magnanimous people, and of having thereby converted the dominions of the Arsacidæ into a Province of the Roman Empire. They asked each other, whether it was worthy of those who had slain Crassus and repulsed M. Antonius, destroying their armies and capturing their standards, to reverence as their King a slave who had studied the arts of a sycophant at the Court of Cæsar! A youthful Prince, who ought to be constantly on horseback, exercising his warlike Parthians, or pursuing the wild beasts of the desert, was seen conversing with learned Greeks on Philosophy and literature, indolently reposing in a carriage, or indulging in the luxurious gratifications of the banquet. His gentle manners and affable address were in their eyes the strongest proofs of a degenerated nature; and as his virtues and infirmities were entirely new to them, they hated equally what was laudable, and what was deserving of censure.*

His unpopularity.

The discontents of barbarians are seldom confined to words. The Parthians prepared their bows and mounted their horses; and sending to Media for Artabanus, a member of their Royal House, they made to him an offer of their Crown, their allegiance, and their services. The adherents of Vonones met the disaffected in the field of battle, and in the first engagement gained a considerable advantage over them; but in a subsequent action the insurgents not only retrieved their loss, but entirely defeated the army which supported the interests of Rome, and compelled the King to seek an asylum in Armenia.

And dethronement by Artabanus.

As the Throne in the latter country happened to be vacant by the death of Ariobarzanes, who had been raised to the sovereignty by Caius Cæsar, Vonones, who had the blood and rank of a Monarch, was invited by the Armenian Nobles to become their head. But the policy of Artabanus required that his late rival should be removed to a greater distance from his native territory. He therefore waged war with Armenia; and as Vonones received no support from Tiberius, who was eager to avoid a rupture with the Parthians, he was obliged to yield to his inauspicious fortune, and to accept a retreat among the Romans, in the Province of Syria. Silanus Criticus, the Proconsul, was instructed to give him the external homage due to a sovereign Prince; but Vonones soon felt his condition to be nothing more than an honourable captivity, and that he was reserved by his ambitious protectors as a fit instrument to promote their own views, should the course of events afford an opportunity.

Vonones finds an asylum in Syria.

U. C. 771. — A. D. 18.

The Throne of Armenia was filled by Artabanus, who placed on it his own son Orodes. But when, in the eighteenth year of Christianity, Germanicus was sent into the East, he found that the son of the Parthian King had abdicated, or was expelled, and that the people were willing to receive a ruler from his hands. Complying with their inclinations, he raised to the

Zeno King of Armenia.

Royal authority Zeno, son of Polemon, who under the protection of the Romans had reigned over Pontus and Cilicia. Zeno from his childhood had shown a predilection for the manners and customs of the Armenians; and he was accordingly crowned by Germanicus, in the City of Artaxata, with the applause and concurrence of the whole nation. His new subjects, when they did him homage, addressed him by the name of Artaxias, an appellation which had become associated in their minds with the memory of some of their best and most fortunate Kings.*

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

During these events, Ambassadors arrived from Artabanus, the King of the Parthians, professing a desire to renew his alliance with the Romans, and to strengthen the bonds of amity which continued to subsist between the two nations. He even requested an interview with Germanicus; and declared that for the sake of doing homage to the son of the Roman Emperor, he would advance to meet him as far as to the banks of the Euphrates. But the motive which led to these demonstrations of friendship was not altogether disinterested. He began the conference by desiring that Vonones, whom he had supplanted, should be removed from Syria, lest he should have an opportunity of corresponding with the Parthian Lords, and thereby of disturbing the peace of the Kingdom. He represented that the interests of Rome were deeply concerned in the tranquillity of Parthia, and entreated that a person so unfit to govern the undisciplined warriors of that extensive country, should not be allowed by the proximity of his residence, to plunge it again into all the miseries of Civil discord.

Negociation of Artabanus with Germanicus.

Germanicus lent an ear to this plausible reasoning, though he could not fail to perceive the selfish grounds upon which it proceeded. He consented to remove Vonones from Syria into Cilicia; where he should be detained under such restraint, as would effectually prevent him from embroiling the affairs of his former Kingdom. History has preserved no other incidents connected with the interview of Artabanus and the Roman Commander; we may therefore finish the brief biography of the ill-fated son of Phraates, whose exile to a more distant land appears to have been the sole object of royal solicitude. We are informed, then, by Tacitus, that in the course of the following year, the sense of his captivity began to press heavily upon him; and that having corrupted his guards at Pompeiopolis, he attempted to escape into Armenia. His object, it is conjectured, was to make an appeal to the generosity of the Scythian Monarch, to whom he was related, and thereafter to attempt the recovery of his Kingdom by the force of arms; but his flight being discovered he was speedily pursued and overtaken by a Roman officer at the head of a party of horse, and soon afterwards assassinated by Remmius, a General to whose superintendence he had been committed.†

Germanicus sends Vonones into Cilicia.

Flight

And death of Vonones.

After the lapse of seventeen years, Artabanus was still on the Parthian Throne, but no longer either beloved or obeyed by his capricious and restless subjects. As long as he stood in awe of the Romans, he was distinguished not only by a punctual observance of his public engagements, by great mildness and an equal administration of justice. But these virtues did not outlive

Artabanus defies the Romans.

* Tacit. *Ann.* ii. 2.

* Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 5. Tacit. *Ann.* ii. 56.
† Tacit. *Ann.* ii. 68. Dion Cassius, lviii.

History of Parthia. From B. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to B. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

the circumstances from which they had sprung. Elated with the success which attended his arms against his immediate neighbours, and contemning the timid policy of Tiberius, which increased with his advancing age, he began to act with insolence towards the Roman Government, and with cruelty towards his subjects. The Throne of Armenia having become empty by the death of Artaxias, whom Germanicus had raised to it under such happy auspices, the Parthian made himself master of the whole Kingdom, and placed the sceptre in the hand of his son Arsaces. Not content with this glaring infraction of his Treaty, he demanded from the Emperor all the treasure which Vonones was understood to have carried with him into Syria; and in menacing letters to the Senate, he made known his determination to extend his authority to the ancient limits of the Persian and Macedonian Empires; for that, as he looked upon himself as the successor of Cyrus and Alexander, he thought it not too much to claim the possessions of those illustrious conquerors

A plot formed against him. U. C. 788. — A. D. 35.

While he was thus making an ideal conquest of all Asia, his Nobles, having at their head Sinnaces, a man of birth and wealth, and Abdus, an Eunuch, had already matured a plot to dethrone him. For this purpose they sent a deputation to Rome, to request that one of the sons of Phraates, who still continued to live in that Capital, might be permitted to appear in Parthia, and relieve his country from the thraldom to which it had been reduced. This proposal coincided entirely with the cautious administration of Tiberius, who was more desirous to effect his objects among foreign States by dexterous artifice, than by the expensive and hazardous operations of open war. He, therefore, very readily granted the request of the Parthian malcontents, and sent Phraates home with a retinue and splendour worthy of his birth, as well as of the high honour for which he was designed.*

His rage against Tiberius.

Artabanus, upon hearing the measures which were adopted against him, gave vent to his rage in an indignant letter addressed to Tiberius. In this, he reproached him with the most atrocious crimes, and advised him to satisfy the indignation of mankind by a voluntary death. This expression of resentment did not delay the execution of the plan which had been formed against him; but the demise of Phraates, which took place soon afterwards in Syria, paralyzed for a moment the exertions of the Romans, and disconcerted the plan of the conspirators. Abdus the Eunuch had fallen by poison, and Sinnaces, upon whom devolved the chief support of the conspiracy, consented to practise with his Sovereign that mask dissimulation of which the latter intended that he should in due time become the victim.

New King sent into this and Armenia.

Tiberius did not relinquish his intentions of setting a new King on the Throne of Parthia. He selected Tiridates, who was probably a grandson of the elder Phraates, to occupy the dignity which had been set apart for his uncle; and in order still farther to distract the attention of Artabanus, he revived the ancient claims of Rome to the paramount authority in Armenia, and nominated Mithridates, a brother of the King of Iberia, to the exercise of the sovereign power in that country. It was in this latter quarter that the blow was first struck. Mithridates, assisted by Pharasmanes and his Iberians, invaded Armenia, and took possession of the Capital; while Artabanus, learning that his son Arsaces was murdered, sent a strong army to revenge his death, and to deliver his Kingdom from the complete and disgraceful subjugation with which it was threatened. The invaders made preparations for defending the ground which they had taken, and for realizing the object which had induced them to take up arms. Both sides enlisted foreign troops, and drew to their standards the mercenary but warlike soldiers of Albania and Sarmatia; being perfectly aware that the Crown of Armenia, and the independence of Parthia, depended upon the issue of the battle in which they were about to engage.*

War in Armenia and defeat of Orodes, son of Artabanus.

Orodes commanded the troops of his father Artabanus. Unequal in number to the enemy, he repeatedly declined an appeal to arms; hoping that the arrival of his auxiliaries would throw the fortune of war so decidedly into his hands, that he should then fight with the certainty of success. But the impatience of his Parthians obliged him to depart from this wise resolution. In the engagement which ensued, the Iberian infantry proved more than a match for the irregular cavalry by which they were opposed; but the victory continued doubtful till the two Generals met, and encountered each other in single combat, when Orodes was wounded, and fell. The report of his loss carried dismay into the ranks of the Parthians, and decided the conflict in favour of their enemies. The Iberians remained masters of the field, and thus gave to the nomination of Mithridates that powerful sanction which a successful sword never fails to confer.

Artabanus himself defeated.

Exasperated by the death of his sons, and the defeat of his army, Artabanus resolved to assume the command of his troops in person. He immediately advanced against the conquerors, determined to hazard a battle, and to recover the reputation of Parthian valour; but having no foot soldiers to oppose to the disciplined infantry of Pharasmanes, his light horse could make no impression on the Iberian lines, and were finally compelled to betake themselves to flight. Artabanus, however, would not yet have relinquished his claims upon Armenia, had not Vitellius, who commanded the Roman legions in Syria, made demonstrations of his intention to invade Mesopotamia with a large army, and to avenge the cause of the Emperor upon the richest Provinces of the Parthian dominions. He therefore withdrew his troops from the contest, which now appeared hopeless, and left to Mithridates the secure and peaceful possession of the Armenian Throne.†

Flies into Hyrcania.

The failure of his arms against Pharasmanes soon led to a more serious overthrow. The disaffected Grandees renewed their conspiracy; and Sinnaces having induced his father Abdageses, the royal Treasurer, to join them, gave the signal for a revolt, which instantly became general. Artabanus, who knew resistance to be vain, took refuge among the Hyrcanians; where he resolved to watch the current of events, and to avail himself of the first indication of returning affection on the part of his capricious subjects, who were

* Tacit. *Ann.* vi. 31. Dion Cassius, *ut suprà*.

† Tacit. *Ann.* vi. 33. Dion Cassius, lix. Joseph. *Antiq.*

History. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

always most disposed to be kind to those who had become the greatest victims of their injustice.*

The path being thus laid open, Tiridates met with no obstacle to the gratification of his ambition. Vitellius at the head of the Roman legions accompanied him over the Euphrates, on a bridge of boats, and introduced him into Mesopotamia, where they were immediately received by Ornospades, the Governor of that Province, attended by a strong body of cavalry. The army of the conspirators, in like manner, added to his strength and dignity, while the acquisition of the public treasures enabled the new King to support his rank, and to reward his adherents.

Tiridates raised to the Throne of Parthia.

Before he left Tiridates to pursue the duties of his new office, Vitellius thought it expedient to address him in the presence of the Parthian Lords, reminding him that he was the grandson of Phraates, and a pupil of the Cæsars, and exhorting him to act agreeably to such a birth, and such an education. Having, in like manner, recommended to the Nobles obedience, and a faithful observance of all their engagements, he withdrew his legions into Syria.

Is well received at first.

The education at the Court of Cæsar, of which Vitellius boasted so highly, proved in this case, as in others, the ruin of the Prince upon whom it had been bestowed. At first, indeed, Tiridates was well received: the cities opened their gates, and the people flocked to meet him with the most joyful acclamations. But disaffection was already deeply rooted in the minds of several powerful Chiefs; and it soon became manifest, that though the nation in general detested the cruelties of their late ruler, there was still a strong party among the Nobles whose hopes were connected with his return to power. Accordingly, when the coronation of the new King was proposed, Phraates and Hiero, the Governors of two extensive Provinces, requested that the ceremony might be delayed; affecting a great desire to be present on so solemn an occasion, and to do honour to the commencement of a reign, which promised to be so happy and advantageous. Others concealed their factious spirit under different pretences; and Tiridates found that whenever the Crown should be at length placed on his head, he would have to seek for the means of giving it strength and dignity, in the patronage or in the arms of the Roman people. His first public undertaking afforded an opportunity for revolt. While he was engaged in an useless attempt to reduce a fortress, into which Artabanus had thrown his treasures, and the defenceless part of his family, a deputation of the Chiefs waited upon the exiled Monarch and invited him to resume his Throne; which they maintained, was vilely dishonoured by the effeminacy and puerile habits which distinguished his successor.†

But afterwards deserted.

Artabanus restored to the Throne.

Artabanus, who saw that their hatred of himself was more than equalled by their contempt for Tiridates, made no hesitation to obey their summons; and he had already advanced into the heart of Parthia, before his rival was informed of the danger with which he was surrounded. Despairing of success in the field, the pupil of the Cæsars listened to the advice of Abdageses, who represented to him that the only chance which now remained of retrieving his affairs, was to retire beyond the Tigris, and wait the approach of his allies, the Armenians and Elymeans, and especially of the Roman legions under the warlike Vitellius. But his troops had too little confidence in his talents, or in his fortune, to share with him the hazards of a retreat. They deserted his standards in such numbers, that he soon resigned the intention of fighting for his Crown; preferring an asylum in Syria, and the society of Greeks and Romans, to the regal honours which had been conferred upon him by a barbarous nation, and which it was impossible to retain, without divesting himself of every mark of civilisation, and almost every feeling of humanity. He left to Artabanus the peaceable possession of a Throne from which new troubles were, in a short time, to expel him.*

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

And craves an interview with Vitellius the Governor of Syria.

In the beginning of the reign of Caligula, about the thirty-seventh year of our era, we find that this King of Parthia solicited an interview with Vitellius, the Governor of Syria; professing great respect for the young Emperor, whose abilities and character he overrated as extravagantly, as he had undervalued those of Tiberius. A Treaty was established between the Parthians and Romans, much to the advantage of the latter; on which occasion Artabanus burnt incense before the statues of Augustus and Caius, paid obeisance to the legionary standards, and delivered one of his sons as an hostage into the hands of Vitellius.†

Is again deposed, and a second time reinstated.

We have already hinted that Artabanus did not enjoy a long or uninterrupted tranquillity. Josephus informs us of a second revolution, which drove him once more from his dominions, when he was forced to fly for shelter to Izates, King of Adiabenum. It is added that Izates received him hospitably, and, moreover, succeeded so well in his negociations with the Parthian rebels, that they consented to submit once more to the Government of their exiled Monarch. But the happiness occasioned by this renewed flow of good fortune was not of long duration. Artabanus died soon after his restoration, leaving his precarious dignity to his son Gotarzes.‡

Dies, and succeeded by Gotarzes.

This Prince, who appears to have inherited his father's cruelty and suspicion, stained the first acts of sovereign power by the death of his brother, his sister-in-law, and nephew.§ The Parthian Nobility, alarmed by such instances of atrocious tyranny, and fearing that a similar fate might await a number of their own body, concerted measures for an immediate revolt; at the same time sending for Bardanes, another brother of the King, remarkable for his valour and activity, and who, it is conjectured, was, at the period in question, the Governor of Armenia. Bardanes accepted the invitation with so much alacrity, that he is said to have rode more than a hundred leagues in two days, and to have surprised his brother before he had time to prepare for resistance. The conqueror was immediately acknowledged by the neighbouring Satraps; but, instead of following up his advantage by pursuing Gotarzes, and intimidating his adherents, he wasted his time in an unavailing attempt to take Seleucia, on the Tigris, a strong town, and well supplied with provisions and arms. Before it was possible to effect his object, Gotarzes was in the field, at the head of

Gotarzes is deposed by Bardanes his brother. U. C. 800 — A. D. 47.

* Tacit. *ubi suprà*. Velleius Paterculus, ii.
† Tacit. *Ann.* vi. 43. Dion Cassius, lix

* Tacit. *Ann.* vi. 45. Velleius Paterculus, ii. Dion, *ubi suprà*.
† Suet. *Calig.* 14. Joseph. *Antiq.*
‡ Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 2. § Tacit. *Ann.* xi. 8.

History of Parthia.

From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D 64.

a large army of Hyrcanians and other barbarians, who had flocked to his standard from the expectation of a liberal pay, and who hoped to find, in the spoils of the vanquished, a full recompense for the toil and danger of battle.

A bloody conflict was apprehended before the pretensions of the two brothers could be determined, or their partizans induced to enter into any negociation. But the course of events assumed a different direction. Gotarzes discovering that treachery and disaffection mixed with the counsels of both armies, revealed the fact to Bardanes; upon this an interview took place, at which the sons of Artabanus, repressing their mutual grievances, pledged their faith to each other by a solemn oath, that they would in the first instance inflict a signal chastisement upon their common enemies, and then refer to arbitration their respective pretensions to the Parthian Throne. The umpires determined in favour of Bardanes, who was forthwith confirmed in his authority; while his elder brother, in order to remove all cause of suspicion and uneasiness, made haste to withdraw himself into the forests of Hyrcania.*

he brothers refer their claims to arbitration.

ardanes referred.

The horrors of Civil war being thus amicably prevented, the King of Parthia directed his first cares towards the recovery of Armenia, which had been for some time in the hands of Mithridates the Iberian. It was in the reign of Tiberius, as we have already seen, that this new dynasty was elevated to the Throne of Artaxata, and chiefly, too, by means of the Roman legions under the Governor of Syria. Mithridates, it is obvious, at the same time, had sustained a short interruption of liberty and power, inasmuch as he was at Rome a prisoner in the reign of Caligula, and was sent back into the East, soon after the accession of Claudius. On his arrival there, he found his territory in the hands of the Parthians; who, taking advantage of his absence, had subdued the Armenians, and reduced them once more to the condition of vassals and tributaries. He was accordingly obliged to wait for a favourable opportunity to assert his rights, which did not occur till the Civil war broke out between Gotarzes and Bardanes; when, assisted by the Romans and Iberians, he attacked Demonax, the Parthian Governor, defeated him in repeated engagements, and finally drove him out of the country, which immediately returned to its allegiance.

ardanes meditates war against Armenia.

it is protected by the Romans.

Bardanes could not brook this diminution of his territorial power; but, availing himself of the peaceable condition to which his Kingdom was restored, he entered upon preparations for carrying war into Armenia, and for reannexing its Provinces to the Parthian Crown. Nor can there be any doubt that he would have succeeded in his undertaking, had not the Romans commanded him to refrain, and to permit their ally to enjoy his dominions undisturbed. Vibius Marsus, the Governor of Syria, was instructed to give him notice that, if he attempted to annoy Mithridates, he must expect an active war with the Senate and People of Rome; in whose name the Emperor was still accustomed to speak, when he wished to give weight and authority to his menaces. Bardanes was not in a condition to brave the displeasure of the Romans. His brother, having repented of the facility with which he had surrendered the Crown, and being invited by some powerful Chiefs to leave his place of retreat, had already at command a formidable army, with which he was about to advance to the frontiers.

arzes turns and ans the rn.

On this occasion the rival claims of the two Princes were decided by an appeal to arms. A bloody battle was fought on the banks of a river, which Tacitus calls Erindes; where Bardanes, gaining a decisive victory, thought it not enough to pursue and disperse the troops to which he had been opposed, but, following his advantages, made considerable conquests towards Hyrcania, and subdued several nations which, till that period, were strangers even to the Parthian name. Nor was the tide of his success checked in its current till his own people, fatigued by long marches in a desert land, and impatient to revisit their homes, made their murmurs meet his ears, and suggested to him the expediency of retracing his steps. Yielding to wishes, which when strongly expressed, were always regarded as the limits of prerogative to Parthian Kings, Bardanes satisfied himself with erecting monuments of his victorious career, on the banks of several distant streams; the names of which, as they are differently spelled, have failed to determine accurately their geographical situation. He was killed soon after his return, while engaged in the amusements of hunting, by a band of conspirators; who declared that they could no longer endure the pride and haughtiness with which the success of his arms had inspired him, nor the uncontrollable ascendancy to which he had risen by the destruction of so many enemies and rivals.*

Parthia.

From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

A battle is fought, in which Bardanes is successful.

The death of Bardanes gave new life to the hopes of his vanquished brother. Many were inclined to favour his views, and his restoration; but others, who had not yet forgotten his cruelties, gave their voices for Meherdates, son of Vonones, and grandson of Phraates, who was at that time at Rome in quality of a hostage. Gotarzes, who had the advantage of being present, carried the election; but instead of endeavouring to remove the bad impressions which his former tyrannical conduct had created, he continued to treat his subjects harshly and unjustly, and thereby excited against himself their warmest indignation. The friends of Meherdates found means to send to Rome, representing the miserable condition to which the Parthian people were reduced, and begging to have that Prince nominated by the Senate to fill the Throne of the Arsacidæ. They informed the Romans of the extent of their sufferings under Gotarzes; that he spared neither brothers, relations, nor strangers; that he murdered women with their husbands, and children with their fathers; while he himself, sunk in idleness and effeminacy, defeated in all his wars and despised by all good men, endeavoured to conceal his cowardice and shame by perpetrating deeds of the most wanton barbarity. They gave assurance that they had no intention to lift the standard of rebellion against their Royal house, nor to shake off their allegiance to the descendants of Arsaces; on the contrary, they were come to request that a Prince of that ancient and revered stock might be set over them, in the room of the tyrant Gotarzes, who had become insupportable to the Nobles, and to the People. Our nation, they concluded, has long been added to your Empire; and it behoves you to

On the death of Bardanes Gotarzes reascends the Throne.

U. C. 801. — A. D. 48.

The Parthians seek a new King at Rome.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xi. 9. Dion Cassius, lix.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xi. 10.

History. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

assist allies, whose forces might perhaps rival your own in number, and in bravery; but who, out of respect, willingly allow you the preeminence. We give you the sons of our Kings as hostages, with the view that when we happen to be ill governed, we may have recourse to the Emperor and Senate, and receive from them Sovereigns trained under their wisdom, used to their manners, and therefore more worthy to reign.*

Claudius, who was present at this conference, took upon himself to answer the Parthian Deputies. He began by extolling the greatness of the Roman power, the generosity of the maxims upon which his Government was conducted, and the value which he put upon the sincere homage which they had just rendered to the majesty of the Senate. Comparing himself to Augustus, he assured them that their just request should be complied with; and, turning to Meherdates, he entreated him not to imagine that he was called to govern a high spirited people, as a master rules over his domestic slaves. Let the Parthians find in you a protector and a fellow citizen; and consider that your justice and clemency will render you so much the more respected by them, as these are virtues unknown to barbarians.† He likewise admonished the Deputies to exercise forbearance towards their Kings, for that frequent changes in this respect, were always attended with hurtful consequences to a State. Be not surprised, he exclaimed, that I give you this disinterested advice. Rome, satiated with glory and conquests, has attained such a pitch of superiority, that she is glad to see peace, happiness, and confidence, prevail in all other nations.

Meherdates is sent to Parthia.

And enters into a war with Gotarzes.

The care of conducting the new King to the frontiers of his country, was intrusted to Calus Cassius, the Governor of Syria. Cassius, who was a prudent and very able commander, invited the Parthian Nobility to meet him at Zeugma, and delivered to them their youthful Sovereign, addressing to him at the same time, the following judicious observations: that it was characteristic of all people in a low state of civilisation to be very ardent at the beginning of an enterprise, but that if they were not immediately led into action, they soon cooled, and the zeal which animated them in favour of the cause that they may have happened to have espoused, was apt to change into perfidy and treason. He advised him, therefore, not to lose a moment, but to advance against the enemy with the utmost despatch.

Meherdates unfortunately did not listen to this sage admonition. He was young and fond of pleasure, and could not allow himself to believe that the moment he became a King, it behoved him to enter upon a system of mortification. He accepted of entertainments, and indulged in Royal pageantry, while Gotarzes, in the meantime, was making the greatest exertions to meet him in the field of battle on more than equal terms. Carrhenes, the General of Meherdates, prevailed upon him at length to join the army; and crossing the Tigris, they reduced Nineveh, a city which had risen upon the ruins of that destroyed by Arbaces, and took the celebrated Arbela, where the Sceptre of Persia was wrested from the hand of Darius. Being reinforced by the junction of a body of troops under Izates of Adiabenum, they proceeded in search of Gotarzes, eager to bring his pretensions to the determination of a battle.

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

The deposed Monarch, whose military strength was inferior to that of his rival, remained on the opposite side of a river, to which Tacitus gives the name Corma, and continued to decline the challenge by which his caution had been repeatedly insulted. Meanwhile he practised, by means of his agents, on the wavering fidelity of Abgarus the Edessan, and of Izates, who appears never to have been hearty in the cause of his new ally; and at length succeeded in seducing these barbarians from the camp of Meherdates, to augment the number of his own. This Prince, fearing a still more extensive desertion, pressed the enemy to battle more vigorously than ever; and Gotarzes, whose courage recent events had materially increased, did not think it expedient any longer to decline it. The two armies, accordingly, were led forth to action, when a most bloody and obstinate conflict ensued. The brave Carrhenes is said to have performed prodigies of valour, and to have cut down or put to flight all who presented themselves before his disciplined ranks; but allowing his ardour to carry him too far in pursuit of the fugitives, he was ultimately surrounded and slain. With this able General perished all the hopes of Meherdates; who, trusting to a traitor, was soon after sold into the hands of Gotarzes, a prisoner, and in chains. The conqueror, indeed, saved his life; but ordering his ears to be cut off, he condemned him to a miserable captivity*

Meherdates is defeated.

A. D. 49.

Gotarzes did not long enjoy the fruits of his victory. According to Tacitus, he sank under the infirmities of nature; but Josephus relates, that he again provoked a conspiracy among his subjects, whose resentment brought to a close at once his reign and his life. He was succeeded by Vonones, the Governor of Media, who is supposed to have been his brother. The annals of this latter Prince are short and undistinguished by any great events; and, in truth, he is only known to History as having transmitted the Parthian Sceptre from Gotarzes to his own son, whose name was Vologeses.

Gotarzes succeeded by Vonones and Vologeses.

Soon after this youthful Monarch had ascended the Throne, a revolution took place in Armenia; of which the Parthians determined so far to avail themselves, as to revive their former claims to the Crown of that country. Mithridates, raised to the sovereignty by the arms of his brother Pharasmanes, and supported by the influence of Rome, had, during many years, exercised his authority among the Armenians in the utmost harmony and esteem. Nor was his repose at length disturbed either by internal disaffection or by foreign hostility. His troubles, on the contrary, arose altogether from the ambition of a nephew, the eldest son of the King of Iberia; who, impatient of the condition of a subject, had resolved to supplant either his father or his uncle. Pharasmanes, it is said, in order to find employment for the restless spirit of this young man, whose name was Rhadamistus, encouraged his views upon Armenia; reminding him that he himself had driven out the

Claims of Parthia to the Crown of Armenia.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xii. 11.

† Ibid. *Ut non dominationem et servos, sed rectorem et cives cogitaret; clementiamque ac justitiam, quanto ignara barbaris, tanto toleratiora capesseret.*

* Tacit. *Ann.* xii. 14. Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii.

History. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 813. — A. D. 64.

Parthians and given it to Mithridates, and that, therefore, he, his son, was only claiming a right which might not improperly be conceived to belong to the elder branch of their family. The crafty Iberian, however, concluded by exhorting his son to exhaust all the resources of intrigue, before he should bear arms against so near a relative, and a distinguished member of their Royal house.

The artful youth took up his residence at the Court of Mithridates, under pretence that he had been compelled to leave his father's presence, on account of a quarrel, originating in the wiles of his step-mother; and being well received at Artaxata, where no one suspected his base intentions, he found means to sow the seeds of disaffection, and even to form a party sufficiently strong to encourage him to adopt the ulterior measures, of which he had never for a moment lost sight. Supplied with troops from Iberia, he attacked his uncle; who having had no reason to suspect this horrible treachery, was totally destitute of all means of defence, and had scarcely time to secure a retreat to the strong castle of Gorneas, in which the Romans usually maintained a garrison.

The arts of Rhadamistus against his uncle Mithridates.

The siege of such a place, conducted by Iberians, must have been protracted sufficiently long to give time to the Governor of Syria to relieve the garrison and restore Mithridates, had not Cælius Pollio, who commanded in Gorneas, insisted on a capitulation, and delivered up the fugitive King into the hands of his unpriacipled nephew. Rhadamistus, after practising much vile hypocrisy, and violating the most sacred oaths, at length gave orders to deprive his uncle of life; and having, in this way, removed all obstacles to the fulfilment of his nefarious scheme, sat down on the Throne of Armenia, in defiance alike of the Romans, who protested against his elevation, and of the Parthians, who were already preparing their arms to expel him from it.*

The latter taken and put to death.

U. C. 804. — A. D. 51.

The conduct of the usurper could not fail to awaken the resentment and call forth the remonstrances of the Roman Governor in Syria. Numidius Quadratus therefore held a Council of the chief officers of the army, to consult what, in such circumstances, ought to be done. But the virtuous pride of the citizens of Rome had already given way to low maxims of policy, which placing a higher value upon interest than upon reputation, led them to find a solace for their injured honour in the weakness which Civil war spread among their enemies. It was therefore resolved, that the Government of Syria should connive at the ruin of their ally, and the accession of an usurper in Armenia; and that the Proconsul in Cappadocia should carry his complaisance so far as to witness the ceremony of the coronation, and thereby give the sanction of the Roman name to one of the most flagrant acts of perfidy that had ever disgraced the ambition of an Eastern tyrant. To counteract, in some degree, the effects of this unworthy proceeding, Quadratus sent one of his Lieutenants, Helvidius Priscus, at the head of a legion, with orders to vindicate the Roman character, and to redress all the just complaints of the Armenian prople. But the Parthians were already on their march to chastise the insolence of Rhadamistus, and to deprive him of a Throne which he had so iniquitously obtained; and accordingly, when Priscus found that he was likely to come into collision with the army of Vologeses, with whom the Romans wished to avoid all pretext for war, he suggested the propriety of being recalled into Syria.

Conduct of the Romans.

It was the intention of the Parthian King to place his brother Tiridates on the Throne of Armenia; for which purpose he led against Rhadamistus a chosen body of troops, before the latter could materially strengthen his interests among the Nobles, or reconcile to his violent accession the affections of the people. The barbarous Iberians, unacquainted with regular warfare, fled in consternation upon the first approach of the Parthian horsemen; and had not the severities of an early winter favoured their desultory mode of fighting, and created want and sickness in the camp of Vologeses, the conquest of Armenia would have rewarded the labours of the first campaign. The Parthians retired, and Rhadamistus returned to his Capital; where he gave vent to his suspicions and revenge in acts of the most savage cruelty, and in threatenings which seemed to compromise the lives and property of all his subjects. Alarmed and incensed, the populace of Artaxata accomplished what the Parthians had begun; for attacking the palace in which the despot resided, they barely allowed him time to save himself by flight, and to carry with him his favourite wife Zenobia, mounted on a swift horse. Zenobia was far advanced in pregnancy; but her dread of the pursuing enemy, and her attachment to her husband, induced her for a long time to support the sufferings to which she was exposed by the rapidity and violent motion of the horse. Overcome with pain and fatigue, she at length entreated Rhadamistus to save himself, and to free her, with his own hand, by an honourable death, from the disgrace of captivity. Distracted by love and jealousy, equally fearful of losing her himself, and of her falling into the possession of another, Rhadamistus awhile embraced and consoled her, and hesitated to commit the dreadful act which she persisted to solicit; at length drawing his scimitar he struck the blow, and threw her into the Araxes, in order that even her lifeless body might escape from captivity. He then again put his horse at full speed, and reached his asylum in Iberia. Meantime Zenobia floated on the quiet waters, and was picked up with signs of remaining life, by some neighbouring shepherds. Her beauty and the dignity of her form, assured them she was no vulgar prize, and they bound her wounds, and watched her till they were healed. On learning her name and condition they bore her to Artaxata, where Tiridates received her with that courtesy and distinction which was justly due to the nobility of her birth, her courage, and her conjugal fidelity.*

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 813. — A. D. 64.

An attempt to place Tiridates on the Throne of Armenia.

The particulars of the war which followed between Rhadamistus and the Parthians, are not any where preserved in History; but it is ascertained, that upon the accession of Nero to the Throne of the Cæsars, intelligence was conveyed to Rome which left it no longer doubtful that the Generals of Vologeses had finally succeeded in making themselves masters of Armenia, as well as in securing the Crown to Tiridates, the brother of their Sovereign. To permit that Kingdom to remain under the direct influence of

The Romans interfere to prevent it.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xii. 44. Joseph. *Antiq.* 20. Velleius Paterculus. Dion Cassius, lx.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xii. 51.

History. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

Parthia, was contrary to one of the leading maxims of Roman policy, as applicable to their government of the Roman Provinces; on which account, the Ministers of the Roman Emperor advised him to make known to the Senate his fixt determination to augment his legions, and to despatch without delay an able Commander into Syria, with the view of recovering in the Armenian States that wonted ascendancy, which had been found indispensable to the safety of their Eastern dominions. Nero gave much satisfaction by making choice of Corbulo as the General who was to serve against the Parthians; while he afforded proof of similar wisdom and activity, by sending instructions, in the meantime, to Numidius Quadratus to complete the number of his cohorts, and to put his whole force in motion towards the frontiers of Armenia. In like manner, he forwarded requisitions to such of the tributary Kings as were in a condition to cooperate with the Governor of Syria; of which number were Antiochus, King of Commagena, and Agrippa the Younger, whom Claudius had first made King of Chalcidica, in the room of his uncle Herod, and afterwards promoted to the extensive Tetrarchies of Iturea and Abilænum. The same orders were given to Aristobulus, son of Herod, and to Sohemus; both of whom he had named Kings, the one of the Lesser Armenia, and the other of Sophena.*

Corbulo appointed to command in the Parthian war.

U. C. 807. — A. D. 54.

The war for which Nero made these judicious preparations, was prevented for a time by the revolt of Vardanes, the son of Vologeses; an event which compelled the Parthians to withdraw their army from Armenia, but without submitting to any formal relinquishment of their claims, either upon its Crown or territory. The Roman Senate, meanwhile, willing to gratify their young Emperor, decreed to him the honour of an Ovation; encouraged him to assume the Triumphal robe; and commanded that a statue of him should be erected in the Temple of Mars the Avenger, as large as that of the God of War himself.†

The Parthians give hostages, and profess to desire peace.

As the campaign, for the success of which these demonstrations of joy were made, was in fact yet to be begun, Corbulo set out for the East at the head of such an army, as raised his command to an equality with that of Quadratus. The latter General could not conceal the uneasiness which the presence of his colleague created in his mind; and the first step which he took in the negociation with Parthia, indicated his resolution to disown a divided authority, at least within the limits of his own Government, and to retain all the honour and responsibility which had always attached to his high office. He sent an embassy to Vologeses, exhorting him to prefer peace to war; to give hostages; and to pay, as his predecessors had usually done, a proper respect and deference to the Roman People. The Parthian, either to gain time, or to get rid of certain suspicious individuals near his Throne, made no hesitation to deliver as hostages some of the most illustrious persons belonging to the Royal family; and these were immediately intrusted to the Centurion Justeius, who, on this occasion had appeared on the behalf of the Governor Quadratus.

* Joseph. *Antiq. Ann.* xx. 3, 5. Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. 7. Dion Cassius, lx.

† Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. 8, 9.

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

No sooner was Corbulo informed of what had taken place, than he sent Arrius Varus, the Præfect of a Cohort, to demand that the hostages should be given in his name, and not in that of the Governor of Syria. To avoid the indecency of a dispute before the eyes of strangers, Varus and Justeius agreed to leave the question to the decision of the hostages themselves, and of the Parthian Envoys by whom they were accompanied. The preference was given to Corbulo; a slight at which Quadratus was greatly incensed, and which moreover seemed to threaten consequences so extremely detrimental to the public service, that Nero deemed it necessary to procure a decree of the Senate, setting forth in both their names, that in consequence of the important achievements performd by Corbulo and Quadratus, in common, the Emperor's fasces should be crowned with laurel. Soon after this occurrence, the latter officer, whose period of Government appears to have expired, was recalled to Rome, and the conduct of the Parthian war accordingly devolved altogether upon the more popular commander.

War renewed.

Two years passed away in comparative tranquillity, but amidst active preparations for war. It was suggested by the Romans, that in order to prevent the effusion of blood, Tiridates should consent to hold the Armenian Crown from the Emperor and Senate, and should disown all dependence upon the Court of Parthia. Vologeses, whose pride opposed itself to this arrangement, would not treat with his powerful enemies on the ground of such a concession; and choosing rather to abide by the determination of arms, strained every nerve to meet the threatened invasion with means so fully adequate to the emergency, as would put the vaunted skill of Corbulo to a severe test.

U. C. 811. — A. D. 58.

The commencement of hostilities was signalized by an advantage on the part of Tiridates. A Roman officer, who commanded a body of auxiliaries, tempted by the prospect of an easy victory, disobeyed the orders of Corbulo, and fought before a sufficient number of troops had arrived to support his attack. He was defeated with considerable loss, and thereby not only occasioned a deep mortification to the Proconsul, who saw the Roman Eagles disgraced by a Barbarian triumph, but also inspired the enemy with a degree of courage, which gave a formidable aspect to the character of the approaching war. Tiridates committed many outrages upon that party among the Armenians who were attached to the cause of Rome, ravaging their lands, and destroying their property; and it was not till Corbulo had appeared in full force at the head of his legions, that this Parthian robber took refuge in one of his strongest fortresses, and confessed the superiority of the enemy.*

A Roman officer engages without permission, and is defeated.

Preparations of Corbulo.

To disarm the vengeance of the Romans, the Iberian King Pharasmanes put to death his son Rhadamistus, who had recently usurped the Armenian Throne, and deposed his uncle Mithridates, and was now cooperating with the Governor of Syria against the brother of Vologeses. Other Chiefs of Provinces likewise volunteered to signalize their fidelity to Rome, and their hatred of the Parthians; while an insurrection of the Hyrcanians occupied the arms of the latter so entirely, that Tiridates was obliged to trust in the meantime to his own resources, supplied by the confede-

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. 36.

rated Nobles of Armenia. In these circumstances, he attempted to delay the progress of the Romans by remonstrances and treaties; threatening, at one time, a coalition of all the Parthian States, and a catastrophe more fatal than that which annihilated the army of Crassus, and immediately afterwards proposing a conference, or suggesting the terms of an amicable accommodation.

He takes Artaxata and Tigranocerta.

At length Corbulo, after reducing several places of strength, advanced against Artaxata, the Capital, which he took and burned to the ground. For this exploit, performed by his General, Nero received the title of *Imperator*, and was loaded with all the other honours which could gratify the vanity of a thoughtless young man; the Senate decreed public thanksgivings to the Gods, and to the Prince Triumphal Arches, Statues, and Consulships for several years to come. But Corbulo, less anxious to share in these honours than to deserve them, prosecuted his victories in Armenia until he had taken Tigranocerta, and subdued all opposition to the authority of Rome. The most formidable enemies with which he had to contend were hunger and fatigue; the country being for the most part wild and uncultivated, and all its magazines having been destroyed by the partizans of Tiridates. The armies of Parthia scarcely ever appeared in the field. Vologeses left his brother to his fate; and at the end of two years the territory as well as the Crown of Armenia were at the disposal of the conquerors.*

Tigranes made King of Armenia. U. C. 814. — A. D. 60.

Nor was it long before Nero determined to exercise the rights of victory and nominate a Sovereign. The person he selected for this high honour was Tigranes, a descendant of Herod the Great, and of Archelaus, formerly King of Cappadocia. Tacitus speaks of him with very little respect; saying, that while he lived as a hostage at Rome, he was fawning, cringing, and remarkable for very low inclinations. His reception by the Armenians was by no means general or unanimous. They could not be induced to forget the claims of the valiant House of Arsaces, whose manly characters threw into the shade the effeminate qualities of the degenerate Idumean; and the greater part submitted to be ruled for a time by this contemptible Monarch, only in order that they might be delivered from the scourge of war, and from the haughty domination of the Parthians. To defend the person, or to grace the dignity of Tigranes, the Roman General placed under his command a thousand legionary soldiers, three cohorts of auxiliaries, and six hundred horsemen; and having, in this manner, settled the affairs of Armenia, Corbulo retired into the Syrian Province, of which he had recently been appointed the Governor.†

Vologeses prepares for war to restore his brother Tiridates. U. C. 816. — A. D. 62.

The peace which was thus established did not prove of long duration. No sooner was Armenia evacuated by the Romans, than Vologeses resumed his favourite plans for its subjugation, and for the annexation of its Crown to the honours of his family. Still the terror of Corbulo's name might have deterred him from this enterprise, had not the insulting conduct of the new King proved beyond all doubt, that with such a neighbour, acting as the instrument of a great foreign Power, the independence of Parthia itself could not be deemed secure.‡ Tigranes had already in a hostile manner entered Adiabenum, a country under the protection of Vologeses, and was laying it waste with every circumstance of cruelty and contempt. The Parthian Nobles were particularly incensed, not only because a friendly State had been unjustly attacked, but because the Romans had employed for that purpose a fawning, low-minded slave, whose insolence was only equalled by his notorious cowardice. The King of Adiabenum added his complaints to those of the Nobles; while Tiridates used with his brother every argument that shame, ambition, or revenge, could render efficacious in the Royal breast. Vologeses, who required no persevering importunity to induce him to draw the sword, assembled a National Council; and setting forth in their hearing the injuries inflicted upon Parthia, by the unprincipled aggressions of the Romans, and also the just pretensions of Tiridates as a descendant and heir of the renowned founder of their House, he proceeded in their presence to the ceremony of coronation; then, placing on the head of the future Sovereign of Armenia a magnificent diadem, he pledged the support of his arms, and the concurrence of all the Grandees of his Kingdom, in favour of the attempt which the latter was about to make for the restoration of his rights.*

In pursuance of this resolution, Vologeses gave the command of an army to Monæses, one of the most illustrious men in Parthia, with orders to drive Tigranes from the Province of Adiabenum, and afterwards to attack him in Armenia; promising that he himself, as soon as he could make up his quarrel with the Hyrcanians, would collect all the forces of his Kingdom, and fall upon Corbulo in the heart of Syria.

Wise measures of Corbulo.

But the Roman Governor was not to be taken by surprise. The designs of Vologeses, as well as his whole plan of operations, were made known to him, and he left no means unemployed to thwart and ultimately to defeat them. He sent two legions, under the direction of Verulanus Severus and Victius Bolanus, to assist Tigranes: he encamped his own legions along the borders of the Euphrates; raised troops among the provincials for guarding the remoter frontiers; built forts, and secured ample supplies of provisions and water. It was not his design to continue the exposure of his own fame or the blood of his soldiers for the sake of a Monarch whom he could not respect, and whose interests, in reference to the Roman power, he did not value so highly as to justify any extensive hazard of life or reputation. In consequence of these views, he instructed the two Lieutenants whom he sent into Armenia, to avoid all unnecessary risks, and to act chiefly on the defensive.†

Retreat of Monæses.

Monæses in the meantime had effected the invasion of Armenia, and compelled Tigranes to shut himself up in the strongest city of his Kingdom. The Parthians, whose troops consisted almost entirely of mounted archers, were ill qualified to conduct a siege. The Adiabenians who attempted to scale the walls were repulsed; and as the forage on the ground was completely destroyed by a flock of locusts, Monæses perceived the necessity of retiring from the neighbourhood of Tigranocerta.

Corbulo, who still wished to shun the alternative of war, wrote to Vologeses that, as the Parthians had

* Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. 24. † Ibid. xiv. 25.
‡ Ibid. xv. 1.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 2, 3. † Ibid. xv. 4.

History. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

committed hostilities against an ally of Rome, he should be reluctantly compelled to enter their territories at the head of his army, unless the King gave orders to his General to raise the siege, and to abstain from all acts of annoyance in respect to Tigranes. It is probable that the Roman commander availed himself of this opportunity to suggest to the Parthian Sovereign, that the war might be brought to a close, and Armenia restored to his brother, provided the latter would consent to receive the investiture of it from the Senate. We find, at least, in the reply which Vologeses made to Corbulo, that he was willing to send ambassadors to the Roman Emperor to request Armenia from him; and that upon so receiving it, he would be ready to conclude a firm and lasting peace. At the same time, he ordered Monæses to withdraw his troops from Tigranocerta; while he himself retired into the centre of his own dominions.*

Negociation.

Abdication of Tigranes.

It would appear that, preparatory to the cession of Armenia, Tigranes resigned the Crown and left the country, for neither his name, nor his pretensions, are introduced into any of the transactions which follow. But Tiridates was not yet to be elevated to the Throne which was thus vacated for him. The Ambassadors returned from Rome with an unfavourable answer; the Senate refused to accede to the proposal made by Vologeses; and the Parthians, accordingly, resolved to renew the war with increased strength and vigour.

Pætus appointed to command in Armenia.

Corbulo had suggested that Armenia ought to be made a separate command for a Roman General, as Syria was exposed to great inconvenience from the frequent absence of its Governors. Cæsennius Pætus was chosen for that appointment; and it was perhaps owing to the desire which he felt to distinguish himself in so important a Province, that greater pains were not taken to prevent a renewal of hostilities. He crossed the Euphrates and entered Armenia, without allowing his resolution to be shaken by any of those incidental occurrences which his soldiers regarded as bad omens. Finding that the Parthians had taken possession of Tigranocerta, he determined to recover that valuable strong-hold; and with this view he advanced into the country, laying waste the cities and the fields, and reducing a number of inferior stations which had served for magazines and military stores. His devastations were first felt by his own army; and the cold of winter adding its rigour to the pressure of want, Pætus could not resist the necessity of relinquishing his conquests, and of returning into a milder and more fruitful land.†

His panic.

Early in the following Spring the Parthian cavalry descended upon the Romans, while they were still scattered in their winter quarters, and quite unprepared for the combined movements of a campaign. Pætus had scarcely time to despatch three thousand chosen men to occupy the principal passes of Mount Taurus, and to station his Pannonian horsemen in the adjoining plain, when his situation became so extremely critical, that he sent a messenger to Corbulo, to beg the assistance of his legions, and of his military experience. But Vologeses made greater haste than the Governor of Syria. He formed a passage over the bodies of the three thousand warriors, whom Pætus had sent to oppose his march, and dispersed the Pannonian cavalry by means of his overwhelming squadrons. The wounded returned to the camp, where they spread the panic with which their defeat had inspired them. They exaggerated the valour of the King of Parthia, the prodigious numbers and ferocity of the nations which followed him; and they found their auditors equally ready to believe, and to adopt the impression of terror which their narrative conveyed. Even the commander himself despaired of a successful resistance. His only resource was in Corbulo; to whom he wrote again in the most pressing terms, entreating him to hasten instantly to save the standards of the legions, and the remains of an unfortunate army.*

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

That cautious and warlike Governor at length began his march, carrying with him a large supply of provisions, and a powerful reinforcement of excellent troops. The road by which he advanced was covered with fugitives, who represented to him in the strongest colours the miserable condition of their fellow soldiers, and intreated permission to place themselves under his command. He rejected the services of men who could abandon their Eagles when menaced by an insolent enemy; and ordered them to return and solicit their General's pardon, and to assure him of a speedy succour.

The approach of Corbulo stimulated the impatience of the Parthian King, and gave vigour to his measures. He urged the Romans to leave their camp, and try their fortune in the field; he attacked them in their entrenchments; cut off their supplies; and threatened them, if they did not speedily surrender, with all the horrors and carnage of a final assault. Pætus desired a conference with Vologeses, which the latter declined; thinking that he condescended sufficiently to a defeated General by treating with him through one of the commanders of his guards, whose name was Vasaces. After much discussion, the articles of capitulation were concluded in the presence of Monobazes the King of Adiabenum, to the following effect: that all hostilities should cease on both sides; that the Roman troops should evacuate Armenia; that the fortresses with the provisions and military stores, should be delivered up to the Parthians; after which Vologeses was to send an embassy to Nero, to consult respecting the final settlement of the Crown and country. The Parthians, according to Tacitus, required, in addition to these terms, that the Romans should build for them a bridge over the river Arsanis which watered their camp. Pætus complied; pretending, however, in order to conceal his shame, that he built it for his own use, though the route which he took betrayed his humiliation, and confirmed the report of his secret engagement.†

Pætus is compelled to surrender.

As Tacitus observes, the Treaty in itself was sufficiently shameful to the Romans; but fame still farther increased the ignominy by asserting that they were actually put under the yoke. It does not appear indeed that the Parthians abused their victory so far; but the Armenians, whose national feelings had been greatly insulted, rushed into the camp before the Romans had time to leave it; and drawing up their troops along the roads by which the vanquished army was to retire, they seized upon all the slaves and pro-

And aggravates the shame of the Treaty.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 5. † Ibid.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 8. † Ibid. xv. 11. Velleius Paterculus.

party which they chose to call their own: They even proceeded to strip and disarm the soldiers, whose spirits were so much depressed, and whose pride was so completely subdued, that they were willing to bear any thing but the face of an enemy.*

treat of e Romans great pa- and dis- ace.

The Romans retreated with a precipitation so extraordinary, that they marched forty miles in one day; leaving behind their sick and wounded, and betraying such other marks of terror and insubordination, as denoted clearly that they had ceased to feel either the authority of their General, or the respect which was due to their own characters. Tacitus relates, that when they abandoned their camp, they left magazines full of all kinds of provisions and stores; while the Parthians, on the other hand, were so distressed for want of forage, that they were on the point of raising the blockade, and of retiring from Armenia; knowing that the legions under the command of the Syrian Governor, were already at no greater distance than a march of three days.

rbulo acks e pursuit the Par- ians.

Corbulo had reached the Euphrates when he met the fugitives of Pætus's army. The soldiers, who were advancing under the standards of Syria, with the hope of relieving their comrades from the disgrace of surrendering to Barbarians, wept aloud when they beheld the miserable plight of their countrymen, disarmed and dejected, and exhibiting in their looks the sullen despair of cowards who have run away from the field of battle. The salutation of the two commanders was short and unfriendly, each accusing the other as the author of the ignominy which had befallen the arms of Rome. Pætus, it is said, urged Corbulo to return with him into Armenia, which was left defenceless by the Parthians; but the latter, finding that his unfortunate colleague had pledged the faith of his country that no Roman soldier should enter that Kingdom until the opinion of Nero, in regard to the Treaty, could be obtained, refused to accede to a proposal so utterly unworthy of his rank and fame. The Governor, accordingly, returned into Syria, and Pætus formed his winter-camp in the Province of Cappadocia.†

egocia- ons re- ewed.

In this situation of affairs, Vologeses and Corbulo renewed their negociations respecting the tenure of Armenia, as a Roman dependency; the King of Parthia having expressed his willingness to permit his brother to wear the Crown of that country, in virtue of an investiture by the Roman Emperor. To pave the way for this accommodation, Corbulo dismantled the forts which he had built on the eastern banks of the Euphrates; while the other consented to withdraw all his troops from Armenia, and to preserve a strict neutrality.

l Am- adors to e. C. 17. — D. 8.

The Ambassadors of Vologeses, on their arrival in Rome, assured the Senate that their Sovereign desired nothing beyond a firm and lasting peace. They added, that Tiridates would not refuse to repair to that city, to receive the Crown of Armenia, if he were not prevented by the Order of Priesthood which he had just received; but that, at all events, he would go to the Roman camp, and there, before the Eagles and the images of the Emperor, and in the presence of the legions, take possession of the Kingdom.‡

The narrative of the Ambassadors, who did not omit to mention the capitulation and retreat of Pætus, opened the eyes of the Senate to the real state of things in the East. It appeared to the leading persons in the Government to be nothing better than a solemn piece of mockery, to grant the investiture of a Kingdom, which had been wrested out of their hands by force of arms. For this reason they advised the Emperor to renew the war with Parthia, and to intrust the management of it to the tried courage and zeal of Corbulo. The Ambassadors were accordingly dismissed without receiving a distinct or favourable answer; but the presents with which they were gratified, indicated the good intentions of the Imperial Ministers; and it was moreover intimated to them that, if Tiridates came in person to solicit what he desired, his request would not be refused.*

The Roman commander consents to an interview with Tiridates.

That Corbulo might devote his whole attention to the war with Vologeses, he was relieved from the administration of Syria; the Government of that Province being assigned to Cestius, an officer of respectable talents and reputation. Though the hopes of peace were not relinquished entirely on either side, active preparations were made by both for a vigorous campaign. The Parthians never regarded Corbulo as an implacable enemy, nor as one who would plunge his country into a hazardous war, merely for the sake of the glory or wealth which he might happen to derive from its successful issue. On this account they resolved, before matters were carried to any degree of extremity, to send messengers to the Roman camp, with the view of asking advice relative to the main question about which two mighty nations were buckling on their armour; and to ascertain whether the evils of war might not yet be prevented by an amicable recourse to negociation, on the basis formerly established during the conference at Rome. Corbulo entered so far into their wishes, as to consent to an interview with Tiridates, and even to send two hostages to the Parthian camp, to answer for the safety of the Prince's person.

Ceremonial which followed, and resignation of the Armenian Crown.

We are indebted to Tacitus for a minute account of the final ceremonial to which this interview was preparatory. The Parthian cavalry, with the standards used by that nation, was drawn up in squadrons, on the one side; on the other, the Roman legions were marshalled in order of battle, displaying their Eagles and other military ensigns. The statues of the Gods were so arranged as to form a circular Temple; in the middle of which a mound of turf was raised, whereon was placed a curule chair, supporting the image of Nero. This emblem of Imperial majesty was approached by Tiridates with every token of veneration and respect; and after offering up sacrifice, the Prince solemnly took the diadem from his head, and laid it at the feet of the statue. A shout from the two armies sanctioned the peaceful nature of the ceremony; and the whole ended with a magnificent entertainment.†

Tiridates consents to go to Rome for investiture.

Having thus divested himself of Regal power and rank, it remained for Tiridates to undertake a journey to Rome, in order to receive from the hand of the Emperor the Crown of Armenia, together with all the rights and securities which the Roman People and Senate could confer. Vologeses, whose consent to all these formalities had been previously obtained, wrote

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. † Ibid. xv. 15—17.
‡ Ibid. xv. 24.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 25. † Ibid. xv. 29.

History. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

to Corbulo, desiring that nothing might be exacted of his brother, which should savour the least of servitude or meanness; that he might be allowed to wear his sword, and be admitted to the salute by all Governors of Provinces; that he should not be required to wait in their antechambers; and that he should receive at Rome all the honours usually conferred upon Consuls.*

Being of the Magian Order, Tiridates found some difficulty in submitting to the necessity of crossing from Asia to Europe by water; his Religion inculcating the utmost sanctity in regard to that element, as well as to the principle of fire. After a tedious procession of nine months, accompanied by an immense retinue of military and of domestic attendants, this descendant of the victorious Arsaces touched the Italian soil, as a vassal of the Roman Empire.

Meets Nero at Naples.

Nero was at Naples when the Parthian Prince arrived; and it was the pleasure of the Emperor that their first interview should take place in that scene of Imperial dissipation. Tiridates, having paid the customary obeisance to his lord paramount, had no longer any reason to bewail the excess of ceremony or restraint; for Nero, who at all times despised decorum, seemed on this occasion to give his attention to no other objects, either at Naples or on the way to Rome, but such as might entertain his Royal guest, and relieve his mind from the painful sense of superiority.

Ceremony of installation exhibited in the Forum.

The great ceremony of installation took place in the *Forum*, the area of which was filled with an innumerable multitude of people ranked according to their several Tribes, arrayed in white robes, with crowns of laurel upon their heads. The Prætorian cohorts, with burnished arms and glittering standards, were drawn up in military order. The roofs of the houses were covered with spectators; and, as all this pageantry was arranged before the break of day, Nero made his appearance at a very early hour, attended by the Senate and his guards, and clothed in a most gorgeous Triumphal robe. Having taken his seat in the curule chair, he awaited the approach of Tiridates; who, advancing with his train, between double ranks of soldiers, went up to the presence of the Emperor and

Speech of Tiridates.

knelt before him. Upon this, the shout of the people was so astounding, that Tiridates, who did not expect it, was somewhat discomposed; at length, recovering his presence of mind, he is said to have addressed Nero in the following words. "Though I am the descendant of Arsaces, and brother to the King, and Vologeses, and Pacorus, I own myself your slave. You are my God, and I am come to adore you as I adore the Sun. My destiny is to be determined by your supreme and omnipotent will, for I depend on you as on Fate and Fortune."

Parthia. From U. C. 701. — B. C. 53. to U. C. 818. — A. D. 64.

Nero made a reply in a style neither more becoming in itself, nor at all suited to his high office and ceremonial in which he was engaged. "What your father could not leave you, and what your brothers, when they had given it to you, could not defend, my munificence is pleased to grant and to confirm. I make you King of Armenia, that the whole Universe may know that it belongs to me to give Crowns, and to take them away, according to my sovereign pleasure." Upon pronouncing these inflated sentences, he placed the diadem on the head of Tiridates, who was sitting at his feet; an act which was immediately followed by the thundering acclamations of the army, and of the assembled people.*

Reply of Nero.

Games and festivities.

The Games and feasts which ensued were magnificent beyond description, and could not fail to alarm the temperance of the Royal Priest on whose account they were given. To crown the festivity, and to exhaust all his powers of pleasing, Nero condescended to display his personal accomplishments as a musician and horseman. He appeared on the stage in the presence of his vassal; after which he exhibited in the Circus his various attainments in the management of a courser, having exchanged the Imperial robe for a green jacket, and a postillion's cap. In return for this amusement, he importuned Tiridates for some of the magical arts which the Eastern sages were supposed to cultivate; but finding that the mysteries of his Priesthood were confined to certain speculative tenets respecting the origin and constitution of things, and had no controul over the fortunes of mankind, he abstained from any farther attempt to gratify his curiosity. Being again saluted *Imperator* for his glorious victories in Parthia, he concluded the scene by proceeding in great pomp to the Capitol, carrying a branch of laurel; and assuming on this slender ground, the merit of having given peace to the whole world, he issued solemn orders to shut the gates of the Temple of Janus.†

Peaceful relations with Parthia till reign of Trajan.

From this period the amicable relations of Rome and Parthia continued uninterrupted till the reign of Trajan; when a dispute about Armenia again involved the interests of the Empire, and induced the Roman Emperor to march at the head of his legions to the borders of the Euphrates.

* Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 31, 32.

* Dion Cassius, *Epit.* Suet. *Ner.* 13.
† Dion Cassius, *Epit.*

LUCIUS ANNÆUS SENECA.—THE STOICAL PHILOSOPHY.

CYNICS.	ANTISTHENES..... BORN B. C.	420.
	DIOGENES.....	414.
	ONESICRITUS, MONIMUS, CRATES, } CONTEMPORARIES WITH DIOGENES.	
STOICS.	ZENO.....	362.
	CLEANTHES	320.
	CHRYSIPPUS	280.
	PANÆTIUS .....DIED	236.
	POSIDONIUS .....BORN	135.
	SENECA.....BORN	8.
	DION PRUSÆUS, CONTEMPORARY WITH SENECA.	
	EPICTETUS, ...DIED A. D.	161.
	MARCUS AURELIUS BEGAN TO REIGN.....	170.

Biography. From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

Progress of Philosophy in Rome.

In postponing the consideration of the Stoical Philosophy to the period of the Roman Empire, we have at once referred it to the people to whose disposition and character it was in its nature best adapted, and to that period in their history in which it was most successfully cultivated. In the early days of the Republic many glorious examples of Stoical virtue were displayed; and Cicero, in illustrating the paradoxes of the Sect, reverts with patriotic triumph to those memorable instances of practical Stoicism. But such developements of character were rather the result of natural temperament, operated upon by circumstances, than the effect of system or discipline. It was at a later period that the Stoical Philosophy may be said to have truly flourished at Rome; after the literature of Greece had been introduced, and when, according to the habits of individuals, or the temper of the times, the different systems of Philosophy prevailed in succession. The manliness of the Roman character, for a long time gave the preference to the doctrines of the Porch. Pomponius, indeed, amidst the convulsions attending successive usurpations, cultivated the milder and more soothing sentiments of Epicurus; but the delicacy of his nature and of his studies was looked upon as scarcely of a Roman mould, and his Attic surname was but an ambiguous compliment to his refinement. Although the practice of Academic disputation captivated the youthful imagination of Cicero, and opened an attractive field for the display of his inexhaustible treasures of eloquence; yet the practical morality of the Stoics seems always to have commanded his respect, and to have had a latent ascendancy in his heart. It certainly advanced in his esteem in his declining years; and his Treatises on the Duties of life, and on the Paradoxes of the Stoics, show an affectionate anxiety to extricate a School, so eminent for virtuous practice, from some of its theoretical extravagances, and if possible to reconcile the dogmas of visionaries to the circumstances of society and the real exigencies of life.

icism parent toicism

The Stoical Philosophy, hardy and severe as it was in its discipline, traced its descent from a Sect still more austere and repulsive;* and though many of the writers in the Stoical School attempted to ingraft on it the doctrines of other Sects, as was the case with Seneca; or gave way to the suggestions of common sense and humanity, as may be instanced in Panætius and Antoninus; yet Stoicism, as such, always bore strong traces of its Cynical origin. It will be necessary, therefore, in developing the doctrines of the Porch, to premise a short account of the parent School, that of the Cynics.

Seneca.—The Stoical Philosophy From B. C. 420. to A: D. 170.

Antisthenes. B. C. 420

Antisthenes, the founder of this Sect, was born in the year 420 B. C. at Athens, of a Thracian mother. In his early youth he studied the art of Eloquence under Gorgias; but his admiration of the independence and severe morality of Socrates, induced him to quit the Rhetorician, that he might become a pupil of the Philosopher. That love of singularity and perverse ambition, which formed a remarkable trait in the character of Antisthenes, and which attempted to disguise itself under the show of mortification and peculiar homeliness of apparel, did not escape the observation of his new master. "I can spy," said he, "the wearer's pride peeping out through the holes of those ragged garments." It does not appear whether he quitted Athens on the occasion of the death of Socrates, as other disciples of that Philosopher did; but a sarcasm of his is recorded, as having contributed to accelerate the punishment of those who effected that judicial murder. Some foreigners, unapprised of the event, are said to have asked Antisthenes where they could find Socrates' house: he assured them that Socrates was not worth inquiring after, but that he could refer them to a far superior and more accomplished personage; and he directed them accordingly to the house of Anytus. Soon after his master's death, Antisthenes seems to have given full scope to the peculiarities of his own character; and whether he happened to select a place which had been previously called *the Dogs* from some incident now unknown,* or that he first obtained the name of Dog, and that the place was so called in honour of his Academy, certain it is, that he inveighed and scoffed in *Cynosarges;* and that his adherents and imitators were with great propriety termed Cynics, or the School of Barkers. Little more is known of

* *Ab Antisthene, qui patientiam et duritiam in Socratico sermone maxime adamârat, Cynici primum, deinde Stoici manârunt.* Cic. *de Or.* 3, 17; and Diog. Laer. vi. 103.

* Ἀντισθένης διελέγετο ἐν τῷ Κυνοσάργει γυμνάσιῳ μικρὸν ἔκτοθεν τῶν πυλῶν· ὅθεν τίνες καὶ τὴν Κυνικὴν φιλοσοφίαν φάσιν ἐντεῦθεν ὀνομασθῆναι. Diog. Laer. vi. 13.

Biography. From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

the particulars of his history. It cannot be doubted that his own conduct must have been irreproachable, and that he must have had a robust sort of satyrical wit, to have atoned for, and sanctioned, the absurdities and extravagances of his outward demeanour. He was a man in many respects superior to the generality of his followers. Instead of decrying Science and Literature, he was himself an author; and he is said to have left behind him ten volumes of his works, though they have all now perished. We learn from Cicero, that he maintained the unity of the Supreme being, in opposition to the Polytheism of the vulgar;* and that his writings were valuable, as monuments rather of his sagacity than of his erudition.† It is probable that some of the tales related of him by the followers of his School are mere fictions; and, in fact, only descriptions of a Cynical model, according to their own notions. It is not likely, for instance, that one, who himself had been a pupil of Socrates, and who was certainly a man of sense as well as humour, should have treated Diogenes, when he expressed himself willing to come under his tuition, as if he already had been really a dog; and should have done his best to beat him away with his large staff, and that the novice only prevailed by his resolute perseverance and endurance of honest blows.‡

Diogenes. B. C. 414.

Diogenes, as has been the case with many others, rushed from the one extreme of licentiousness to the contrary one of asceticism; and sought to retrieve the dissoluteness of his youth, by the mortification and moroseness of his later years. His temperament is represented by all writers, as fervid and enthusiastic; his humour was coarse, homely, and caustic; and the specimens of it which have been preserved, exhibit a tartness in which it is difficult to say whether the character of sagacity or of scurrility most predominates. His predecessor was, by constitution, hardy and temperate; and observation of the world had confirmed him in his opinion of the dangerous nature of the passions. His lectures, therefore, and declamations against Pleasure, were those of a humane, though an austere and rugged monitor. Diogenes, on the contrary, was of a nature altogether impetuous and excitable; his humour of restraint had as little relation to any rational purpose as his previous indulgences. He did not attempt to instruct, but professed to reprove others. He gave no lessons of prudence or severity; but disgorged his spleen, or envy, in bitter and insolent contumelies. His own uncomfortable feelings found vent in his taunts on all around him; and, by assuming a sort of misanthropy on principle, he furnished abundant exercise to all the malignity of his wit. Such satirists and ribalds, by profession, are perhaps necessary characters in the great theatre of the world, and may serve well as the antidotes to parasites and sycophants, but they have little claim to be canonized amongst Philosophers and Moralists.

The following are, perhaps, amongst the happiest of the recorded sarcasms uttered by this accredited scoffer:

He often found it necessary in life, he said, "to have ready an answer or a rope."

He was indignant at people for praying to the Gods for health, and at the same time doing what they could to destroy it by feasting.

Seneca.—The Stoics

Philosophy. From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

Calling out once, "Men, come hither;" and numbers flocking about him, he beat them all away with a stick, saying, "I called for men, and not varlets."

Dining one day at a common eating-house, he saw Demosthenes pass by, and invited him in. Demosthenes refusing, "What," said Diogenes, "should you be ashamed to dine here, when your master does so every day?"

"Against fortune," said he, "we must oppose courage; against nature, law; against passion, reason."

Being asked, what animals were the most dangerous in the bite? "Of wild animals," he replied, "a detractor; of tame, a flatterer."

Seeing some women hanged upon an olive-tree, "I wish," remarked he, "that all trees bore the same fruit!"

To one who reproached him with living in dirty and discreditable places, "The sun," replied he, "can shine upon kennels, without disparagement to himself!"

Upon seeing an old woman painted, he observed, "If you do this to gratify the living, you are mistaken in the effect; if it is for the dead, lose no time in joining them."

Onesicritus

Among the friends of Diogenes are mentioned Onesicritus, Monimus, and Crates; the first of these, however, did not continue in the School of the Cynics at Athens, but attended the army of Alexander the Great in his Indian expedition.

Monimus.

Monimus seems to have been possessed with much of the extravagance of his friend and model Diogenes; and a saying of his is preserved, which is at once very suitable to his character as a man of lively and changeful impressions, and very remarkable as containing the germ of the Sceptical system. It is recorded to have been his doctrine, that there is no such thing as reality; but that all objects are the conceptions and creations of our own mind producing fantastic illusions, or semblances of external objects; and that the whole is but a dream or show.

Crates.

Crates was a Philosopher of a very different cast, and seems to have aimed at moral instruction under the guise of levity and petulance. He was not at all of a Saturnine complexion; but made it his aim to give much oblique reproof, and to qualify many salutary but offensive reflections, with the appearance of ridicule and humour. The real good nature and kindness of his purpose were duly appreciated by his fellow citizens; and whilst he was admired by strangers for his festive wit, and for the poignancy and vivacity of his sallies, he was frequently used as an umpire by his fellow townsmen in their mercantile or family disputes; and his good sense and impartiality gave authority to his verdicts. He was the last, and, with the exception, perhaps, of Antisthenes, the most creditable teacher in the School of derision; and, indeed, his good sense and his constitutional vivacity seem so much to have modified his character, that if he was a Cynic by system and profession, he was in practice such a Philosopher as might have belonged to any age, and as any School might have been proud to own.

Such was the course of the Cynical School among the Greeks. Its prevailing characters were a contempt of Pleasure, a disregard to the distinctions of society, and an utter insensibility to decorum.

* *De nat. Deor.* i. 13.
† *Ad Att.* xii. 38.
‡ Hieron. *adv. Jovin.*

Biography. From B. C 420. to A. D. 170.

Review of the Cynical doctrines.

With regard to Pleasure, moralists of all sects have concurred in admitting, that it is not, in its vulgar sense, to be made an ultimate object of pursuit; that first impressions are to be distrusted; and that mere prudence and self-regard will point out the superiority of the intellectual and moral enjoyments, over the mere gratifications of sense; and that it is an equally gross fallacy in calculation, as it is a deviation from propriety, to prefer a personal pleasure to a social duty. But it is surely a strange error to suppose that Pleasure, as such, must be an object of aversion to rational beings. When limited by prudence as to ourselves, and by a proper regard to the rights of Society, a gratification of our own desires, and a sympathy in the enjoyments of others, are things innocent and commendable. Asceticism and mortification, for the sake of misery without any reference to utility, are the virtues of a misanthropic disposition or of a deranged intellect.

As to the distinctions of society, the Cynics of antiquity showed much more of spleen than sense, in their insolent disregard of them. Industry can never be encouraged effectually without permanent security to property; nor can any means be devised for giving such security which will not, in the end, produce an unequal distribution of wealth. Differences in the conditions of men are inevitable; as long as there are differences in their capacities, the degree of exertion which they employ, and the extent of their industry. The accumulation of wealth and the rights of inheritance, cannot be prevented or interfered with, without reducing the *bonus* of industry, and taking away the stimulants to exertion. Orders which are not open to merit, and privileges which benefit particular classes to the oppression of the community, are indeed abuses which should be removed wherever they exist; but some distinction of classes is inevitable in the course of national advancement: abilities and services must procure power and consideration, and wealth will always command influence. The Cynics, who derided these arrangements in society, did not so much exhibit any magnanimity of character, as they exposed their ignorance and contracted views. In their indiscriminate scoffing at what they termed Ambition, they little perceived how much they injured the cause of Virtue, by repressing every spirited exertion, by extinguishing the flame of worthy emulation, by deadening that enthusiasm without which nothing good and great was ever accomplished. Whilst they decried Vanity, they rooted up at the same time much of that regard for the feelings and opinions of others; much of that social affection, which is in some instances the guarantee of propriety, as it is in others the incentive to Virtue. When Diogenes trod upon Plato's robe, and exclaimed, "I trample under foot the pride of Plato," the Sage's reply to the Cynic seems not without its justice: "True, but it is with the greater pride of Diogenes."

In regard to the insensibility of the Cynics to decorum, several of their outrages upon public manners are enumerated by Sextus Empiricus; and, perhaps, there may be some exaggeration in the descriptions given by this avowed enemy to them, and to their derivative Sect the Stoics. But other particulars in the history of the Cynics, show that they were not slow or timid in illustrating by their example the doctrines which they promulgated; and if, as it is agreed, it was one of their leading principles, that time and place could make no difference in the morality of actions, and that no expression could be improper which related to transactions which were proper,* it is easy to imagine what extravagances of conduct these Philosophical caricaturists may have exhibited, and in what licentiousness of language they may have indulged. These aliens and obtruders into civilized society, when they treated Shame as a factitious sentiment, and decried Modesty and self-respect, showed a systematic perverseness which has provoked the reprehension of Cicero for its profligacy,† and the opposition even of the licentious Mandeville, from the ignorance which it implies in the principles of human nature.

Seneca.—The Stoical Philosophy From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

The Stoics.

We proceed, however, to a history of the seyon School of the Stoics; and we may premise, that the characters of the individuals belonging to it varied so materially from one another, and so materially also influenced the doctrines which they promulgated, that the system of the Stoics, as delivered by Zeno, can scarcely be recognised in the ostentatious pretensions, and quibbling paradoxes, of Chrysippus; and that it requires something like chemical art to detect any remnant of the same ingredients, when the compound has been filtered by the good sense of Panætius, or sublimed into the gasconade of Seneca.

After detailing, therefore, a few particulars in the life of Zeno, we shall subjoin a brief summary of the physical and moral doctrines of the Stoics, as they appear to have been expounded by him; and shall interweave in the narrative of his successors those prominent points in which they extended or deviated from the notions of their founder.

Zeno.

Zeno was born at Citium, a town on the coast of Cyprus. His father was a merchant, and in his voyages to Athens, brought home some of the pieces written by the pupils of Socrates. The young Zeno was charmed with the style of these Philosophical productions. At the age of thirty-two he visited Athens, and from that time forwards devoted himself exclusively to Philosophy. He attached himself at first to the Cynic Crates, and then for ten years placed himself under the tuition of Stilpo. He afterwards listened to Xenocrates and to Polemo. After this long course of discipline, he ventured to open his own School, and selected the Portico, a public building, ornamented with the paintings of Polygnotus, Myco, and Pandænus, the brother of Phidias. This place was, it seems, before his time one of general resort, and was, from these paintings and from its statues, denominated the *Painted Porch*; but the lectures and discussions of which it became the Theatre, soon imparted to it a celebrity sufficient to distinguish it from other buildings of the same nature; and the followers of Zeno have been long handed down in History, as the Philosophers of *The Porch*. The regularity of Zeno's life, as well as the severity of his doctrines, and the keenness of his logic, ensured to him the respect and admiration of the Athenians.

B. C. 362.

The Porch.

* *Non audiendi sunt Cynici, aut siqui fuerunt Stoici pæné Cynici, qui reprehendunt et irrident, quod ea, quæ turpia re non sint, nominibus ac verbis flagitiosa dicamus: illa autem, quæ turpia sint, nominibus appellemus suis. Latrocinari, fraudare, adulterare, re turpe est; sed dicitur non obscænè: liberis dare operam, re honestum est, nomine obscænum: plurasque in eam sententiam ab eisdem contra verecundiam disputantur. Off.* 1, 35.

† *Cynicorum vero ratio tota est ejicienda. Est enim inimica verecundiæ sine quâ nihil rectum esse potest, nihil honestum. Off.* 1, 41.

The keys of the city were delivered into his custody. A golden crown was presented to him, and a statue of brass raised to his honour. Antigonus Gonatas, the King of Macedon, whenever he visited Athens, attended his lectures, and was anxious to prevail on him to come to the Macedonian Court. Zeno's fame seems to have continued increasing to the end of his life, and in his latter days excited the jealousy, or at least incurred the reprehension, of Epicurus. He died at the age of ninety-eight, after having presided many years in the Porch. He was tall in stature, thin in person, abstemious, with a countenance somewhat repulsive and scowling. He wrote a work on the Commonweal, in which he animadverted on the errors of Plato with much acrimony. Of this work nothing remains, except some few passages incidentally cited by ancient authors.

His doctrines.

The Stoics considered the present system of the world as wrought out of an original Chaos; but they distinguished between the rude materials and the vivifying principle. From the *materials* they held that the different elements were produced by the operation of that mighty and pervading *principle*, which existed prior to their production, and which will survive their decay. The Stoical masters differed in their account of the process by which the elements were divided from one another. Zeno seems to have considered that the Earth was separated by its own gravity and adhesion; that the Water consisted of such fluid particles as were not solid enough so as to conglomerate into Earth, and yet were of too settled a nature to evaporate altogether into Air; that the Air itself was produced by exhalation; and that Fire was produced from the Air by flashes or coruscations.

System of the World.

Centripetal force.

Zeno seems to have had a tolerably distinct notion of the universality of a centripetal force. He maintained that all things which exist by themselves are moved towards the middle of the whole, and likewise of the world itself, and that there is the same cause of the rest of the world in infinite space, and of the rest of the earth in the world, in the midst of which it is constituted as a point. It is true that Zeno stated that heavy bodies are principally influenced by this propensity, but he at the same time insisted that the lighter elements, as Air and Fire, did in some respect tend towards the centre of the world.

Phænomena of Nature.

As the Stoics considered Water to be, in one sense, the basis of all the elements, and Fire itself to be produced from Water after having been previously refined into Air, it is not surprising that they defined the Sun to be a self guiding or intelligent mass of Fire, gathered and kindled originally and still constantly nourished by exhalations from the great Ocean; and that they deemed the Moon to be nourished in the like manner from the exhalations of fresh Water. They traced the variations of the Seasons to the approach or remoteness of the Sun. The Rainbow they considered as a reflection of the Sun's rays from a humid cloud.

The following were the principal arguments advanced by the Stoics, in proof of the existence of the Supreme Being.*

Supreme Being.

If anything exists in nature which it would surpass the ingenuity, the wisdom, and the capacity of Man to produce, the power which did produce such things must surpass the nature of Man. But Man could not form and arrange the heavenly bodies and the mighty system of the Universe. The Being, therefore, who produced these must be something superior to human intelligence or power; and what can we term such a superior Being, otherwise than a Divinity.

Every thing in nature seems to admit of gradations. In the parts of Creation which appear inanimate, there are different degrees of utility, of completeness, and of beauty; there are greater or lesser approaches towards perfection. In the animated world there are all the varieties of susceptibility; rising from the merest torpor to the most exquisite sensation, and to the most lively and accurate instinct. But in Reason, Man stands alone; and is it to be supposed that this intelligence, which in his nature is coupled with a frame so full of impressions and infirmities, should not exist in some higher degree, and be able to exercise its operations in some nobler mould, in some form less fettered by incumbrance, and less exposed to casualty? It is probable, surely, that Man, high as he stands, and far transcending all mere animals, may yet be but the lowest and most imperfect of rational and intelligent beings.

The universe is not a confused mass of unconnected and isolated materials. It is coherent. It is organized. It is a system. In every system there is some preeminent point, some spring of nourishment, some centre of vitality, in dependence upon which all the other parts exercise their functions, and in reference to which they act. From this all the supplies of the machinery are drawn, to this they all seem to revert. In the Vegetable Kingdom, the roots are considered the grand and primary organs; in the Animal, the heart or the brain. Can such an anomaly then be supposed, as that the system of the universe itself is without a centre of life, and motion, and intelligence? Must it not be inferred, that there is some sovereign principle or sensorium of the universe, from the ocean of whose beauty all the energies of nature are derived, and into which, after having refreshed every part of the system with their tides of health and beauty, they will eventually be reabsorbed? The Stoics, however, at the same time that they maintained the unity of the pervading principle, accommodated themselves to the prevailing superstitions, by adopting them in a modified sense. They considered the popular Divinities as figurative representations of the various powers of nature; and all the idle fables connected with the vulgar Polytheism were resolved into allegories, and treated as treasures of mysterious wisdom.*

Polytheism

In considering the Moral doctrine of the Stoics, it will be only necessary to advert to those peculiarities by which they were distinguished from the other Philosophical Sects of antiquity. In opposition to the Epicureans, instead of resolving Reason into Instinct, and considering the pursuit of Happiness as a quest of Pleasure on a more enlarged scale, they proceeded to the other extreme, and maintained that the first impulses of nature are evidences of an inherent and connatural self-love. They argued that the first gleams of desire, as they are directed to things appropriate and conducive to welfare, are scintillations of an innate Reason and prudential faculty. Since the natural desire of infants in their earliest moments are

Morals.

* Cic. *de Nat. Deor.* ii. 6, 12 and 13, 7, 38, 45 and 46.

* Cic. *de Nat. Deor* iii 24.

directed to things beneficial, and their aversions are calculated to guard them from things that would be injurious; this School stoutly maintained that these particular affections imply a deliberate preference of what is good for the whole nature, and that those movements which have the appearance of senseless organic impulse, are the evolutions of an inherent prudence, and of a native self-love. They argued further, that the seminal principle of self-preservation must be the ground of all original appetite and aversion, and not any pursuit of Pleasure as such, or any declination from Pain as such; for that Pleasure and Pain are merely the result and consequences of certain actions; now these consequences cannot be anticipated before experience, and therefore cannot originally, in the first instance, be the ground of the actions themselves. In the inanimate creation, where Pleasure cannot be felt, there is still some inherent principle which directs the roots of trees to feel their way into appropriate layers of soil or moisture, and their branches to shoot upwards into the congenial atmosphere. In the lower orders of animals, life and health are preserved by some salutiferous influence of the same kind. If in human nature these original motives to action were mere animal propensities to the blind quest of Pleasure, Nature, which in other instances is so vigilant and conservative, would in the case of Man often impel to injury and destruction. So far, therefore, from Reason being resolved into blind appetite, what is termed Instinct in the earliest impulses of the human frame ought to be exalted into a modification of Reason.

The Stoics further argued, that though Utility is a great object of desire, and a great test of the morality of actions, it is not the only consideration which impels to action; that all Knowledge is desirable on its own account, without reference to the practical benefits which it produces; that the curiosity of children is an indication of a character inseparable from the human mind; and that, however disguised or counteracted by circumstances, a thirst for information and a yearning after truth, are constituent parts of our nature. The gratification of these intellectual longings and aspirations, was therefore held by them to be in itself an ultimate object of desire; and as we have seen, that they considered the appetites merely as modes of self-love, or expressions of the endeavour after perfection, it was in perfect consistency with such principles, that they held the virtues, and the acquisitions of Science, to be desirable in themselves, without reference to the benefits resulting from them to the individual, or to the community.

The great excellence of the Stoical Morals consisted in the elevation which they gave to the sense of duty. When the understanding once ascertained what was proper to be done, the dictates of an enlightened conscience were, in their estimation, the universal and invariable rule of conduct. Their Moral rules, though they may sometimes sound as if they had a speculative cast, were all applied to, and intended for sound practical use. They considered the conclusions of experience respecting the happiness of mankind, as the voice of Nature announcing the destinations and duties of individuals. No progress can be made towards the perfection, scarcely any even to the developement, of the human faculties, without Society. Society, therefore, is the natural state of Man; the nature of his body and his mind as clearly indicating, that it was intended by Providence that he should live in a social state, as the structure of other animals shows them to be adapted to the peculiar elements in which they live. The faculty of reasoning and language prove that Man was intended for intercourse of this kind, as clearly as the construction of his lungs indicates that he was calculated for the atmosphere which he respires. The moment that the social nature of Man is recognised by the understanding, the duties which that condition involves are implicitly comprehended as matters of paramount importance. The process by which, in general, the affections extend themselves from the individual to his home, his Country, and mankind at large, is indeed somewhat reversed in the reflective and unimpassioned system of the Stoics; and the pupils of that School are taught rather to *know* their duties, by applying the conclusions of their Reason to their particular situation, than to *feel* them by having their sympathies gradually expanded. But the coincidence between these deductions of the understanding, and the natural suggestions of the heart, is mutually illustrative to both.

Ideal perfection of human character.

The character which the Stoics have given of a Wise man, has been the occasion of much misrepresentation. It was their aim to describe such a being as should be a constant model for the admirers of virtue to mould their own characters by, as far as human infirmities would permit. So far were the pupils of the Stoical School from pretending that they had attained such a degree of perfection themselves, that they expressly declared that their great Masters, Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus, were themselves far deficient, and that although worthy of all veneration, they did not attain to the *ideal* of human excellence. The Stoic masters in their description of the Wise man have, as might be expected, concurred in accumulating such qualities as tend to make a man at once most independent and most useful to others; thus they attributed to him an absolute command over his passions, and a mind so well acquainted with the course of nature, as not to be surprised at its apparent deviations and irregularities. There was indeed some variation in the notions of their different masters, whilst some regarded independence of mind, and others usefulness as the great object of pursuit. Thus Chrysippus urged, that a Wise man ought to apply himself to some office in the Commonwealth, whilst Apollodorus maintained that a Wise man ought to imitate the Cynics. It is a striking proof of the superstition of the Stoics, that amongst the qualities of their ideal character, they attributed to him the spirit of prophecy and divination; they held that he must know those signs which are communicated by Gods and Dæmons in the relations of human life; that he must be able to interpret dreams, and be versed in the mystery of Augury. They not only held that their Wise man would on adequate occasions willingly sacrifice his life for his Country and friends, but they held that he would destroy himself when subjected to the torture of continued and racking pain, or afflicted by some lingering and incurable disease.

As far as the Stoics endeavoured to raise themselves, by the contemplation of a perfect character, to something above humanity, their design was good and likely to be beneficial. On the other hand, the perpetual contrast between these strange and exaggerated notions,

Biography. From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170

associated as they were with the name of Stoicism, was calculated to estrange the pupils of that School from the ordinary habits and feelings and affections of society. Whilst they revolved in their imagination the perfections of the Wise man, they felt an additional disgust or a sanctified pity for the prejudices, the errors, and the delusions of those around them. Though they expressly disavowed the presumption, yet they unconsciously identified themselves with the model of their admiration. When they considered their imaginary Wise man exempt from the failings and infirmities of nature, and that in the satisfaction of his own mind he concentrated all the honours which power and dignity seemed to bestow; the young aspirants would often feel a Cynical aversion from the conflicts of life, and rest contented with that superiority which vanity easily generates in the fancy. They were taught to consider their Wise man as a character mighty, elevated, and possessed of great power, yet at the same time void of all pride; he was the only person qualified to be a King or Magistrate; and in accordance with their model, the conceit of their own importance was often disguised from others, and sometimes concealed from themselves by the appearance of a rough independence or a virtuous humility.

But from this general Criticism on the doctrines of Zeno, we must turn to pursue the History of his School, and to glance at the modifications introduced by his successors. Cleanthes was a native of Assus, a city in Æolia. He was originally a wrestler, and he preserved through life that vigour and hardiness of frame which qualified him for his first profession. His poverty was extreme; and whilst attending the School of Zeno in the daytime, he was compelled to work for his subsistence during the greater part of the night, as a common carrier and drawer of water. It is related, that his healthy appearance, whilst he was apparently without any means of support, excited the attention of the Police; and when he was summoned to give an account of his means of providing a livelihood, the gardener under whom he drew water, and a woman for whom he ground flour, came forward to attest his extraordinary industry. His faculties were not quick, but his application compensated for the defects or peculiarities of his natural disposition. Zeno admired him for his zeal and perseverance, and instituted him his successor. He wrote fifty-six volumes, all of which are lost. But Cicero has noticed one of his illustrations, and Diogenes Laertius and Stobæus have preserved a few of his memorable sayings. The illustration given by Cicero is this: "To place in a conspicuous point of view the impropriety of considering Pleasure as the ultimate object of pursuit, and Virtue as merely subservient and subsidiary, Cleanthes desired his hearers to suppose a fair tablet placed before their sight, in which Pleasure was represented enthroned in majesty, with the Virtues ministering to her as attendants upon her state, whispering to her that they were born to do her service, and that their only end and aim in existence, was to show her honour by waiting in her train, or executing her commands."

Cleanthes. B. C. 320.

Chrysippus B. C. 280.

Chrysippus was a native of Solis, a town of Cilicia, but early in life devoted himself to Philosophy, and fixing his residence in Athens, attended the School of Cleanthes. He soon distinguished himself by that logical subtilty, and that faculty of quick discrimination, which constituted at once the strength and the foible of his character. His ingenuity and address were inexhaustible; and as he pressed keenly and without reserve upon the weak points of his antagonist's arguments, spoke without reference to any system on his own part, and seemed regardless of every thing except the point immediately under discussion, he was found to be a most redoubtable and vexatious disputant, and his character stood high as a leader in that warfare of words in which the Athenians so much delighted. To him the Stoical Philosophy owes that store of perverse and exaggerated conceits, with which it was embarrassed and disfigured. It procured applause for Chrysippus, and amazed the by-standers, when he advanced that all crimes were of equal magnitude, because all were equally deviations from right; or maintained that the virtuous man alone was possessed of absolute power, and was incapable of error. To show his logical skill, he adopted and insisted upon many of the most absurd and revolting of the Cynical notions; and we must refer to Sextus Empiricus for details which may prove Chrysippus to have been a hardy controversialist, but which cannot impress any one with a favourable opinion of him, either as a champion of good sense, or as a friend of virtue.

Seneca.—The Stoical Philosophy From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

After Chrysippus, Panætius and Posidonius supported the character of the Stoical School, and indeed did much to retrieve it from his extravagances. But the Philosophy of Greece was naturalized at Rome by Cicero. The opinions of the Stoics were a favourite study of the Roman Lawyers in particular; and it has been said, that some of those terse maxims of the Roman Code, which have been incorporated into the general law of Europe, may be traced as having originated in that School. By the Roman Poets, too, the doctrines of Stoicism were much cultivated; and Lucan has condensed into a few lines the leading principles of the Sect, when giving the character of Cato.* But Seneca, Epictetus, and Antoninus, are the three principal names which supported the glory of Stoicism under the Roman Emperors; and we shall proceed to speak of their several characters and merits somewhat compendiously, since, considering the limits of our general work, we have perhaps already expatiated somewhat too largely in developing the peculiarities of Stoicism.

Panætius, abt B. C. 136. Posidonius aet. B. C. 135.

Stoicism introduced into Rome

Lucius Annæus Seneca was born at Cordova, in the eighth year before Christ. His father was Marcus Annæus Seneca, a Rhetorician of eminence, some of whose productions have come down to us. His mother's name was Helvia. He had two brothers, Marcus Annæus Novatus and Lucius Annæus Mela. Seneca was of a delicate frame of body, and was during the early period of his life much afflicted with ill health. He commenced his studies under his father; but lectures on the *media* of proof, and on the modes of awakening the passions, served rather to stimulate than to satisfy his curiosity. He was anxious to inquire deeper into the nature of Man, and to learn what could be known about the system of the Universe. For this purpose he commenced his studies under Sotio the Pythagorean, a man whose exemplary habits at once sanctified and illustrated the doctrines which he expounded. But the ardour of Seneca's mind was such as not to allow him to acquiesce in the system

Seneca. B. C. 8.

Educat

* ii. 380.

lography. inculcated by Sotio, to the exclusion of further research. He was initiated by Attalus in the peculiarities of the Stoical doctrine. He studied the Peripatetic Philosophy under Papirius Fabian; and he learned, as far as an institution which despises all learning can be taught, the whimsies of the Cynics from Demetrius. This latitude of inquiry, and rejection of exclusive partialities, continued with Seneca through life; and to this habit we may attribute the characteristic excellences, as well as some of the peculiar blemishes, of his writings. His intercourse with Demetrius ripened into intimacy; and in his progress in the world, when fortune had heaped honours upon him, the courtier and the favourite did not abate his esteem or his familiarity with the Cynic. But the system of the Stoics was, upon the whole, the favourite with Seneca.

From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

Seneca.—The Stoical Philosophy.

From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

appear- a as a ader.

By his father's advice he then mixed in the active concerns of life, and commenced his exertions as a Pleader at the Bar. At Rome, the pursuits of a Lawyer and of an Advocate were kept much more distinct than they usually have been in modern times. It required the labour of many years to qualify a man to practise as a Jurist; and the continued and tedious comparison of texts, and cases, and precedents was preliminary to the formation of that character of an authorized and solemn expositor of Law, which is most nearly expressed by the modern term of a Chamber-Counsel. A few hours study, on the contrary, such as could give a smattering of the terms of Art, and a sketch of the general principles of Law, was all that was thought necessary by the ancient Romans for the qualification of an Advocate or Pleader at the bar.

We are informed by the unknown author of the *Dialogue on the Causes of the Decline of Eloquence*, that Seneca distinguished himself during the short period whilst he practised at the Bar, by the weight and pointedness of his remarks; but that he was as deficient in his pleadings as he afterwards showed himself to be in his writings, in that uniform progression and flow of thought, which is almost inseparable from the character of Eloquence. His success, however, was such, that he became desirous of advancing himself in public. He discharged the duties of the Quæstorate, and became at length a distinguished favourite in the Court of Claudius. But in consequence of an imputed familiarity with Julia, the daughter of Germanicus, he, with some others, fell into disgrace, and was banished to the Island of Corsica. His conduct during exile deserves to be remarked, as illustrative of the tendency of that Philosophy which he advocated and professed. In his letters to his own friends, he boasts of the opportunities now allowed him for retirement and study, and makes an ostentatious display of the means of wisdom and independence which were afforded him by solitude and retreat; he vaunted that his happiness was independent of external circumstances, and that a Wise man could find a home and a Country in any quarter of the earth. In his letters to the Emperor, however, his submissions are abject; and his solicitations for leave to return are unqualified, spiritless, and pitiful. Lord Bolingbroke, in his *Reflections on Exile*, has adopted the spirit and the style of Seneca's Stoical letters; and we know that the magnanimity of this modern Courtier and Philosopher was on a par with that of his ancient prototype. Cicero, on the contrary, though the occasion of his banishment reflected honour rather than disgrace upon his character, instead of playing off the idle jargon of words, or making any hypocritical boast, or affecting an indifference to the regard and esteem of his countrymen, gave way too much to the painfulness of an exile which was unjustly inflicted upon him; and indulged in expressions of sensibility, which, however natural, and however amiable, have been reflected upon as amongst the blemishes of his character. Cicero, however, with whatever frankness he may have unbosomed his own feelings of weakness during exile, was recalled by the unsolicited and spontaneous summons of his own free countrymen. Seneca, whilst affecting to the world to pride himself in his compulsory seclusion, procured a remission of his sentence by undignified and unmanly intreaties to a tyrant. Besides his own direct submissions, his return is said to have been accelerated by the mediation of Agrippina, the mother of Nero. After his return, Seneca was engaged first as the Tutor of Nero, and afterwards as his Minister; in both capacities he seems to have deserved well of his pupil and of the Roman People, but in neither of them did his conduct escape obloquy. As a Tutor it is said, that he sanctioned the excesses of his pupil; whilst, in fact, he probably only modified irregularities which he could not restrain. As a Minister, he has been made responsible for several of the outrages of his Sovereign; though he may, perhaps, deserve the credit of repressing, rather than the imputation of instigating such perversions of power. Certain it is, that that part of Nero's reign in which Seneca participated in the administration of government, is not marked by atrocities so numerous or so intolerable as those which disgraced the latter part of it. The amplitude of Seneca's fortune, whilst Minister, is another particular which has been objected to him by the censurers of his character. But, however inconsistent it may be with some of his Stoical eulogies upon poverty, and Cynical tirades against wealth and luxury, the acquisition of opulence cannot be otherwise a reproach to him; since extortion, or any dishonourable practice, is not imputed to him. Still less can there be any serious charge brought against him from his mode of enjoying his property. His own personal habits are admitted to have been temperate, and even abstemious; and if he delighted in the elegance of his gardens, or gratified himself by the number and extent of his villas, such indulgences were suitable to his condition and circumstances, though not to his pretensions to austerity; and were a rational and creditable mode of enjoyment. Umbrage, however, was given to Nero, by some particular in Seneca's conduct; and the tyrant made Piso's conspiracy a pretext for the destruction of the Philosopher. The particulars of Seneca's death are recorded with much minuteness by Tacitus. That author mentions the frivolous circumstances by which Nero endeavoured to entrap him into an acknowledgment of his familiarity with the conspirators, as well as the dignified answer of Seneca; in which, after explaining his own refusal to see Piso on one occasion, as being unwell, and having no reason to prefer another man's welfare to his own, "Cæsar himself," he added, "knew that he was not a man of compliment, having received more proofs of his freedom than of his flattery." This answer of Seneca's was delivered to Nero in the presence of Poppæa and Tigellinus, his infamous favourites. Nero inquired whether it could be collected from Seneca's manner, that he had any intention of suicide. The Tribune answered, that Seneca was so

Tutor and Minister of Nero.

His death.

ustour.

nish- nt.

Biography. From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

little discomposed by his visit, that he afterwards continued a story which he happened to be relating at the time. Nero sent him back, with peremptory orders for Seneca to put himself to death. The Tribune, who himself had been engaged in Piso's conspiracy, had not resolution enough to be the bearer of such a message; and therefore despatched one of his officers with it. Seneca, upon receiving the command, expressed his desire to make some alterations in his Will; but the officer refusing to allow him access to his papers, he turned to his friends, and told them, that, since nothing else was left to him, he could at least bequeath to them the picture of his life; and intimated that some of the features of his own character were the best model for them on the present occasion. When some of them gave way to their feelings of grief, he rebuked them for their want of fortitude, or of foresight; "Where now," said he, "is our boasted Philosophy; or of what avail is it, if it fails us when the most required? We cannot any of us have been unaware of the character of Nero: after the murder of his mother and his brother, it was scarcely to be expected that he would spare his preceptor." The death of Seneca was a lingering one, from the exhausted and the emaciated state of his frame. He opened the veins in his arms, in the presence of his wife, and other friends, and afterwards those in his legs. Finding this course ineffectual, he persuaded his wife to quit the room, and procured a draught of poison to be administered to him. As this, too, seemed to fail in its influence, he desired to be removed into a warm bath; and, as he entered, he sprinkled those who stood near him, saying, "I offer this libation to Jupiter the Deliverer." His life-blood then gushed forth, and he speedily expired.

His Works.

Seneca's works consist of separate Treatises, On *Anger*; *Consolation*; *Providence*; *Tranquillity of Mind*; *Constancy*; *Clemency*; *The Shortness of Life*; *A Happy Life*; *Retirement*; *Benefits*; of one hundred and twenty-four *Epistles*; and of seven Books of Questions in *Natural Philosophy and History*. As a Philosopher, Seneca is certainly not entitled to very high respect, either for the consistency or the temperateness of his opinions. His general principles are those of the Stoics; but his fondness for display and exaggeration, makes him caricature even some of their paradoxes. He thus maintains, in one place, that the Wise man of the Stoics is not an ideal figment; but, that it has been realized in many individuals of the Sect, and that it is such a model, as it is expected others should attain to. In another place he proposes Bion's insensibility as a model of Stoical wisdom, when after the loss of his wife and children in the course of a siege, he boasted that he was consummately happy, because he had escaped himself: for a Wise man has no concern about any thing else; his own person is the whole of his property.

But Seneca does not scruple to adopt any notion, however inconsistent with the leading principles of Stoicism, if it gives him an opportunity of showing some of his turns and niceties of diction. He is, indeed, to be considered rather as a moral declaimer, than as a Philosopher of any Sect. As a Moralist, his theory inclined to the asperities and singularities of Cynicism. His love of effect, and constant affectation of brilliant sentences, naturally carried him to such an extreme.

As a writer, Seneca may be commended for occasional felicities; and as he was always striving to add wit to reason, and to express something weighty and solid in a striking manner, it is not to be wondered, that he should sometimes have succeeded. But he is justly termed the grand corrupter of Roman Eloquence; and his style, brilliant as it is, is the more dangerous on account of the author's abilities.* It is a perpetual succession of efforts, and in the range of antitheses, of points, of figures, prettinesses and exaggerations, the reader finds himself without intermission, amused, surprised, dazzled, baffled, and fatigued. There is no repose in the composition, and thoughts and expressions which singly might make some impression, are lost in the crowd of others which are protruded with equal ostentation, and with the same glare. A sentiment, which in the pages of Tully, we should find reflected in one continued impression, as from a clear mirror, is dealt out to us in the sentences of Seneca, as from a glass fantastically cut into a thousand spangles.

Seneca.—The Stoical Philosophy. From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

Contemporaneous with Seneca flourished Dio of Prusa, surnamed Chrysostom. His character is handed down as that of a severe and unsparing censurer of the follies and vices of his time. His speeches which remain to us are rather remarkable for their abruptness and affected importance, than for any genuine vigour or eloquence.

Dion Prusæus.

Epictetus was the great ornament of the Stoic School during the reigns of Domitian and Hadrian. Born a slave, and maimed in person, he obtained his manumission by the excellence of his conduct; and not only instructed the age in which he lived, by his irreproachable example and illustrious doctrine, but has edified succeeding ages by those precepts which his pupil and admirer Arrian collected into a manual of moral wisdom, and illustrated with a commentary. No Philosopher has surpassed Epictetus in urging the claims of virtue to independence. His maxims are terse and pregnant with sense, and his exhortations earnest and affectionate. Though there is much severity of discipline recommended, there is no sternness in the manner of the teacher. He speaks, perhaps, with some degree of injustice of the world at large; and too often describes Virtue as necessarily in a state of persecution. But no production of any heathen writer is better adapted than the manual which is inscribed with the name of Epictetus, to summon Virtue to a proper steadiness and reliance upon itself, or to arm a wavering mind with resolution amidst the occasional discouragements and untoward circumstances of life.

Epictetus, *obiit circiter* A. D. 161.

Next in succession to this illustrious slave among the ornaments of the Stoic School, appears the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. The particulars of this noble Roman's public life will be found traced in some of our future pages. It is unnecessary here even to glance at those victories on the Euphrates and on the Danube, by which the Philosophic Monarch protected the boundaries and ensured the subsequent tranquillity of the Roman Empire. His reign forms part of the happy period in which the vast extent of that Empire has been characterised, as having "been governed by absolute power under the guidance of virtue and wisdom." The predilection of Antoninus for the Stoical system displayed itself early in his life. At the age of twelve years he commenced

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus A. D. 170.

* Quinctilian has very justly sketched the character of Seneca, x. 125. *Abundat dulcibus vitiis*, is one of the terse and closely applicable strokes by which he pourtrays him.

Biography. From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

that discipline of patience and self-restraint, which in after life enabled him to be the master of himself, whilst he was the Sovereign of the world. Throughout life his self-command was complete and exemplary. In his youth he was not a slave to the favour of his passions, nor was he the plaything of ambition in his maturer age. In his Palace he preserved the strictness and system of a General. In his camp he composed a great part of those Philosophical meditations which will immortalize his name. Even his own favourite sect never carried him away captive from good sense, or led him to indulge in their extravagant pretensions and paradoxes. His character is a bright example of the best influence of the Stoical tenets, operating upon a mild temper and amiable disposition; and supplying that firmness and energy which are most required for, but are rarely found combined with such a nature.

Seneca.—The Stoical Philosophy From B. C. 420. to A. D. 170.

SERVIUS SULPICIUS GALBA.

FROM A. D. 68 TO 69.

Biography. From A. D. 68. to 69.

GALBA, whom the goodwill of the Army and the concurrence of the Senate raised to the Throne of the Cæsars, was descended from the Sulpician family; an ancient and patriotic race, who distinguished themselves, in the early times of the Commonwealth, as the enemies of Regal power and domination. His mother, Mummia Achaica, derived her lineage from Mummius, the conqueror of Corinth, and from Quintus Lutatius Catulus, one of the greatest ornaments of the Republic, and who was less powerful than his two great contemporaries, Pompey and Cæsar, only because he was more virtuous, and more sincerely attached to the interests of his Country.*

Lineage of Galba.

Nero the last of the family of Augustus.

The extinction of the family of Augustus, which took place at the fall of Nero, forms an important era in the History of Rome. Though the Imperial Government originated in the military ascendancy which terminated a Civil war, and had been supported hitherto by strength of arms, yet the respect which already began to be felt for hereditary right restrained the power of the soldiers, and prevented them from gratifying their avarice, as they afterwards did, by setting up the Empire to open sale. But the death of Nero, as Tacitus remarks, brought to light a secret of State. It was then discovered that an Emperor could be made elsewhere than at Rome; that force alone was sufficient to determine the choice; and, consequently, that the nomination of the Cæsars to the Throne, was thenceforth to be regarded as the privilege of the Army.

Galba opts measures secure the Throne.

Galba was at Terragonia in Spain when he listened to the first proposals of revolt against Nero, and took the first steps to succeed that infatuated Prince, as the head of the Roman Government. But being unwilling to incur the reproach which is justly attached to rebellion, his measures were for some time unsteady, and his views undetermined. He was desirous to ascend the Throne, but was averse, notwithstanding, to the sanguinary counsels which were urged upon him by his confederates; and we find, accordingly, that even after he had assumed the title of *Lieutenant to the Senate and Roman People*, he was more inclined to wait the issue of events, and to avail himself of some fortunate contingency, than boldly to open a path to supreme power by the arms of his legions. It required all the eloquence of Titus Vinius, an officer in the Prætorian guards, to rouse him from his indecision. He was reminded that the army under his command had already proceeded too far to retreat either with honour or with safety; for that to have deliberated whether they should continue faithful to Nero, was in fact equivalent to having thrown off their allegiance.

Servius Sulpicius Galba. From A. D. 68. to 69.

His indecision and difficulties.

The defeat of Vindex in Gaul added greatly to his perplexity. Virginius at the head of a victorious army refused either to accept the Empire himself, or to cooperate with Galba in raising a third person to the Throne; persisting in his resolution to acknowledge no Sovereign but such as should be elected by the Senate, and be recommended by that venerable body to the fidelity of the legions. Clodius Macer, who enjoyed a command in Africa, had more ambition and less principle than Virginius; for as long as he could hope to profit by the partiality of his troops, he did not allow the sense of his crimes to prevent him from aspiring to the purple. The General who led the army on the Lower Rhine, was likewise actuated by selfish motives; having resolved to reserve his power, either to promote his own views at Rome, or to purchase, by the employment of it, the countenance and protection of the new Emperor. Distracted by a condition of things so little propitious to his undertaking, Galba, we are informed by Suetonius, was about to put an end to his life by an act of suicide, when the news was brought to him at Clunia or Colonia, by his faithful dependent Icelus, that Nero had just fallen a victim to the indignation of the People; and that the voice of the Senate, as well as the acclamations of the Army, had already invited the great-grandson of Catulus to enter the Palace of Augustus.*

The Governors and Generals support him

The example of the Prætorians in the Capital, was soon followed by the legions which were serving in the Provinces. Virginius, who was importuned by his soldiers to become their master, not only refused to accede to their wishes, but finally prevailed upon them to swear allegiance to Galba. Vespasianus, too, who at that period was prosecuting a war against the Jews, sent his son Titus to pay homage to the successor of Nero; and even the turbulent cohorts of Africa allowed the life of their unprincipled Chief to be taken

* Suet. *Galba*, 2. *Statuarum titulis Pronepotem se Quinti Catuli Capitolini semper adscripserit.*

* Suet. *Galba*, 10.

Biography. From A. D. 68. to 69.

away, that they might be permitted to yield an undivided obedience to the new Cæsar.

Nymphidius creates troubles at Rome.

The only cause of disturbance, which threatened the tranquillity of Galba's reign, arose from the ambitious designs of the worthless Nymphidius; who had betrayed the confidence of Nero, and turned against him, in the very crisis of rebellion, the powerful swords of the Imperial guards. This faithless adventurer, who had bribed the troops by the promise of an immense gratuity, first aspired to the distinction of being appointed for life sole Præfect of the Prætorian cohorts, and soon afterwards raised his views to the Throne itself.* He held Galba in contempt, as a feeble old man who could no longer endure the fatigues of military service; whilst he ascribed to himself all the merit of the late revolution, the triumph gained in favour of liberty, and the overthrow of an intolerable and disgraceful despotism. He knew, besides, that the Emperor was at once too parsimonious, and too much attached to the ancient discipline to gratify the inordinate expectations of the soldiers, by bestowing the largess which himself had promised; for which reason he found it easy to induce a great body of the Prætorians under his command to identify his interests with their own, and to look forward to his preferment as the only means whereby their hopes could be realized. But his nefarious schemes were defeated by the prudent loyalty of Antonius Honoratus, the Tribune of a Prætorian cohort; who, by an eloquent speech which he addressed to the troops, affected so deeply their sense of duty, as well as their feelings of shame and resentment, that he prevailed upon the whole camp to avenge at once the cause of Nero, and to prove their fidelity to his successor, by bringing the factious Præfect to a condign punishment.

Is put to death by the soldiers

The soldiers immediately rushed to arms; and raising a shout, which they knew would bring Nymphidius to his post, they seized the opportunity of despatching him with a thousand wounds. His body was forthwith placed in an iron cage, and exposed to the view of the whole Army.†

Character of Vinius.

Unfortunately for Galba, the men who succeeded to the power of Nymphidius, were neither more virtuous nor more deserving of confidence than that intriguing commander. Titus Vinius, who became the chief Minister of State, was dissolute in his manners, and tainted in his reputation. His early life was marked by vices so gross, as to have drawn down upon him the indignation even of Caligula, by whom he was cast into prison for attempting the virtue of his General's wife, while encamped in the presence of an enemy. He was afterwards suspected of stealing a golden cup at the table of Claudius; an offence which that Emperor punished, by directing that at the next entertainment he alone should be served on earthenware. But daring, ingenious, and active, he was too valuable a person to be finally disgraced. He triumphed above all impeachment; and when he was intrusted by Nero with the Government of Narbonnese Gaul, he displayed so much integrity and zeal, as to render doubtful all the charges which had been brought against him. Tacitus describes him as one of those persons whose minds show an equal degree of intensity in the pursuit of virtue or of vice; and who, in order to reach a splendid reputation, require only the assistance of favourable circumstances and of suitable motives. But the height to which he was raised by Galba, proved the occasion of his final ruin; and the use which he made of the power with which he was invested, proved the cause or the pretext for the tragical events which attended the close of this Monarch's reign.*

Servius Sulpicius Galba. From A. D. 68. to 69.

And of Laco, the Prætorian Præfect.

Nor was Cornelius Laco, who obtained from Galba the office of Prætorian Præfect, possessed of either virtue or talent sufficient to support the interests of his Imperial master. He appears to have been no less deficient in courage than in honesty; and the Historian of these times, accordingly, gives way to his indignation so far as to remark, that the union of the most cowardly of men with the most wicked, drew hatred and contempt upon the Government of the Prince in whose service they were employed.† There is no doubt that almost all the faults with which the short reign of Galba was chargeable, ought to be laid to their account. His love of justice, good order, and military discipline, was of little avail, when opposed by the corruption and avarice of his principal servants; and though it was acknowledged on all hands, that the Sovereign was animated with a desire to promote the welfare of his people, he was punished for the evil which he allowed his Ministers to commit.‡

Austerity and cruelties of Galba.

But perhaps the severity of his manners, his advanced age, and his parsimonious habits, operated more unfavourably than even the misconduct of his servants, in alienating from him the affections of his subjects in the Capital. Suetonius observes, that when the Emperor began his journey to Rome, he was preceded by an evil report of avarice and harshness.§ On the way, too, he affected a formidable appearance, wearing the military dress as if he had been about to carry hostilities into an enemy's country; and carrying a dagger suspended to his breast, as if the dread of assassination had been ever present to his mind. Nor were his actions, during his progress towards Rome, at all calculated to soften the impression which arose from his menacing attitude. Enraged against certain towns in Spain and Gaul, which had deliberated too long before they declared in his favour, he punished some by imposing exorbitant taxes, and vented his fury against others by demolishing their fortifications. Such officers, moreover, as had incurred his resentment or suspicion, were put to death without mercy; and in some instances he extended his brutal vengeance even to the wives and children of those who had fallen under the weight of his displeasure. Mithridates and Cingonius Varro, the accomplices of Nymphidius and Petronius Turpilianus, who had no other fault than that of being faithful to Nero, were ordered for military execution; a proceeding which gave great offence to the people of Rome; for as these distinguished persons were con-

* Plutarch, *in Galba*, tells us that he promised to pay to every soldier of the Prætorian cohorts 7500 drachmas, and to the troops quartered in the Provinces 1250 drachmas a man; a sum which it would have been impossible to collect without inflicting on the Empire a greater evil than Nero had done during his whole reign.

† Tacit. *Hist.* lib i. c. 5. Plut. *in Galba.*

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 48. and Plut. *in Galba.*

† *Invalidum senem T. Vinius et Corn. Laco, alter deterrimus mortalium, alter ignavissimus, odio flagitiorum oneratum, contemptu inertiæ destruebant.* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 5.

‡ Dion Cassius, *in Galba*, lib. lxiv.

§ *Præcesserat de eo fama sævitiæ simul et avaritiæ.* Suet. *Galba*, 12.

demned without being heard in their own defence, they perished with all the commiseration which is usually bestowed upon the innocent and oppressed.

His conduct to the legion of Marines.

But an event which occurred immediately before he entered the City, rendered the Emperor an object of hatred as well as of fear to the greater part of the inhabitants. The Marines whom Nero had formed into a regular legion, and who had thereby acquired a rank more honourable among the Romans, than that which they formerly held in the public service, proceeded about three miles from the gates to meet Galba, in order to solicit from him a confirmation of the honour which his predecessor had conferred upon them. The Emperor, rigidly attached to the forms of discipline, attempted to satisfy them with an ambiguous answer, craving time to consider maturely a matter of so much importance. Regarding delay in this case as equivalent to a refusal, the petitioners urged their suit with an importunity bordering on disrespect, and some of them even proceeded so far as to draw their swords with the view of intimidation. Such conduct could not escape the reprehension of Galba. He ordered the cavalry which attended him to repel force by force; and a conflict ensuing, many of the Marines, as well as of the unarmed multitude, were wounded or put to death. Dion Cassius writes, that seven thousand were cut to pieces upon the spot, and that a great number more were committed to prison, where they lay till the accession of Otho. Suetonius adds, that he decimated those who escaped the swords of his horsemen, and agrees with the other Historians of his time in remarking, that to have entered the City amidst so much blood and slaughter, was universally regarded as a most inauspicious circumstance. The people who had formerly been taught to despise him as a weak sluggish old man, now viewed him as an object of horror and apprehension.*

His unpopularity.

It was not to be expected that the public measures of such a ruler would be viewed in a favourable light. His justice was pronounced severity, his economy was called avarice, and the simplicity of his manners was held as rustic coarseness. He was greatly blamed for an act of patriotism, which, in better times, would have secured the confidence and applause of the Romans. He disbanded a cohort of Germans, the ordinary guard of the Cæsars, and intrusted the safety of his person to the fidelity of the native soldiers; thus putting an end to a practice which has always been found to keep pace with the progress of despotism and the decay of public liberty. But Galba had not studied the valuable art of doing good things with a becoming grace. He satisfied himself with the wisdom and integrity of his conduct; and thus, while he laboured to restore the fortunes of his Country, and to revive her institutions, his zeal met with no other reward than obloquy and distrust. Satire aimed its bitterest shafts at him. If an expression in a Play, or a song, conveyed a satirical allusion to decrepid age or stingy parsimony, the audience instantly applied it to their Emperor, with shouts of merriment, and repeated the words again and again, with the strongest accents of derision and triumph. Invention was indulged to the utmost in imagining cases equally ludicrous and mean, in which the unpopular Monarch was supposed to have displayed his characteristic propensities. For example, the malicious wits of Rome maintained, that when the inhabitants of Terragonia presented the Emperor with a crown of gold weighing fifteen pounds, he insisted that it was three ounces deficient; and that, to ascertain the fact, he ordered it to be melted down, and placed in the scales, divested of all extraneous matter. They gave out, too, that whenever he saw a sumptuous feast placed on the Imperial table, his appetite was taken away by the recollection of the cost; and that instead of eating he could only utter groans and prudential maxims, and deplore the misery of his fate, which condemned him to witness such unseasonable profusion. They said that he rewarded the integrity of his steward by the present of a few peas; and that on one occasion he was so charmed with the notes of a flute, which was played during an entertainment in the Palace, that he drew from his purse a sum of money equal to three farthings, and bestowed it with an air of generosity upon the matchless performer.*

He attempts to recover the donations made by Nero.

These ridiculous fictions were not lost upon the credulous malignity of the Roman populace; and a measure which Galba actually adopted, to repair the losses of the public Treasury, contributed not a little to aggravate the rumours which were circulated against him. Finding upon inquiry that the foolish donations of Nero amounted to a very large sum, he resolved to have the whole refunded, with the exception of one-tenth; but, as Tacitus observes, the persons who had received the late Emperor's benefactions, were too prodigal of money to have even one-tenth remaining, and had, besides, neither lands nor income which Galba could attach. Determined that this financial expedient should not be defeated, the thrifty Monarch proceeded to adopt measures against those into whose hands the Imperial presents had passed, either in the way of purchase, or in the ordinary transactions of trade. The vexation and inconvenience which attended this step were extreme. Many houses and estates were brought into the market; and no fewer than thirty members of the Equestrian Order were implicated in the investigation, and exposed to great pecuniary loss.†

Conduct in regard to Tigellinus.

The public were not grieved to find, that those whom Nero had enriched by improper means, were now rendered as poor as those whom he had robbed; but they were indignant to perceive that Vinius, and the other favourites about Court, to whose counsels the harsh measures described above were every where attributed, indulged meanwhile in the most unbounded luxury; abused in a very shameful manner the influence which they had acquired over Galba; protected the guilty; oppressed the innocent; and set up to sale every office, privilege, and immunity, which the Government could bestow. Tigellinus, one of the most infamous and mischievous of Nero's Ministers, and whose punishment the People never ceased to demand, was observed in particular to enjoy the countenance of several powerful persons at the head of affairs. He had purchased the good offices of Vinius by large sums of money, the fruit of his intrigues and corruption; and the latter induced Galba to publish an ordinance in defence of a miscreant, who had been the principal agent in Nero's worst crimes, representing that he laboured

* Suet. *Galba*, 1, 12. Plut. *in Galba*. Dion Cassius, lib. lxiv.

* Suet. *Galba*, 13. Plut. *ut suprà*.

† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. 20. Suet. *Galba*, 15.

Biography. From A. D. 68. to 69.

under a mortal disease, which, in the course of nature, would soon terminate his life; and condemning the cruel and vindictive disposition, which thirsted for the blood of a man who was already enduring a severe affliction under the heavy hand of the Gods.*

People irritated and disgusted.

From this period the most moderate and even patriotic measures pursued by Galba were misrepresented, and made a foundation for dislike and suspicion. It was in vain that he kept the soldiers to their duty; that he punished with the utmost severity those who by their false accusations had occasioned the death of innocent persons; that he delivered up to the vengeance of the laws such slaves as had borne unjust evidence against their masters; that he recalled those who under pretence of treason had been driven into exile by Nero, and restored them to their rank and fortunes. His wisdom and good intentions were equally despised. The corrupted populace regretted the dissipation and spectacles which occupied the cares of the late reign; the theatrical amusements and exploits of the Circus, in which their days and nights were passed. The more thoughtful perceived that the Government would be at once capricious and severe in the hands of an old soldier, whose rules of administration were derived from the habits of a camp; while the men of Consular and Patrician dignity had already been made to feel, that the whole authority of their Order was sunk in the intrigues and venal ambition of a few military adventurers.†

The Army dissatisfied.

The crisis of Galba's fate was no doubt accelerated by his injudicious conduct towards the Provincial armies, whose affections he ought to have secured while he was engaged in suppressing the arrogance of the Prætorians at Rome. To the Gauls, indeed, who had been concerned in the conspiracy under Vindex, he was advised to grant, not only a remission of tribute, but even the more important gift of Citizenship, with all the honours and privileges which belonged to natives of Italy. The troops in Germany, however, who had followed the victorious standards of Virginius, and maintained the dignity of the Empire, and the honour of the Senate, were allowed to pass unrewarded; on which account, though they were now commanded by a General nominated by Galba, they did not fail to express their disappointment, in language which breathed mutiny and rebellion. When intelligence was brought to Galba, that the Guards were dissatisfied because no gratuity had been conferred upon them at his accession, he replied, in a spirit no longer suited to the character of Romans, that *he had been accustomed to levy soldiers, not to buy them.* This answer completely alienated the Army at home and abroad. Insulted and angry at the haughty style which he assumed, the legions, as well as the Prætorian cohorts, showed themselves ready for a change; and nothing was now wanting, but a plausible pretext, to induce them to invest a more liberal master with the ensigns of Imperial power.‡

Galba resolves to adopt an heir.

Galba at length opened his eyes to his situation, but he mistook the cause of the odium and contempt into which his character had fallen. He imagined that the Roman people despised him because he had no heir to succeed him on the Throne; for which reason he determined to adopt a young man of such birth and qualities, as would revive for the head of the Government that respect and affection to which his childless old age had for some time rendered him a stranger. Vinius was eager in his recommendation of Otho, a personage who figured in a manner not very creditable to his sense or virtue, during the reign of Nero, and who, on account of the equally abandoned Poppæa, was sent into an honourable exile, as Governor of Lusitania. With the fickleness and want of faith which distinguished his whole life, Otho was the first commander of a Province who declared against his master; and the strenuous exertions which he then made to secure the crown for Galba arose, it is said, from the expectations which he even at that time entertained of being adopted by him, and raised to the name of Cæsar.

Servius Sulpicius Galba. From A. D. 68. to 69.

That hope was daily flattered by the partiality of the soldiers, and the assurances of Vinius; for the latter, whose daughter, it was reported, was to become the wife of Otho, exerted all his influence to effect an object so dear to them both. But the views of Galba were otherwise directed. He appears to have suspected the selfish motives of his Minister, which were artfully exposed by Laco and Icelus; and Tacitus thinks that, in his choice of a successor, the old Emperor was principally actuated by a regard to the public welfare, and by his knowledge of Otho's character, notorious at once for vice and insincerity. The love of virtue, and a sentiment of patriotism, determined his election in favour of Piso Licinianus, the son of M. Crassus and Scribonia, whose ripe years and pure morals promised long happiness and prosperity to the Empire.

And fixes on Piso Licinianus.

This unfortunate person had been adopted by one of the Piso family, probably after the death of his father and mother, who, as well as his elder brother, fell victims to the jealousy of Claudius. Another brother was slain by order of Nero, while Piso himself was driven into exile, whence he seems not to have returned till after the revolution which placed Galba on the Throne. Suetonius assures us, that this Emperor had been always fond of Piso, and had even resolved, long before he attained supreme power, to make him the heir of his name and fortune. Others think that the new Cæsar owed his elevation to Laco, the Prætorian Præfect, who had formerly been acquainted with him, but who, on this occasion, pretended to be an entire stranger to his history, in order that his recommendation might not be suspected of personal or interested feelings. At all events, it is certain that Galba was much delighted with the severe manners and spotless reputation of his adopted son. Taking him by the hand, at a meeting of the principal Officers of State, he addressed him in an eloquent speech, in which he set forth with much earnestness the duties which he had to perform, and the dangers and temptations which it should be his study to avoid. "Let the fate of Nero," said he, "ever be before your eyes. Think of the end of that unhappy Prince, whose empty mind was inflated with pride, merely because he could reckon in his family a long line of Cæsars! It was not Vindex, with his thousands of unarmed Gauls, nor I with my single legion that overturned his Government. It was his own debauchery, and his monstrous cruelty that forced mankind to shake off his detestable yoke; and to create an example, till then unknown, of an

Address of Galba to Piso.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 72. Suet. *Galba*, 14.

† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 10. Zonar.

‡ Tacit. lib. i. c. 5. *Accessit Galbæ vox, pro Republicâ honesta, ipsi anceps, legi a se militem non emi.* Suetonius, *in Galba*, 16, words it this way, *Legere se militem, non emere, consuesse.*

Biography. From A. D. 68. to 69.

Emperor condemned and punished. Though raised to this high station of rank and power by the success of our arms, and by the more legitimate authority of a free and unanimous election; and though disposed to govern with the strictest regard to justice, and to all the rights and charities of social life, we must be prepared to meet the attacks of envy, and even of disaffection. Be not, however, dismayed, though a few factious politicians, or mutinous soldiers, should disturb the commencement of your reign. When the act which I now perform is made known to my people, their affections to my Government will be confirmed, and my old age, the chief occasion of their reproach and fear, will be entirely forgotten. The bad, it is true, will always regret Nero, but it must be our study that none except the bad may ever have cause to regret him."*

"The best and shortest rule that I can lay down for your conduct is, to reflect on what you yourself have approved or condemned in the conduct of other Princes. Here, the Government rests on the opinions and sentiments of those for whose behoof it is exercised; for there are not in this country, as in some others, only two classes of men, the one born to certain command, and the other to constant and unreflecting obedience. On the contrary, you are called upon to govern a people, who, as they are not qualified to enjoy a boundless freedom, so assuredly will not submit to an unlimited servitude."†

During this scene, Piso acquitted himself like one who had been long in the habit of repressing his feelings. No sign of emotion was perceived in him from first to last. His answer was full of respect towards his father and Sovereign, and of modesty as far as it respected his own character and pretensions. He appeared, says Tacitus, neither elated nor insensible; and every one thought him more deserving of Empire than eager to enjoy it.

alba akes nown the doption to e Army d Senate.

Galba proceeded without loss of time, to make known to the Prætorian guards and the Senate the adoption of Piso. Combining in his speech the brevity of an Emperor with the manner and accent of a military chief, he informed the soldiers of what had just taken place; referring to the example of Augustus and the practice of the Commonwealth, as an authority for so important a measure. He neglected to mix any kind expression or soothing promise in his address to this most capricious portion of his army, accustomed to be courted, solicited, and praised; while they, on the other hand, looked gloomy and dissatisfied; indignant that they should be refused the largess which had usually been given to them on the most peaceful accession, in a case wherein the Emperor owed his Crown to their arms or approbation. Tacitus remarks, that a little liberality on this occasion, would have secured to Galba the affections of all orders of men, and bound to his interest the services of the Prætorians; but he chose to persevere in his adherence to ancient maxims, though it was obvious to every one that the ancient spirit of the Roman institutions had passed entirely away.‡

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 14—16. Plut. *in Galba.* Suet. *Galba*, 17.
† Tacit. *ut suprà*, and c. 18.
‡ Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 18. *Constat, potuisse conciliari animos quantulâcunque parci senis liberalitate: nocuit antiquus rigor et nimia severitas; cui jam pares non sumus.*

Servius Sulpicius Galba. From A. D. 68. to 69.

The address to the Senate, was neither more lengthened nor more conciliatory than that which he pronounced in the camp. Piso indeed expressed himself in a kind and modest manner, and gained the hearts of most of his auditors. Many of the Senators approved of his elevation to the purple; and even those whose views pointed in a different direction, were pleased with his gentle demeanour, and could not withhold their approbation from the choice of Galba. But the tranquillity of the Empire could no longer be secured by any political arrangements adopted at Rome. The mutinous legions in Germany called openly for a new master; threatening to cross the Rhine, and add force to their demand by joining with the disaffected in all the Provinces of Gaul and Italy. The Senate, alarmed at the aspect of affairs, proposed to send a deputation of its members to appease the sedition; while the friends of the Emperor suggested that Piso should be commissioned at the head of that body, in the hope that the name of Cæsar, added to the authority of the Legislature, would bring back the soldiers to duty and submission. But the conspiracy, it is evident, had already extended to the Capital; for no one would consent to discharge the office of Deputy in the proposed mission to the army on the Rhine; and Galba, compelled to receive the excuses of his servants, became more and more an object of contempt and ridicule.

The Senate receive the notice favourably.

Otho excites a conspiracy against Galba.

Otho, meanwhile, availed himself of these circumstances, so favourable to his aspiring views. His private affairs had already reached that point of confusion and despair at which frugality is useless, and all the ordinary expedients of industry can afford no relief. He acknowledged that his debts amounted to a sum equivalent in our money to sixteen hundred thousand pounds; and that, unless he were raised to the Sceptre, he could no longer hold a place in society. He assured his friends that the decisive moment of his existence had arrived; and that if he must perish, it was of no consequence to him whether it should be in the field of battle contending for a Crown, or in the Forum struggling with his creditors. These sentiments, too, were supported in Otho by a firm and resolute courage, unlike the effeminacy of his manners, and the delicate exterior of his person. His dependents, moreover, accustomed to the voluptuous habits and the luxurious living which prevailed in the Court of Nero, incessantly stimulated his ambition, and advised him to risk every thing in order to gratify it. Such exhortations were calculated to please his vanity; and his splendid dreams of Imperial magnificence and power were almost converted into realities by the mystical assurances of the Astrologers, who, it is said, revealed to him that he was chosen by Destiny to fill the Throne of Augustus after the death of Galba.*

His motives and conduct.

Having determined to encounter all the hazards of the momentous enterprise, he employed his freedman Onomastus, in whose hands he had placed about eight thousand pounds, to gain a party among the Prætorians, who should hold themselves prepared for the most daring attempts. By his presents and promises, this agent bribed two inferior officers of that distinguished cohort, who undertook to provide a

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c 21, 22. Suet. *Othon.* 5.

Biography. From A. D. 68. to 69.

certain number of confederates well armed and resolute; and thus, says Tacitus, two soldiers engaged to dethrone one Emperor and make another, and succeeded.*

Progress of the conspiracy.

On the fifteenth of January, the day fixed for the execution of the plot, Otho, according to custom waited on the Emperor, and was received as usual; after which he attended Galba, who was about to offer up a sacrifice. At this rite the conspirators had the satisfaction to hear the Priest who consulted the entrails of the victim, declare that there were strong signs of impending anger on the part of the Gods, and of imminent danger proceeding from a domestic enemy.†

While he was thus employed, Onomastus presented himself, and communicated the signal to his master that every thing was ready. Otho, excusing himself on the pretence of private business, took leave of the Emperor, and accompanied his freedman to the Forum, where he found only twenty-three soldiers, who saluted him by the title of Cæsar. His confidence gave way at the sight of so small a number, and he appeared desirous, says Plutarch, to relinquish an undertaking which had been so badly concerted. But the soldiers would not allow him to retrace his steps. They put him into a chair, and conducted him to the camp sword in hand, inviting their friends and companions to follow their example. The Tribune who guarded the gate, either taken by surprise or being privy to the conspiracy, allowed them to enter without opposition; while the other officers on duty, unwilling to expose themselves to jeopardy in a falling cause, looked quietly on passing events, and permitted them to take their course.

Piso addresses the Prætorian cohort on duty at the Palace.

Meanwhile Galba continued to assist in the pious duties of the sacrifice, and, as Tacitus expresses it, to fatigue with his prayers the unfriendly Gods who had already declared for his rival. A report had already reached the Palace that the camp was in a state of mutiny, and that some man of rank had placed himself at the head of the soldiers. Piso, in order to sound the dispositions of the cohort then on guard, assembled them under the windows of the Imperial residence, and addressed them in a speech equally remarkable for eloquence and for knowledge of the several characters whose interests were at stake. His words and authority produced a salutary effect. The Prætorians, accustomed to reverence the orders of Cæsar, drew up in order of battle, and professed their readiness to serve him. But the rest of the military were devoted to the rising fortune of Otho; and the zeal of the guards themselves, was not long proof against the revolutionary spirit with which the camp and the city was filled.‡

Death of Galba.

The friends of Galba were divided in their opinions whether he ought to shut himself up in his Palace, and fortify himself against the attempts of the infatuated soldiery, or go forth at the head of the bands which still remained faithful to him, and endeavour to subdue the sedition by force of arms. The Emperor, who wanted neither courage nor dignity of sentiment, made haste to determine in favour of the nobler means; only it was deemed a proper precaution to send Piso beforehand to the Prætorian camp, to prepare both officers and men for the reception of their Imperial General. It was thought that the great name of the young Prince, the recent splendour of his adoption, and the aversion which he was known to bear to Vinius, who was now detested by all classes of the people, would render him agreeable to the military. But the work of sedition was completed before he could reach the camp. Otho had given instructions to break open the armoury, and to bring forth a supply of weapons for all his adherents, soldiers and civilians; and he was already addressing them in a pompous harangue, full of invectives against Galba and his Government, to which his audience were replying in shouts of triumph and congratulation. Upon hearing this tumultuous noise Piso returned towards the Palace, when he met the Emperor, who was now approaching the Forum. At the same moment, Otho despatched a party of soldiers to prevent any rising in the city in favour of Galba, and these happened to reach the Forum, while the attendants of the aged Monarch were striving to convey him through it, on his way to the camp. No sooner did the armed band appear, than the standard-bearer of the cohort which was with Galba tore that Prince's image from the pole and threw it on the ground. This act of brutal insolence was the signal for a general revolt, and all the soldiers immediately declared for Otho. Those who carried Galba, disconcerted and alarmed, overturned the litter in which he was placed, and left him to the insults and violence of the enraged conspirators. His last words have been differently reported, according to the political bias of the several historians who have written his life. Some say that he humbly expostulated with his murderers, and promised to gratify their wishes on all points, if they would grant him an opportunity of reforming his Government. Others assure us, that he boldly presented his throat to the assassins, and invited them to strike, if they thought the prosperity of the Empire required such a sacrifice. The barbarity of those into whose hands he fell, was fully manifested by the numerous and unseemly wounds which they inflicted upon his body, even after he was dead. The soldier who cut off his head, at first wrapped it in his cloak, there being no hair on the forehead by which to hold it up; till exhorted by his comrades to shew the trophy of their guilty exploit, he thrust his fingers into the mouth, and so raised it in the air, to gratify the curiosity and revenge of the sanguinary rabble.*

Serving Sulpicius Galba. From A. D. 68. to 69.

And of Vinius a Piso.

Vinius, whose crimes were the main cause of this conspiracy, and who, there is reason to believe, was privy to the designs of Otho, did not long escape with impunity. He was run through the body by the spear of a soldier. The virtuous Piso encountered the same fate; but it was not until Sempronius Densus, a Captain of the Prætorians, had sacrificed his own life to protect that of Cæsar. That generous Centurion, the only man, says Plutarch, worthy of the name of Roman on whom the Sun looked during that day of guilt and horror, drew his dagger, and upbraiding the assassins with their perfidy, turned their blows against himself, and thereby afforded Piso time to take shelter in the Temple of Vesta. His retreat, however, being immediately made known, he was dragged thence, and

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 24, 25. † Ibid. c. 27.
‡ Ibid. *ut suprà*, c. 29.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 40—42. Suet. *Galba*. 20. Plut. in *Galbâ*. Tacitus says, that having presented his throat Galba exclaimed, *Agerent sic ferirent, si ita e Republicâ videretur.*

Biography. From A. D. 68. to 69.

butchered at the gates of the asylum. Piso fell at the age of thirty-one, leaving a name much more splendid than his fortune, and having enjoyed the rank of heir to the Roman Empire only during four unhappy days.

The body of Galba remained for a long time exposed to every kind of insult, his head having been sold in order to gratify a mean species of revenge on the part of a freedman, whose patron had provoked the indignation of the Emperor. At length the corpse of the descendant of the Sulpicii and Catuli was given to one of his slaves, who conferred upon it a private burial in the gardens belonging to his family. Such was the end of Galba, at the advanced age of seventy-three, after enjoying a prosperous fortune during the reigns of five successive Princes, and being blessed with a degree of happiness whilst others reigned, which he could not obtain from the possession of supreme power in his own person. His talents, says Tacitus, were not of the first order; and in respect of morals, he was rather free from vice than endued with any distinguished virtues. He was neither indifferent to fame, nor passionately fond of reputation. The wealth of other men never excited in him either envy or cupidity; he was economical in the disbursement of his own, and rigidly exact in the administration of the public finances. He was in too many instances governed by his friends and dependents. When these were honest, his facility did not hurt his reputation; but when they proved wicked, his complaisance rendered him despicable. The splendour of his birth, and the evil of the times in which his lot was cast, served in some degree to protect his character, and procured the name of wisdom for actions which were remarkable only for their imbecility. As long as he was a private man he appeared to merit a much higher station; and every one would have thought him deserving of supreme power, had he never been exalted to the condition of Emperor.*

Character of Galba by Tacitus.

Servius Sulpicius Galba. From A. D. 68. to 69.

Suetonius informs us, that the Senate, as soon as they were allowed, erected a statue to Galba, on a column in the Forum, at the spot where he was murdered; and adds, that Vespasianus, from a suspicion that assassins had been sent by that Emperor into Judæa to cut him off, ordered the decree to be cancelled, and the figure to be taken down.

MARCUS SALVIUS OTHO.

A. D. 69. FROM JANUARY TO APRIL.

Biography. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

Otho was descended from an honourable family in Etruria, which, according to Suetonius, boasted the blood of the ancient Kings of that country. His father, Lucius Otho, was a person of great weight in the counsels of Rome, during the administration of Claudius; and he is said to have borne so striking a resemblance to Tiberius, as to have been generally esteemed a near relation of that Emperor. By his wife, Albia Terrentia, he had two sons; the elder of whom, Lucius Titienus, had the good fortune to spend a private life; the younger, who was named M. Salvius, became the successor of Galba, whom, it is worthy of remark, he both raised and cast down by the guilt of conspiracy.

Image of Otho.

Marcus Salvius Otho. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL. Succeeds Galba.

pointed vernor Lusita-

The history of Otho first attracts the attention of the reader in the early part of the reign of Nero. Sharing deeply in the vices and extravagances of that infatuated Prince, he obtained not only his private friendship, but even a considerable influence in the affairs of State; till at length the rivalry which took place between them for the affections of Poppæa, produced such a degree of hatred and mutual suspicion, as must soon have terminated in the ruin of the favourite, had not Seneca procured for the latter the Government of Lusitania, to which he was sent as to an honourable exile. The resentment with which this usage inspired him, sought a ready gratification in the revolt, which, originating with Vindex in Gaul, extended to the legion in Spain, and ultimately transferred the possession of power from the hands of Nero to those of Galba. Having thus seen the last of the family of Augustus deprived at once of sovereignty and life, Otho busied himself in fomenting those disgusts and enormities which he found prevailing in the army, and which, he knew, would prove the most efficacious means for accomplishing the objects of his ambition. The result proved that his calculations were founded on an intimate knowledge of the materials which he had determined to employ; but he appears not to have been conscious that he was thereby calling into action a principle which he might never be able to controul, and giving his sanction to the exercise of a species of military despotism, of which he was himself to experience the cruel and capricious effects.

His good conduct on the Throne.

In the first days of his power, Otho seemed desirous to atone, by the mildness and wisdom of his Government, for the badness of the means which he had used for attaining it. He pardoned in a very graceful manner the obstinacy with which Marius Celsus, the Consul elect, adhered to the cause of Galba, and for which he had been thrown into prison by the partisans of the new reign. He appointed men of character to all the important offices, as well in the city as in the Provinces; and he satisfied the justice of the army and of the populace, by delivering up to punishment the infamous Tigellinus, so long the minister of Nero's vices and tyranny. As soon as he found himself invested with the purple, he resolved to forget all the

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 49. *Major privato visus, dum privatus fuit, et omnium consensu capax imperii nisi imperasset*

Biography. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

injuries and quarrels which attached to his private history. He granted immunities to the soldiers, and held forth to the mass of the people the prospect of enjoying once more those public sights and festivities, which still endeared to them the remembrance of Nero's liberality. In short, he appeared all at once to have changed his nature; and, accordingly, those who had formerly regarded him as one of the most furious and depraved of mankind, now looked to him as the restorer of the Commonwealth, and a pattern of national virtue and decorum.*

Takes the name of Nero.

But it was remarked by the more discerning of his friends, that he carried his complaisance rather too far, when, to indulge a whim on the part of the populace, he permitted them to salute him by the name of Nero, and to set up in the most conspicuous parts of the city the statues of that Emperor. It is even said, that, in official letters which he sent by couriers into Spain, announcing his accession to the Throne, he coupled, in his superscription, the name of the son of Agrippina with his own; and it was not until he perceived that this practice gave offence to the higher classes of his subjects, that he was induced to discontinue it.†

Tumult by the Prætorian guards at Ostia.

The favour which by these and similar means he had gained with the Prætorian cohorts, proved the occasion of a very unseemly and alarming occurrence. He had issued orders to remove the seventeenth cohort from Ostia to Rome; and the Tribune Crispinus, on whom this duty was imposed, desirous to put the troops in motion with as little delay as possible, proceeded in the evening to pack up their arms and baggage, in order to send them to the city during the night, or very early on the ensuing morning. As soon as these preparations were observed, the most turbulent of the soldiers affected to entertain suspicions in regard to the object of such unusual haste and secresy. They cried out that Crispinus came with no good intention; that the Senate had some design against the Government; and that the arms which he was so eager to convey to the Capital, were to be employed against the Emperor, and not in his service. These fears soon spread among the corrupted and riotous Prætorians. Exasperated at the plot which they imagined had been formed against Otho, and which was now detected by their own sagacity, some of them seized upon the waggons, while others attacked the officers who laboured to quell the mutiny, and put Crispinus and two Centurions to death. They forthwith resolved to march in arms to Rome, to protect the Emperor from the designs of his enemies. Being informed on their arrival that about eighty Senators and Magistrates with their families were supping in the Palace, they exclaimed, that now was the time to crush, at one blow, all the adversaries of Otho. The Imperial household was thrown into the greatest consternation, and the Emperor himself was in unspeakable distress. He saw that his guests fixed their eyes upon him with looks of dread and suspicion; while, in regard to the ultimate designs of the military, he was as ignorant as they were. He desired the principal officers of the guards to go out and speak to the soldiers, with the view of learning their intentions and appeasing their fury; adopting, at the same time, the suitable precaution of sending away his company by private doors. Scarcely had these withdrawn, when the Prætorians rushed into the apartment, demanding with loud voices and the most impassioned gestures, to have all the enemies of Cæsar delivered up into their hands. It was with the utmost difficulty that Otho prevented them from hurrying to the most frightful extremities. Rising from his couch and throwing aside the stateliness of his rank, he expostulated with the mutinous guards on the error and dangerous tendency of their conduct; and at length, after having condescended to employ intreaties, and even tears, he prevailed upon them to desist from their sanguinary project.*

Marcus Salvius Otho. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

Otho appeases the soldiers.

Next day, says Tacitus, the city appeared as if it had been taken by an enemy. All the houses were shut up; hardly any person ventured into the streets; and the few who did show themselves seemed quite dejected and alarmed. Of the soldiers it was justly remarked, that there was more of sadness in their faces than of penitence in their hearts. After having presented the Prætorians with a handsome donation, Otho ventured to go into their camp; where he pronounced a speech more expressive of regret than of displeasure, and concluded by fixing on two of their number, the most noted for sedition and turbulence, for capital punishment.†

Movements on the part of Vitellius.

But the stability of Otho's Government, it soon appeared, did not depend on the affections of the people at Rome, nor even on the partiality of the troops in the Italian Provinces. The armies beyond the Rhine had already made choice of another Emperor; and even before Otho had placed himself in the chair of the Cæsars, the legions which served in Germany under Vitellius and Hordeonius Flaccus were advancing with forced marches towards the Capital, to make good their election at the point of their swords. The revolt of Vitellius was known at the seat of Government, before the death of Galba; and was only concealed from the public, in order to prevent the domestic enemies of that Emperor from taking advantage of an occurrence so favourable to their views. But secresy was no longer practicable. The veterans who had gained so many battles under the standards of Virginius, were now in possession of the strongest passes of the Alps, and ready to contend with Otho on the plains of Italy for the Crown which he had so faithlessly usurped. To understand clearly the position which the fortunes of the rival competitors had thus assumed, it will be necessary to state the outlines of certain proceedings which took place immediately after the death of Nero.

State of the legions in Germany.

Upon the accession of Galba, Hordeonius Flaccus was sent to supersede Virginius in the command of the army upon the Upper Rhine, while Vitellius was appointed to assume the direction of the legions which served in the Lower Germany, and which had been recently commanded by Fonteius Capito. It has been mentioned in the history of the Emperor just named, that upon the death of Nero, the army of Virginius urged him to accept the Imperial Crown; and that it was not without much management that this disinterested General could induce his followers to take the oath of allegiance to Galba. Being soon after-

* Plut. *in Othon.* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 45, 46, and 71.
† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 78.

* Suet. *in Othon.* c. 8. Plut. *in Othon.* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 80.
† Plut. *in Othon.* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 83—85.

Biography. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

wards deprived of this able commander, the legionary soldiers, who had never heartily concurred in the elevation of the aged Governor of Terragonia, showed themselves not only ready for a revolt, but also determined to obey no other master but such a one as they themselves should elect. Accustomed to war, and impatient of exile in a savage country, where the fruits of valour were confined to the bare honours of victory, they longed to prove the strength of their arms upon a more wealthy people; and to have a share in those splendid gratuities with which every new Emperor was said to reward the fidelity of his partisans.*

The enemies of Galba took advantage of this mutinous and turbulent disposition among the troops. They assured the credulous soldiers that it was the intention of the Emperor to decimate them, for their avowed attachment to his rival, and to break their favourite officers, for not having taken a more decided part in his favour, upon the defeat of Vindex. They described him, too, as an avaricious old man, who was equally incapable of gratitude and of forgiveness; and they especially endeavoured to impress upon their minds, that he was devoted to the interests of the Gallic faction which had taken arms in his cause, in opposition to the Germanic legions, who had fought for the privileges of the Senate and the liberty of the People.

Vitellius takes the command on the Upper Rhine.

Under these circumstances, the arrival of Vitellius at the camp on the Lower Rhine, was regarded as the signal for revolt in both armies. His name was illustrious in the annals of the Republic; his father had been three times Consul; and his own reputation, though not free from stains, was such as could not fail to render him popular in a nation of soldiers. He was affable in his manners, liberal in his disposition, and not very severe to mark slight violations of discipline. In particular, he gained honour by shunning the disgraceful cupidity of Fonteius Capito; who is said to have sold employments, and to have weighed the merit of all his officers by the amount of their fortunes, and their readiness to bribe.†

s declared mperor.

It was on the second of January, a few days before Galba was put to death, that Vitellius was proclaimed Emperor by the Armies on the Upper and Lower Rhine. The principal agents in this revolution were Fabius Valens, who commanded a legion under Vitellius in the Lower Germany, and Alienus Cæcina, who held the same rank under Hordeonius in the Upper Province. The character of neither of these officers was entirely pure, nor such as to entitle them to unlimited confidence. Both had declared for Galba, and had even showed much zeal in promoting his advancement; but the former being disappointed in his expectations of a recompence, accused his master of insensibility and want of discernment, and accordingly made haste to offer his services to another; while the latter, detected and punished as a plunderer of the public treasury, determined to avenge his honour upon the fortunes of him whom he had injured; and, as Tacitus expresses it, to conceal his private wounds in the disasters of the Commonwealth. Cæcina, in other respects, had every qualification fitted to gain the affections of soldiers. He was young, had a fine person, and showed a courage and an ambition equally boundless. His eloquence was spirited and

aracters Valens d Cæcina.

powerful; his mien resolute and commanding, and his eyes full of fire. No one, in short, was better suited to wield the passions of the army in which he served, or to turn to the accomplishment of his own ends the mutinous spirit which at that period shook the camp of Hordeonius.*

Marcus Salvius Otho. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

The ardour of the soldiers was not fully seconded by the ambition of Vitellius. Luxurious in his habits, he was unwilling to sacrifice the ease and abundance which he enjoyed on the banks of the Rhine, to the chance of feasting like an Emperor on the banks of the Tiber. He was, however, induced to allow Valens to advance towards the Cottian Alps at the head of forty thousand men, while Cæcina was to proceed by a shorter route, and enter Italy by the way of the Pennine Alps, securing as he advanced all the important passes in that mountain barrier. No sooner were these resolutions made known, than the legions pressed strongly for orders to march; and that little delay took place is manifest from the fact, that they had already made some progress on the road when they received the tidings of Galba's murder, which, as has been stated above, was perpetrated on the fifteenth of January.

The Armies advance into Gaul.

The death of Galba made no impression on either army; it being to both of them a matter of absolute indifference, whether they were to fight against him or against his successor; for the one was as much an object of hatred as the other, and each equally proved a bar to the advancement of their favourite Vitellius. The Gauls, indeed, who had been attached to the late Emperor by a series of kind actions, which marked his accession to the Throne, made a demonstration of warlike intentions, as the legions of Valens passed through their territory; but upon learning that their patron was no more, and having no personal regard for Otho, who had overthrown him, they unanimously declared for Vitellius, the terror of whose arms had begun to shake their constancy.†

And occupy the passes of the Alps

The march of Cæcina through the country of the Helvetians, was productive of much distress to that simple but warlike people. Ignorant that Galba had ceased to reign, they refused to pledge their allegiance to Vitellius; and it was not until they had sustained several reverses on the field of battle, that they implored the clemency of the conqueror, and were allowed to resume the privileges of Roman subjects. The reduction of Helvetia was succeeded by an event still more important to the cause of Vitellius. A strong body of horse which had formerly served under him in Africa, and which was now stationed on the Po, no sooner observed the standards of Cæcina, moving towards Italy from the passes of the Alps, than they declared with one voice for their ancient Commander, and induced four considerable cities in the neighbourhood to follow their example.‡

Otho makes proposals to Vitellius.

When Otho was informed that his rival had made such formidable preparations for war, he addressed him several letters, inviting him to peace; offering him a large sum of money, and the highest offices in the Government; or, if he should prefer a life of privacy, the choice of a retirement in any part of the Empire, where he might spend his days in affluence and tranquillity. Vitellius replied to these propositions by

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 9. † Ibid. c. 52.

* Tacit. *Hist. ut suprà, et* c. 54—56.
† Ibid. c. 64. ‡ Ibid. c. 67, 70.

Biography. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

making offers equally ostentatious and insincere: till, after a short exchange of heartless compliments, they both gave way to the natural feelings of their hearts, and loaded each other with the bitterest invective and reproach.*

Arts resorted to by both parties.

Reluctant to embroil their Country in the miseries of a Civil war, each party endeavoured to thin the ranks of his opponent, by employing the usual arts of corruption among such as were open to the effects of deception or bribery, and by appealing to the patriotism and humanity of those who were willing to sacrifice their individual interests to the national welfare. These undisguised and more honourable attempts were followed by secret stratagems which proved equally disgraceful and unavailing; till at length the two competitors for the Imperial purple sent assassins to murder each other. Otho possessed a powerful check on the designs of Vitellius, by having in his hands the mother, wife, and children of that Commander, who were left by him in Rome, when he joined the army on the Rhine. The former consulted well for his reputation, by protecting from violence these innocent and helpless persons; and the generosity of Otho was amply requited by his successor, who employed the power which belonged to him as the head of the State, to shield from the calamities of a military revolution the relatives of his vanquished antagonist.†

The warlike means of Otho.

It has been already stated, that Vitellius was leading into the field the two armies which had been stationed in the Upper and Lower Germany, and also such forces from Gaul as the influence of his Generals had been able to draw over to their interests. The strength of Otho was not less considerable. Besides the troops in Italy, including the Prætorian cohorts, he had on his side the legions of Dalmatia, Pannonia, and Mœsia, who readily swore obedience and fidelity to him. The Provinces beyond sea, too, Britain, Egypt, Syria, and Africa, had professed their allegiance, and acknowledged him as their Sovereign; not so much, perhaps, from affection to his person or respect for his character, as from the reverence which was still entertained in the remoter parts of the Empire for the majesty of the Senate, and the name of the Roman People. On this principle, it was enough that the elevation of Otho was first announced to them, in order to secure all the duty and attachment which the Provincials were accustomed to manifest towards the successors of Augustus. The power of each party, therefore, was nearly equal; and the chance of ultimate success appeared to be entirely suspended on the skill of the leaders, and the constancy of the soldiers.

His plan of the campaign.

The plan upon which Otho intended to conduct the campaign, has been described by Tacitus as follows: finding that the passes of the Alps were already occupied by the troops of Vitellius, he resolved to attack Narbonnese Gaul by sea; and for that purpose fitted out a fleet manned with the most trusty of his people, particularly the Marine legion, which had been so cruelly treated by Galba, and whose commanders excelled all others in the knowledge of naval affairs.‡ Placing himself at the head of the land forces, he prepared to march against Cæcina and Valens, who were now descending rapidly upon the Po; having selected for his assistants in the field, Suetonius Paulinus, Marius Celsus, and Annius Gallus, three of the ablest and most experienced warriors that Rome then possessed. He reposed his chief confidence, however, in Licinius Proculus, one of the Prætorian Præfects; an officer whom Tacitus described as exceedingly well qualified for the duties of a city-guard, but entirely without experience in those higher parts of Generalship which either insure victory or speedily repair the evils of defeat. The same Historian adds, that he was a crafty and subtle calumniator, who knew how to cast an unfavourable light on the best deeds and qualifications of others, and to fill the Prince's mind with fears and suspicions of those who to superior talents joined an habitual frankness and modesty.*

Marcus Salvius Otho. A. D 69. From JANUARY to APRIL. And character of his General

Sensation produced at Rome.

The preparations for war filled Rome with confusion and alarm. Since the reign of Augustus, the sound of arms to be employed in actual hostilities so near the city had not once been heard. The Senators had grown grey in the habits and enjoyments of a peaceful life; the Patricians were become enervated by the long disuse of military practice; and few of the Equestrian Order could boast of ever having made a campaign. All were smitten with fear; and the more they strove to conceal it, the more did their panic betray itself. The young, indeed, to whose imaginations war presented itself as a desirable occasion for displaying their fine arms, rich uniforms, and spirited horses, were busy in preparing for the field, and in feeding their vanity with hopes of distinction and future Triumphs. The wise bewailed the loss of public tranquillity, and the disasters which were about to afflict the Commonwealth; while the multitude, already smarting under a diminished supply of food, uttered their complaints in loud execrations against the authors of the war, and the restless ambition of the great.

Otho addresses the Senate and People.

Otho soon perceived the necessity of seeking a remedy for these evils in a prompt determination to bring his enemy to battle. On the fourteenth of March he convened the Senate, and formally recommended to their care the safety of the Republic. By certain acts of clemency and munificence he laboured to gain their esteem, and to encourage the prospect of a mild and beneficent administration. He likewise harangued the People, and in his speech boasted of the greatness of the Capital of which they were citizens, and magnified the advantages which he derived from the suffrages in his favour of the august body of Senators, who constituted the original and essential Government of the Empire. He refrained from mentioning the name of Vitellius. Of the partisans of that General he spoke with modesty and forbearance; charging them rather with ignorance and prejudice, than with dislike to his own person, or with treasonable feelings towards their Country.

Such conduct did not fail to produce to a certain extent the effect which was contemplated. The Senate applauded the wisdom of their Emperor, and the common people saluted his ears with their flattery; which, says Tacitus, was as loud as it was false and deceitful. Nothing more could have been done, he adds; no stronger affection could have been shown, had the great Dictator, Julius Cæsar, or the Emperor Augus-

* Plut. *in Othon.* Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiphil.* p. 203. Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 74.

† Tacit. *ut suprà.*

‡ Ibid. c. 87.

* Tacit. *ut suprà.*

Biography. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

tus been leaving the Capital, to bring in chains to Italy the Chiefs of distant Britain, or the vanquished King of the warlike Parthians. To so low a state had habitual servitude already brought the Roman People, that they appeared now in no better light than as a nation of slaves, consulting only their private ease and interests, and showing the utmost indifference for the public welfare and glory.*

And sets out to meet the enemy.

Otho had so far matured his plans, as to be able to despatch towards the north of Italy five Prætorian cohorts, and a small body of horse, under the command of Annius Gallus and Vestricius Spurinna, who received orders to dispute with the enemy the passage of the Po. He himself followed at a small distance, with the rest of the Prætorian cohorts and all the other troops which it had been possible to collect together; having deemed it inexpedient to wait the arrival of four legions, which were on their march from Dalmatia and Pannonia to join his standards. The personal deportment of the Emperor, meanwhile, inspired his followers with the best hopes. Throwing aside the effeminate luxury for which he had been theretofore remarkable, he armed himself with an iron breast-plate, and marched on foot at the head of his troops, regardless of the fatigue to which he was thereby exposed.

Success of his arms at Placentia.

The first events of the campaign were favourable to the cause of Otho. His fleet reduced to obedience the whole of Liguria and Narbonnese Gaul; retaining in his interests, at the same time, the important Islands of Corsica and Sardinia. The army, too, gained considerable advantages.† The cavalry of Vitellius, aided by some Germans and Batavians, having forced a passage over the Po, and taken prisoners a Pannonian cohort, and a thousand marines, who had allowed themselves to be surprised, were induced by the ardour of victory to advance to Placentia, in which Spurinna had shut himself up with three Prætorian cohorts and a body of veterans. Cæcina, eager to strike a decisive blow, resolved to carry that city by storm; and though in the first assault he was repulsed with great loss, his failure only incited him to renew the attempt on a larger scale and with more adequate means. The night preceding the second attack was spent in mutual preparations. The soldiers of Vitellius made ready hurdles, sheds, and battering-rams, with the intention of approaching and levelling the walls; while the garrison prepared long poles, and collected enormous masses of stone, lead, and other materials to throw down upon the works of the assailants, and to crush those in pieces who should advance under the ramparts. Each party was sensible of the effect likely to be produced by a successful issue in this important enterprise. Scarcely had the day dawned, when the walls of Placentia were covered with defenders, and the adjoining plain seemed filled with troops, whose armour reflected the first rays of the morning. The legions in close order, and the auxiliaries extended over a larger space of ground, prepared to assist each other in the attack; the latter being well practised in the use of missile weapons, and accustomed to run and climb with incredible swiftness. The Germans, who disdained the aids of defensive armour, exposed their half-naked bodies to the darts and arrows of the Prætorians; and even the legionary soldiers who advanced under a canopy of shields, found no protection in that military device against the huge masses which were hurled from the battlements. Cæcina, after two fruitless assaults, which cost him many lives, was compelled to raise the siege, and retire to Cremona.*

feat of cina.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 90. † Ibid. lib. ii. c. 11—13.

Marcus Salvius Otho. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

This advantage might have been further improved, had Annius Gallus seconded the ardour of his soldiers; who, learning the route which the enemy had taken, importuned their Commander to follow and complete their destruction. The policy of Gallus, which has not been explained by any Historian, led him to check the impetuosity of his men, and instead of advancing upon Cremona to halt at a village called Bebriacum, where the fortune of the war was very soon afterwards determined.

This caution, which was condemned in Gallus, was imitated about the same time by Martius Macer and Suetonius Paulinus. The former, after defeating a strong body of German auxiliaries, allowed them to pursue their retreat unmolested; and the latter permitted victory to slip out of his hands, after it had been almost entirely achieved by the valour of Marius Celsus. Cæcina, to recover the reputation which he had lost at Placentia, formed a stratagem in order to insnare the Generals to whom he was opposed in the field. But his artifice being discovered, was turned against himself with so much effect, that the Imperial horse broke through his ranks, and would have completely destroyed his whole army, had they received the assistance of the foot commanded by Paulinus. This officer was noted for the caution and slowness of his movements, never thinking it time to conquer, says Tacitus, until he had removed every hazard of being vanquished. If the ardour of Paulinus in the pursuit had been equal to his skill in the engagement, it is probable, he would on that day have secured the Empire of Rome to his master Otho.†

Second defeat of Cæcina.

The soldiers who served under Cæcina, perceived with indignation the fault of their Commander, and were disposed to ascribe to treachery what, in fact, belonged to want of military talent. They put the Prefect of their camp in chains, on a suspicion that he was corrupted by the enemy; and had not Valens arrived at this juncture at the head of his numerous army, there is every reason to believe that the legions of Cæcina would either have dispersed, or have placed themselves under the standards of Otho.

Vitellius offers battle which Otho is disposed to accept.

When the forces of Vitellius were thus united, they thought themselves in a condition to offer battle; and the wisdom of this determination became the more manifest, when they perceived that a spirit of jealousy and mutual aversion actuated all the proceedings of the two Generals. Cæcina despised his colleague for his low avarice; and Valens poured contempt on Cæcina for his arrogance, presumption, and mean abilities. It was likewise discovered that the public judgment, on a comparison of the rival Princes whose claims were about to be decided, was in favour of Vitellius; inasmuch as an indolent voluptuous character was less to be feared, than one which combined a variety of ungovernable and destructive passions. Otho, on the other hand, had urgent reasons for protracting the war, or at least for postponing a general

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 20—22. † Ibid. c. 24—26.

Biography. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

engagement, in which his hopes might be irretrievably ruined. Several legions, the arrival of which would give a decided superiority to his army, were on their march to join him; all the strongholds on the Po were garrisoned by his troops; and he had magazines so amply furnished with provisions and military stores, that his soldiers, however numerous, were completely secured against the risk of scarcity.

Reasons urged by Otho's Generals for delay.

These reasons, it is true, were less felt by Otho himself than by his more experienced Generals, all of whom recommended a short delay. The Emperor, it was suspected, could no longer endure the torture of suspence. The vivacity and impatience of his temper made him prefer a speedy decision, whatever might ensue, to that painful uncertainty which had so long hung over his head; and he therefore gladly listened to the counsels of those who discovered an advantage in accepting the challenge of the enemy. The Prætorians, too, unaccustomed to the fatigues and restraint of actual service, became importunate for battle; imagining that they had only to meet their adversaries in the open plain, to ensure for themselves the honours of a Triumph, and all the indulgences and solace of a lasting peace. But a more urgent reason than any yet mentioned, may have influenced the determination of Otho to appeal to the decision of arms. It was conjectured that the soldiers on both sides, had begun to question the propriety of sacrificing their lives for two of the most worthless men on the face of the earth; and to take into their consideration, whether they might not render an important service to their Country by rejecting both the one and the other, and by conferring the title of Augustus on some meritorious and popular character, whose actions would not disgrace that proud appellation.*

Otho is determined to fight.

At all events, it was determined that a battle should be fought; after which resolution, Otho was weak enough to allow his advisers to agitate the question, whether he should be present in the field, or retire beforehand to a place of safety at a convenient distance. It was resolved that the Emperor should provide for the security of his person by falling back upon Brixellum; a measure which Tacitus very justly regards as the main cause of Otho's defeat and ruin. In the first place, he carried with him a part of the Prætorian cohorts and some other of his best troops, and thereby deprived those which remained of their usual courage and confidence; and, secondly, he intrusted his fate to the mutual suspicions and jealousy of his Commanders, who, having doubts of one another's fidelity, required more than ever some presiding genius to direct their movements and make them act in concert. In such circumstances, the prudence and experience of Paulinus were of no avail. The brother of the Emperor was, upon the retirement of the latter, invested with the title of his Lieutenant; but the chief power resided in Proculus, the Prætorian Præfect, a man who possessed hardly any one military qualification, while he was equally insolent and vain in the discharge of his office. It was no longer doubtful that a general action and the downfall of Otho were rapidly approaching.

The battle of Bebriacum or Cremona.

The conflict took place at Bebriacum, a village not far removed from the banks of the Po. It was begun by an attack of cavalry on the part of Otho's Generals, who, urged by their master to hasten an engagement, had proceeded by forced marches in search of the enemy. The inequality of the ground, or the precipitate manner in which the contending legions were brought into contact, occasioned considerable interruptions in either line; so that the battle, though general, was divided into a number of separate fights. In such circumstances, the fortune of war could not fail to present a variety of aspects. In one part of the field the impetuosity of Otho's troops subdued all opposition, and bore off in triumph the Eagles of their antagonists; while, in another quarter, this success was more than counterbalanced by the steady bravery of Vitellius's veterans, and by the furious onset of his German and Gallic confederates. At the close of the day, Vitellius, though still lingering in Gaul, found himself a conqueror, and master of the Roman world; for next morning Marius Celsus and Annius Gallus went to the camp of Cæcina and Valens in order to sue for peace, offering to acknowledge him as their Emperor. The negociation was neither long nor difficult; all parties found their interest in coming to a speedy accommodation; and as soon as the Deputies returned to the camp, the gates were thrown open, and the soldiers who so lately had fought for Otho, now showed the utmost alacrity in swearing allegiance to Vitellius.*

Marcus Salvius Otho. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

Otho defeated, and Vitellius declared Emperor.

The account of the battle given by Plutarch, differs considerably from that which has been preserved by Tacitus; the former introducing into it a number of incidents, which evidently belong to the partial engagements which took place before the armies met at Bebriacum. He admits, indeed, that those from whom he received the details were ignorant of many of the particulars, owing to the confused manner in which it was fought; but, he adds, that long afterwards when he was passing over the field of battle, Mestrius Florus, a man of Consular dignity, pointed out to him an old man, who in his youth had served under Otho, and who gave him such information respecting it, as sufficiently established the fact that the struggle had been both obstinate and sanguinary.†

Conduct of Otho after defeat.

Otho waited at Brixellum the event of the conflict which he had so injudiciously accelerated. When his misfortune was first announced, he bore the intelligence with considerable firmness, but gave manifest indications of the fatal resolution which he was about to carry into effect. The guards who were admitted to his presence, entreated him not to abandon the Empire, nor to desert an affectionate and devoted army, ready to die for his sake. One of the Præfects even proceeded so far, as to repeat in his ears the usual common-places against suicide, and to remind him, that there was more real courage in bearing adversity than in sinking under it; that brave men should struggle against Fortune, and, in spite of her frowns, should still hope and strive for better times; and that it belonged only to the character of cowards to permit their fears to carry them to despair.‡

The reflections of Philosophy were in vain addressed to a mind which had never been taught to exercise controul over its own passions, nor to regulate its

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 31, 32, 37.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 44, 45. Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiphil.* p. 203.

† Plut. *in Othon. ad finem.*

‡ Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 46.

Biography. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

movements by the calculations of Reason. Tacitus puts into his mouth a speech filled with lofty sentiments, and which may be said to express the very fanaticism of self-murder; but it is manifest, notwithstanding, that Otho resolved to die, because he had not strength of character to bear any longer the anxious suspence and uncertainty of a Civil war; and because he was determined that no chances of fortune should ever place him at the mercy of Vitellius, or compel him to court the clemency, or add to the Triumph, of a man whom he had lately denounced as a rebel, and reproached as one of the most contemptible and depraved of human beings. He spent the last evening of his life in attempting to comfort his nephew, Salvius Cocceianus; in writing a letter of condolence to his sister; and in recommending the care of his ashes to Statilia Messalina, the widow of Nero, whom, it is said, he intended to marry. At break of day he desired to be left alone, that no one might be accused of being an accomplice in his death; His suicide immediately after which he fell upon his sword, and almost instantly expired. His remains at his own request were interred without any delay, as he was apprehensive that his head might be cut off and exposed, or other insults inflicted on his dead body. The soldiers erected a monument over his grave, which, says Plutarch,* neither by its size nor by any pomp of epitaph could ever excite the smallest degree of envy. I have seen it, he continues, at Brixellum; it was extremely modest, and the inscription was this:

TO THE MEMORY OF
MARCUS OTHO.

Marcus Salvius Otho. A. D. 69. From JANUARY to APRIL.

The early debaucheries of Otho threw a stain upon his reputation, which his good conduct in Lusitania, and his mildness as Emperor, did not altogether remove. The treatment which he received from Nero might, in some degree, justify his rebellion against that Prince; but no palliation can be found for the treason and cruelty with which he was chargeable towards Galba. In all things his actions were marked by a culpable extreme; and perhaps both the good and the evil which appeared in his life, were the result of circumstances, rather than of virtuous principle or of fixed and incurable depravity. He died on the fifteenth or sixteenth of April, at the age of thirty-seven; having reigned exactly three months.† His character.

AULUS VITELLIUS.

A. D. 69. FROM APRIL TO DECEMBER.

Biography. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

The pedigree of Vitellius cannot be traced with certainty higher than to his grandfather Publius, who in the reign of Augustus held an office in one of the lower departments of the revenue, and was raised by the same Emperor to the order of Knighthood. Suetonius informs us, on the authority of a Tract composed by Quintus Eulogius, that the Vitellian family, in ancient times, reigned over the whole of Latium; and that they were descended from Faunus, King of the aborigines, and Vitellia, a female of mortal origin, but who derived from the superstition of the surrounding country, the reverence and worship due only to a celestial being. The same Biographer draws from certain local names and traditions known to the inhabitants of Rome, an additional species of evidence in favour of the antiquity of this race; but he admits, at the same time, that there is much probability in the arguments of those who maintain that the successor of Otho was the great-grandson of a slave and of a baker's daughter.* The lineage of Vitellius.

Lucius Vitellius, the father of the Emperor, enjoyed under Tiberius the dignity of Consul, and had afterwards conferred upon him the Government of Syria. His high rank and the influence which he appears to have possessed with his Imperial master, enabled him to procure for his son the doubtful advantage of a courtly education; for it is mentioned by Suetonius, that the young Vitellius passed his infancy and early youth at Capreæ, in the society or attached to the establishment of the Prince.‡ The luxurious habits which were formed at that important period of life, determined his future character, and laid the foundation of that systematic licentiousness and gross sensuality, which destroyed in his mind every noble principle and manly feeling, and which has entailed upon his memory a load of contempt and reproach. Vitellius became remarkable for the most expensive gluttony; measuring the value and extent of his power by the means which it afforded him of gratifying his pampered appetite, and of placing on his table a variety of rare and costly dishes, which could no where else be seen. At the Court of Caligula he rose into reputation as an expert charioteer; he gained the favour of Claudius as a gamester; and he placed Nero under a deep obligation, by requesting that Emperor to sing at a public entertainment, and by assuring him that his subjects longed so much to hear the charming melody of his voice, that they would accept of no apology. By such means it was, that Vitellius, beloved and favoured by three succeeding Princes, was elevated to the highest offices of the Magistracy and Priesthood; joining, in every instance, as it has been emphatically remarked, the greatest grandeur to the greatest vice.§ Early history at Court.

Aulus Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

We have observed, when speaking of his conduct at the head of the legions in Germany, that he was free from the vice of avarice, the besetting sin of

* Suet. *in Vitell.* c. 1, 2.

* Plut. *in Othon.* † Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 49, 50.
‡ Suet. *in Vitell.* c. 3. § Ibid. c. 4, 5.

Biography. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

almost every Roman Commander in those evil times. During the two years, likewise, that he governed Africa in quality of Proconsul, he discharged his duties with impartiality and moderation; no complaint having ever been made against him by the people over whom he ruled, that he either plundered or oppressed them. When his profusion had reduced him to indigence, and compelled him to rob, he chose for his victims the revenue of the State or the wealthy establishments of Rome; for we find that when charged with the care of the public buildings, he was suspected of removing the ornaments, and of withdrawing part of the donations and offerings which were presented in the Temples; substituting pewter in the room of silver, and gilded brass instead of gold.*

Sent to Germany by Galba.

It was the policy of Galba to promote to the highest military posts those persons from whom he had least to fear, and who, he imagined, would be slow to encourage any seditious proposals in the armies over which they presided. On this principle, he sent Hordeonius Flaccus to supersede Virginius, whose popularity had become dangerous; and gave to Vitellius the command of those legions on the Lower Rhine, which had been stirred up to revolt by the arts of Fonteius Capito. The successor of Capito was too much devoted to the pleasures of the palate to be disturbed by the dreams of ambition; and it was not till the soldiers laid hands on him, carried him into the street, and proclaimed him Emperor, that Vitellius gave his consent to be saluted by the title of Augustus. No sooner was this ceremony concluded, than the master of the Roman armies took refuge in a house, where he was told a feast had been prepared for him; and from which he was with difficulty removed, even after a fire, which had broken out in the apartment, threatened to reduce the whole building to ashes. In fact, he was a mere puppet in the hands of Cæcina and Valens, who, sensible that they themselves had neither name nor rank to justify the expectation of Imperial power, determined to raise their General to the head of the Empire, and thereby to open up a path for their own ambition, as the leaders of victorious armies.

And proclaimed Emperor by the legions on the Rhine.

Virginius still refuses the Empire.

It was mentioned, at the close of the last reign, that Marius Celsus and Annius Gallus entered into a treaty with the victorious Generals, and that the soldiers under their command professed their readiness to swear allegiance to Vitellius. But besides the army actually engaged, there was the strong detachment of troops which Otho had carried with him to Brixellum; who, retaining the greatest affection for their Prince, refused to acknowledge for Emperor the besotted epicure whom the seditious legions had brought from the Rhine. We find, accordingly, that immediately after the funeral rites of Otho were performed, the troops applied to Virginius, whom they had forcibly detained at Brixellum, to accept the vacant diadem; renewing on that occasion the violence to which he had formerly been exposed, and threatening to compel him by all the means in their power to assume the duties of the supreme Government. Virginius would not receive from the hands of a beaten army, the boon which he had twice refused when offered by the legions in the moment of victory. He declined even to undertake the adjustment of an accommodation with Cæcina and Valens; and making his escape from the furious soldiers, who were now more inclined to engage in intrigue than in battle, he left them no choice but to submit to the conqueror.*

Asks Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER:

The accession of Vitellius created hardly any sensation at Rome.† The inhabitants were employed at that moment in celebrating the Festival of Ceres; and upon learning that Otho was dead, and that the troops in the Capital had already taken the oath of allegiance to the new Emperor, they unanimously applauded the conduct of the armies, approved of their new master, and continued their amusements. The multitude, meanwhile, carried to all the Temples the statues of Galba, adorned with flowers and laurel; and erected in the *Forum*, on the spot where he was murdered, a pyramid of crowns in form of a tomb. Nor was the Senate more backward in their expressions of adulation. By one decree they granted to Vitellius all the privileges and honours which had been conferred upon his predecessors, at different times, and after the lapse of many years. Thanks were likewise voted to the German armies for their zeal and patriotism; Deputies were named to convey their homage to Vitellius, and to congratulate him on his accession to the Throne of the Cæsars; and, in a word, the proudest of that once illustrious body lavished on the despicable glutton whom a military faction had set over them, all the praises which the most rigid personal virtues, and the most eminent public services could have merited in the best times of their Commonwealth.‡

The accession of Vitellius received with indifference at Rome.

War presses on the Provinces of Italy.

But though Rome escaped the horrors of Civil war, the weight of that calamity was severely felt by the country at large. The troops of Vitellius, unchecked by their officers, who had neither power nor firmness to oppose their excesses, spread themselves over the richest Provinces of Italy, plundering the towns and villas, robbing Temples and private houses, and adding every where to their violence the most shameful debauchery. Cæcina, less covetous than his colleague, was more disposed to yield to the caprice and rapacity of the soldiers; while Valens, noted for his own extortions, could not refuse to connive at the faults of those who, in their worst actions, only followed his own example.§

Vitellius leaves Gaul for Rome.

Vitellius was still in Gaul, when his army on the Po conquered for him the highest dignity of the Empire. He had with him all the forces which were left in the Lower Province at the departure of Valens and Cæcina; to which he had added eight thousand men levied in Britain, and a considerable number of recruits, which he raised in his march towards the Alps. When the news reached him that the battle of Bebriacum had placed him on the Throne, he assembled his troops, conveyed to them the important intelligence that he was now their Emperor, and made preparations for his journey to Rome.

Clemency and liberality of the new Emperor.

His principal officers recrossed the Alps to meet him, and attend his progress to the Capital. Valens and Cæcina were loaded with favours, and received the honour of having a seat on each side of the Imperial chair. He listened to the submission of Paulinus and Proculus, and gave a ready audience to Marius Celsus, who had induced the vanquished troops to

* Suet. *ut suprà.*

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 51. Plut. *in Otho.*
† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 55. ‡ Ibid. *ut suprà.*
§ Ibid. c. 56.

acknowledge his authority. With a few exceptions, he extended his clemency towards all the Tribunes and Centurions who had fought for Otho; and, in no case did he harass the families of those who had shown the greatest zeal for his antagonists, either by forfeiture of their estates, or by deprivation of their rank. Nor did he retain any hatred to the memory either of Galba or of Otho. On the contrary, he allowed the coin stamped with their impress to continue in circulation, and their statues to receive respect, in every part of the Empire. He sought popularity, too, by remitting such arrears due to the public Treasury as could not be paid without distress; and by allowing the benefactions and immunities which had been granted by his predecessors, to be enjoyed by those who held them, without disturbance or reproach.*

His gluttony and expensive living.

His conduct so far was praiseworthy and seasonable; but he disgraced these good deeds by a mixture of mean actions, and particularly by indulging to a disgusting excess in the pleasures of the table.† He made four meals regularly every day with a sharp and craving appetite; using emetics to relieve his stomach, and to create a desire for food. Earth and Ocean were ransacked to find dainties wherewith to stimulate his palate. The countries through which he passed were impoverished by his unceasing voluptuousness; and, Tacitus assures us, that the principal inhabitants of the cities were ruined by the inordinate expenses of the entertainments which they found it expedient to give him, on his way through their territory. He dined with one, and supped with another; but still the burden was intolerable, as no feast could be served up before him, which did not cost at least four hundred thousand sesterces.‡ The duty of eating with him, too, was not less oppressive than that of supplying his table. Vibius Crispus, falling ill, was relieved from his attendance at those murderous feasts; and declared, that he must soon have been a dead man if he had been overtaken by sickness.§

stances his ex- s in gra- ying the ite.

As the insatiable appetite and extravagance of Vitellius were the most remarkable features in his character, and even conferred a species of distinction on his reign, the annalists of Rome have not thought it unbecoming the dignity of History to record some instances of his sumptuous gluttony. Suetonius tells us, that Lucius, the Emperor's brother, gave an entertainment in honour of the new Dynasty, at which were served up two thousand fish, and seven thousand rare and expensive fowls. The Emperor himself made a solemn dedication of a silver dish, which, on account of its prodigious size, he denominated the *Shield of Minerva, the Guardian of Cities*;‖ and this he filled with livers of a very scarce fish, with the brains of peacocks and pheasants, the tongues of redwings, and with the roes of lampreys. It was preserved as a monument of Imperial luxury till the reign of Hadrian, who gave orders to melt it down, and convert the material to a more useful purpose. The expenses of such an establishment could not fail to be very great; but our belief is startled at the enormous estimate made by Dion Cassius, who says that Vitellius spent during the eight months he was on the Throne nine hundred millions of sesterces, a sum which exceeds seven millions of our money.* Nor were the regular supplies of his table found sufficient to allay the cravings of his inordinate desire for food. At sacrifices he was ready, as his Biographer relates, to snatch from the burning coals the flesh of the victims which had been offered up, and the sacred cakes which usually accompanied the solemn oblation. If, in passing along the streets, the cooks' shops or stalls presented any dressed victuals or fragments of broken meats, he seized with his own hand the tempting morsels; regardless as to who had feasted on it before him, or from whose kitchen it had been sent for sale.†

Corruption of the soldiers.

Under such an Emperor, the corruption of discipline could not but advance at a rapid pace. The soldiers imitating his example, while they despised his person, gave themselves up to all manner of licentiousness; and the officers, unable to restrain their followers, seemed willing to shelter their reputation under the conduct of their Chief. Hence arose many acts of violence and disorder. The march of his army was tracked by waste and plunder; the peasantry were impressed, and made slaves to their military tyrants; and the wealth of the Provincial towns became the booty of the fierce Gauls and barbarous Germans who had espoused the cause of Vitellius. At length, the legionary soldiers and the auxiliaries proceeded to open war with one another; and on the arrival of the Emperor at Ticinium, he found that two cohorts of the latter were actually cut to pieces by the swords of his regular troops. The confusion which thus disgraced his own camp, was augmented by the haughtiness of the conquered army, which had been induced to submit after the death of Otho; and as the symptoms of insubordination were becoming every day more alarming, Vitellius resolved, by dispersing some of his legions and by breaking others, to reduce the power of his military once more within due bounds. He ordered the Batavians back to Germany, and the XIVth legion to Britain; while he inflicted on the Prætorians, whose attachment to the late Emperor had hastened the crisis of Civil war, the suitable punishment of disbanding all the cohorts which were on the Po. He dismissed, at the same time, all the militia raised in Gaul; regarding them as more proper to swell the ranks of an invading army, than to increase the strength or respectability of a peace establishment. Devoted as he was to the lowest species of sensuality, he could not fail to perceive that the danger which he had most to apprehend, arose from the turbulent disposition of his soldiers; and that the Civil authorities of the Empire could not be reinstated in the exercise of that just power on which the lives and liberty of his subjects depended, unless the arms of the Republic were again placed under the controul of the Senate. With this view he proceeded to reduce the number of men both in the old legions and auxiliaries; a measure which is condemned by Tacitus, not only without reason, but in opposition, we think, to the clearest principles of poli-

Vitellius disbands a great part of the Army

---

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 60.

† Ibid. c. 62.

‡ About £3200. Tacitus remarks of this Emperor, *Epulas vorum fuda atque inexplebilis libido—Exhausti conviviorum apparatibus principes civitatum; vastabantur ipsæ civitates.*

§ Suet. *Vitell.*

‖ Ibid. c. 13. *Clypeum Minervæ πολιοῦχον.*

* Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiphil.* p. 206, and Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 95.

† Suet. *Vitell.* c. 13

tical wisdom.* The Historian questions the policy of the step, because the duty of the soldiers was thereby increased; a sufficient cause, we admit, for the dissatisfaction of the military; but when he adds, that their bodily vigour was diminished by their luxurious habits, we are at a loss to connect his remark with the occurrence to which it seems to bear a reference.

He visits the field of Bebriacum.

Vitellius, who was still on his progress towards Rome, repaired from Ticinium to Cremona, where Cæcina entertained him with a banquet and a combat of gladiators. After this, he expressed a desire to see the plains of Bebriacum, where the battle was fought which set him on the Throne; and as forty days had not yet passed since the conflict took place, there still remained many proofs that the Empire had not been determined without a severe struggle and the shedding of much blood. The Emperor enjoyed the minutest details of the fight, and witnessed without horror the mangled limbs of the brave men, whose lives had been sacrificed to the ambition of two worthless adventurers. His eye wandered over every part of the dreadful scene, betraying not the smallest emotion at the sight of so many thousands of his countrymen deprived of the decent honours of burial. On the contrary, he is said to have indulged in the most unbecoming merriment, replying to those who complained of the stench which proceeded from the putrid carcases, that nothing smelled more sweetly than the body of a dead enemy, particularly when that enemy was a citizen.†

And proceeds to Rome, which he enters in state,

An entertainment and another exhibition of gladiators, provided by Valens at Bononia, supplied to the luxurious Emperor sufficient spirits to proceed to his Capital. He was followed on his way thither by sixty thousand armed men, who knew neither order nor discipline, and who dragged after them a still greater number of slaves and attendants. As he approached nearer to the City, there issued forth to meet him a multitude of actors, singers, buffoons, and other ministers of courtly dissipation, who claimed the privileges of friendship, or the rewards of former services. To these were added many Senators and Roman Knights, who went to salute their new Sovereign; some from fear, others from flattery, but all in order to prevent any bad construction being put upon their slowness to sanction the choice of the victorious army, and to offer their homage to the Imperial Commander. Vitellius had resolved to enter Rome as a place taken in war; but his friends succeeded in dissuading him from a step so extremely unpopular. He began his procession at the Milvian bridge, mounted on a fine horse, and completely armed; but when he reached the gates he put on the *toga prætexta*, and converted the military spectacle into a peaceful pageant, suited to the character which he meant to assume, as well as to the wishes of the better part of the citizens. When he reached the Capitol he found his mother waiting to receive him. He embraced her with an appearance of affection, and conferred on her the title of Augusta, though he himself had accepted no higher honour than the appellation of Cæsar.‡

He addresses the Senate and People.

Next day he convened the Senate and People, to listen at once to professions which were never to be reduced to practice, and to boast of activity and temperance which had no foundation in truth. Though every one knew that he had travelled from the Alps to the Tiber, either asleep or stupid from dissipation; the Emperor reminded his auditors of his unceasing vigilance and unwearied assiduity in promoting the interests of Rome; upon which the giddy populace, now accustomed to echo the flatteries which were addressed to their rulers, redoubled their acclamations in his ears, and prevailed on him at length to accept the title of Augustus. He pursued, at the same time, all the other means of acquiring popularity which were most likely to gain the suffrages of the multitude. In the Theatre, he bestowed his applause and protection on such actors as were most agreeable to the people; and in the Circus, he espoused the cause of the Blue Faction, though interest and inclination must have led him to give his countenance to their rivals. He attended the Senate, too, at every meeting, whether the business to be transacted was important or trifling; bearing the opposition of those whose opinions differed from his own, with a degree of placidity which denoted either craft or weakness.*

Conduct of Cæcina and Valens, the new Consuls.

Cæcina and Valens, who had been raised to the Consulate, enjoyed all the power of the Government, while the Emperor was compelled to execute their orders, and to rest satisfied with the mere semblance of Supreme authority. The Consuls, meantime, were jealous of each other; and the two Prætorian Præfects, Publius Sabinus and Julius Priscus, took, in like manner, different sides; the former lending the weight of his influence to Cæcina, while the latter endeavoured to strengthen the interests of his antagonist. The pomp and arrogance of these officers gave great umbrage to the Roman People. They loaded themselves with riches, and took possession of houses and lands which belonged to the ancient Nobility; and it was remarked that many of this illustrious Order, who were recalled by Galba from an honourable exile, were not restored to their property, but allowed to languish in indigence and neglect. Vitellius recommended to these high-minded Patricians, who had sacrificed their liberty and estates for the good of their country, to avail themselves of a law which compelled freedmen, in case their master should ever be in want, to supply them with the necessaries of life, and to leave to them at their death the one-half of their goods.

Relaxation of manners at Court, and strictness of the people.

The Army, as has been already observed, was greatly reduced in number, but not improved in discipline. It soon became necessary to replace the Prætorian cohorts, which the fears or resentment of Vitellius had induced him to disband; and for this purpose twenty thousand men were levied, and divided into sixteen cohorts called Prætorian, and into four, which were denominated Urban, or City Cohorts. As this was a favoured service, the soldiers showed great eagerness to be enrolled; and as the choice of candidates devolved upon the Consuls, in their quality of Commanders of the Army, who had gained great credit by the victory at Bebriacum, assumed the chief management in the new levy, and, by admitting his friends into the ranks of that powerful corps, confirmed

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 69. *Exitiabile id Reipublicæ, ingratum militi, cui eadem munia inter paucos, pericula et labor crebrius redibant: et vires luxu corrumpebantur, contra veterem disciplinam et instituta majorum.*

† Suet. *Vitell.* c. 10. *Optimè olere occisum hostem, et melius civem.*

‡ Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 90.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 91.

Biography. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

the ascendancy which he had already acquired. The jealousy of Cæcina's temper now took the alarm; and Tacitus remarks, that from this period the fidelity of the Consul began to waver. Vitellius, blinded by the incessant glare and ostentation of Imperial luxury, perceived not the dangers by which he was surrounded. The mutiny of his soldiers was appeased by the sacrifice of the most virtuous Citizens, or of the most patriotic among the Nobility; the extravagance of his establishment was maintained by rapine, extortion, and the meanest arts of finance; and the corrupted taste of the furious populace was constantly gratified by fights of gladiators and combats of wild beasts. The same profusion and venality which had disgraced the Court of Nero, were revived to the fullest extent. Honour and integrity were equally despised; and the only way to attain power was to lavish on the gluttony of the Emperor the most sumptuous feasts that wealth could supply or luxury invent. Rome already groaned under the weight of such oppression. The freedmen and other dependents of Vitellius accumulated immense fortunes, derived from the fears or ambition of those whose fate depended on the caprice of that dull and grovelling epicure. In the course of four months, the inhabitants had smarted under the exactions of Otho and the tyrannical inflictions of his successor; had given up their property to the infamous Ministers of both; had gratified the avarice of Vinius, Icelus, Asiaticus, and Valens,* and met the enormous expenses of the Imperial kitchen. The patience of all classes was nearly exhausted; when the good began to hope, and the bad were made to fear, that the reign of Vitellius would soon be brought to a close.

The cruelty of Vitellius

To these evils, which threatened the speedy ruin of the country, the Emperor at length added the most wanton cruelties against private individuals. Many with whom he had been intimate from his childhood, and whom he allowed to indulge in the privileges of friendship, were condemned to ignominious deaths; and against such of his creditors as had in any manner teased him for the payment of his debts, he cherished a hatred so violent and implacable, that nothing short of a capital punishment could satisfy his vindictive mind. One of these persons, who waited on him to pay his court, was ordered from his presence into the hands of the executioner; but altering his intention, he immediately desired him to be brought back and stabbed before his eyes, saying that he wished to have the pleasure of seeing an enemy's blood. On another occasion, two sons who besought him to spare their father's life were condemned to the same death. A Roman Knight exclaimed as they were dragging him to execution, that he had made the Emperor his heir. Vitellius commanded the will to be produced: and finding that the testator had made one of his own freedmen a joint inheritor, he issued immediate orders that they should both be put to instant death.†

Gres objects revolt.

Such instances of tyranny prepared the minds of the people for the revolution which was already planned in the East. The miserable condition of the Empire, and the persuasion of those who wished to see the supreme power exercised with greater wisdom and clemency, had more weight with Vespasianus than any motives of personal ambition in determining his conduct at this important juncture. He had abstained from taking any share in those occurrences which deprived Nero of the Throne and of his life; and so far was he from entertaining any designs against Galba, that he sent his son Titus to pay homage in his name to that Emperor on his accession to power. Titus, on his arrival at Corinth, received information that the Crown was again vacant, or rather was claimed by two competitors, equally unworthy of occupying the chair of the Cæsars. Returning to Palestine he found his father in appearance determined to support Otho, to whom he had induced the legions to take the oath of fidelity; but, at the same time, he was engaged in a correspondence with Mucianus, the Governor of Syria, with the view of concerting measures whereby the Commonwealth might be restored, under a virtuous Sovereign, to its ancient dignity and vigour.*

Aulus Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

Character of Vespasianus, and of Mucianus, the Governor of Syria.

Vespasianus and Mucianus were men of very different characters, and had even been for some time at variance. The one was a warrior, and the other excelled in the arts of negociation; the former was distinguished for his simplicity and economy, the latter delighted in show and magnificence, living more like a Prince than a private man. Vespasianus was great in action, Mucianus stood high as an eloquent and persuasive speaker. An excellent Prince, says Tacitus, might have been formed out of the two Generals, could their good qualities have been blended, and their respective frailties been entirely removed.†

Their confederacy.

They united in a sincere fidelity to Galba, whose principles they respected, and from whose administration they anticipated the happiest results; but when they found that the Empire was to fall a victim either to Otho or to Vitellius, they called to mind that patriots have higher duties to perform than merely to yield obedience to a successful usurpation, or to submit to that worst of all despotisms, the absolute power of a military Chief. They began, therefore, to estimate the strength that would be necessary to put down a Government founded on principles so entirely selfish, and supported by means at once so oppressive and so disgraceful to the Roman People. The forces at their command, or under the influence of the motives which were to guide their enterprise, appeared fully equal to the accomplishment of the great end which they had in view. Judæa had three legions, inured to the fatigues and privations of an obstinate war; Syria presented four, well trained and equipped, and animated with the best spirit towards their Country and their officers. Egypt with its two legions was ready to increase their ranks; and the troops in Asia Minor, Pontus, Cappadocia, and Armenia, indignant at the arrogance of the legions on the Rhine, who claimed the right of giving Sovereigns to the Empire, were burning with desire to assert their own privileges, as well as to share the ease and luxury which were enjoyed by their brethren in the Italian Provinces.‡

They wait the issue of the Civil war.

Though perfectly confident in regard to the inclinations and valour of their soldiers, the Generals were disposed to wait the issue of the war between Otho and Vitellius. It was of little consequence to them which of the two rivals should ultimately prevail, and

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 93—95. † Suet. *Vitell.* c. 14.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 96.

† Ibid. c. 4, 5. *Egregium Principatûs temperamentum, si, demptis utriusque vitiis, solæ virtutes miscerentur.*

‡ Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 73—87.

Biography. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

even whether the troops which were defeated under the one should join the victorious standards of the other. They knew that no sincere reconciliation could take place between the legions which had been opposed to one another in the field; and they were sufficiently acquainted with the characters of the contending Emperors to foresee, that if the fortune of arms should put an end to the one, the gratification of his hopes would destroy the other.

Vespasianus still hesitates.

But even after the battle of Bebriacum and the death of Otho, Vespasianus continued to hesitate. Nay, he proceeded so far as to go through the ceremony of taking the oath of allegiance to Vitellius; himself dictating the formulary in which the Army was called to plight its faith, and adding prayers for the happiness and prosperity of the new Emperor. Perhaps, he was not grieved to observe that the soldiers remained in sullen silence, or reluctantly repeated the words which he put into their mouths; but it is not concealed that the dangers connected with the undertaking to which the sense of duty impelled him, appeared in their full magnitude to his imagination, and kept his mind in painful suspense. "How important," said he, "how solemn, and how pregnant with perilous contingencies must that day prove, in which a father threescore years old shall expose himself with his two sons in the flower of their age to all the hazards of war. Those whose views do not extend beyond a private station, may, if success appear impracticable, relinquish their attempts; they may limit their risk according to the prospect of advantage; but he who aims at sovereign power can pursue no middle path, and must either gain the highest elevation or sink to the lowest depth of misery, contempt, and despair."*

At length forms his decision.

His principal officers and friends laboured to dissipate the fears which prevented the future Emperor from coming to a final determination. It required all the eloquence of Mucianus, who addressed him in a set speech, as recorded by Tacitus, to remove the obstacles which encumbered the resolves of his colleagues; nor was it until they reminded him of the numerous presages which the Soothsayers had revealed to him, of the greatness which he was destined to attain, that his confederates overcame his reluctance to accept the Crown. He was desired to recollect those splendid predictions which gave to him, and his children after him, the possession of Imperial power; that even the Books of the Jews, against whom his arms had been so long employed, announced that a Sovereign was to arise in the East, whose kingdom should extend to the remotest parts of the earth; and that the knowledge of futurity which was granted to his own Astrologers, amply confirmed the oracles which were delivered at other shrines.†

Aud is saluted Emperor in all the countries of the East.

Vespasianus was first acknowledged and proclaimed Emperor at Alexandria. On the first of July, the legions there under the command of Tiberius swore allegiance to him; and hence that day was afterwards reckoned the first of his reign, though his own soldiers did not take the oaths till the third of the month. The impatience of the troops both in Judæa and Egypt, anticipated in some degree the maturer counsels of Mucianus and Titus; for while these commanders were engaged in concerting measures, for securing to the accession of Vespasianus the popular effect of a simultaneous and general proclamation by all the armies of the East, the soldiers in his own camp saluted him Emperor, calling him Cæsar and Augustus, and giving him every other title which belonged to Supreme power. The Governor of Syria, however, did not fail to secure the cooperation of his legions in favour of their new master; so that before the fifteenth of July Vespasianus was acknowledged by the whole of that important Province. This example was soon followed by the Kings of Saphæna and Commagena, and by the younger Agrippa, the King of the Jews. All the Roman dependencies in Asia Minor declared themselves in favour of the same cause; and nothing now remained but to form a plan for bringing into the field the powerful armies which were engaged to dethrone Vitellius.*

Aulus Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

Mucianus prepares to invade Italy.

Mucianus made preparations to cross from Asia into Europe, with a force consisting chiefly of light troops, and not exceeding in number thirteen thousand men. The fleets of Pontus were ready to assist him in his enterprise, having received directions to wait in the harbour of Byzantium his approach on the opposite coast. Many individuals contributed from their private fortunes the means of conveying this army to the scene of action on the shores of Italy; the zeal of all classes of men was inflamed by the hope of delivering the Roman world from the tyranny of a heartless glutton; and every thing contributed to ensure to Mucianus the best prospect of success, when an event occurred which placed the Emperor on the Throne without the instrumentality of the Syrian legions.

Character of Antonius Primus.

Antonius Primus, a Gaul by birth, commanded the VIIth legion in Pannonia; and though his character was stained by many of the vices which spring up in revolutionary times, he was reputed a man of considerable influence, both in the counsels of peace and in arrangements of war. Learning that the troops in Mœsia had in a body revolted from Vitellius, and finding, moreover, that the affairs of that Emperor were every where assuming a very unfavourable aspect, he resolved to declare for Vespasianus, and to gain over to the same interest the legions which were serving in the several Provinces of Illyria. He was joined in his undertaking by Cornelius Fuscus, the Intendant of Pannonia, a young man of an energetic but unsteady temper, who is said to have loved danger for its own sake, and to have preferred the agitating excitement which proceeds from hazard and uncertainty, to the most affluent fortune if fixed and established. They immediately wrote to the XIVth legion in Britain, and to the Ist in Spain; both of these having held out for Otho against Vitellius. They sent messengers to every part of Gaul to give notice of their intended movement; and, by these means, they organized the insurrection on so wide a scale, that by the time the Illyrian armies were pre-

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 75, &c.

† We cannot refrain from quoting the reflections of M. Bossuet on this misapplication of the Jewish prophecies. "Blind, indeed, so to give away the hopes of Jacob and of Judah to strangers, by seeking in Vespasianus the son of Abraham and of David, and by ascribing to an idolatrous Prince the title of him whose light was to convert the Gentiles from idolatry."* Vespasianus had so much confidence in soothsaying, that when Emperor he publicly maintained at Court an Astrologer called Seleucus.

* See his *Hist. Universelle.*

* Tacit. *ut suprà.*

pared to take the field, the legions in almost all the other Provinces were ready to follow their example.*

A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER. ondact of itellius.

Vitellius was sunk in his usual sloth and dissipation, when the news was brought to him that the IIId legion had revolted in Mœsia. Reports had already been conveyed to his ears that Vespasianus was a great favourite with all the armies in the East, and that there was reason to apprehend that their views with regard to that Commander were inconsistent with the stability of the new reign; but when he was informed that the soldiers in those Provinces had followed the example of their officers, and sworn fealty to him, his alarm gave way to habitual indolence, and he believed himself perfectly secure. Nor would he allow the impression to rest in his mind, that the sedition of the troops on the eastern shores of the Adriatic was at all connected with the intrigues of Vespasianus. He regarded it merely as the insurrection of a single legion, originating in a particular cause which did not in the least affect the principles of the rest of the army. As a suitable precaution, indeed, he sent couriers to Britain, Germany, and Spain, instructing the Generals in those countries to set in motion towards Italy all the disposable forces which they had under their command.†

roused a mo- entary ention,

At length the approach of the disaffected legions, threatening to invade the northern States of the Kingdom, roused Vitellius to a little exertion. He ordered Cæcina and Valens to take the field at the head of the armies which had lately vanquished Otho. The former of these, who alone was able to obey the Imperial mandate, immediately despatched a body of horse to secure the important post of Cremona. But the fidelity of Cæcina had already been shaken, both by the ascendancy which his rival, Valens, had attained, and also by the knowledge which he appears to have possessed of the extent of the conspiracy directed against the power of Vitellius. It is imagined that he had listened to proposals on the part of Flavius Sabinus, the brother of Vespasianus, who was Præfect of the City; and, further, that he made use of the intelligence which he had thereby gained, to seduce from Vitellius, the inconstant Lucilius Bassus, the Admiral of the Ravenna and Misenum fleets. The result proved, that treasonable counsels had poisoned the minds of the Emperor's most confidential servants; for Cæcina betrayed his army in the presence of their enemy, and Bassus surrendered all the ships intrusted to his care to be employed against his master.‡

ns ad- s into

The partisans of Vespasianus were more faithful to their duty. Antonius Primus urged the necessity of immediate and decisive action, before Vitellius could receive reinforcements from Germany or Spain. Letters were sent to Aponius Saturninus to hasten forward with the Mœsian legions; and, in the meantime, Antonius himself, and Arrius Varus, whom he selected as a coadjutor, passed the Pannonian Alps, at the head of a chosen body of horse and foot, and poured down on the plains of Italy. He took possession of Opitergium, Altinum, Padua, and Ateste, and afterwards reduced Verona and some other towns of less importance.

Cæcina, whose strength was greatly superior to that of Antonius, neglected several opportunities of bringing him to an engagement. Having sold his fidelity to the enemies of his master, he only waited for a proper occasion to avow his deed; for which reason he no sooner heard that Bassus had delivered up the fleets, than he assembled the chief officers of his army, and made known to them his intention of acknowledging Vespasianus as the Emperor of Rome. Those who were in the secret applauded the speech of the Consul, and swore allegiance to the Sovereign whom he recommended to their fidelity; and many of the rest taken by surprise, or already wavering in their attachment, were induced to follow the example of their companions.*

Aulus Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER. Revolt of Cæcina.

Discovered by his army

When the soldiers were informed of the step which had thus been taken, they rushed tumultuously to the quarters of their General; where, upon finding that the name and statues of Vitellius were already succeeded by those of Vespasianus, they gave utterance to the most impassioned expressions of grief and indignation. After a short delay, the Vth legion proceeded to replace the images of the Emperor, throwing down those of his antagonist; and, having loaded Cæcina with irons, they chose Fabius Fabullus, their own Commander, and Cassius Longus, the Præfect of the camp, to head them in the field of battle. So great, indeed, was their rage, that the unfortunate sailors, who had no concern in the defection of the fleet, happening to fall into their hands were massacred without pity. They forthwith left their camp, and marching back to Hostilia they took the road to Cremona, in order to join the two legions which Cæcina had sent thither with part of the horse.†

The armies meet.

Antonius, aware of what had taken place, resolved to prevent the junction of the three legions, and, if possible, to attack them singly. He, accordingly, threw himself between the Vth legion and Cremona, and succeeded in bringing on an action, which was contested chiefly by the mounted soldiers. Night put an end to the skirmish, which was not attended with any decisive result; but while Primus, with the view of gratifying the resentment or the avarice of his men, was preparing to attack the defences of the city, intelligence arrived that all the troops which were encamped at Tarentum under Cæcina, having heard of the defeat inflicted on their comrades, were advancing by forced marches to Cremona, to avenge their reputation. This army consisted of six legions, with the usual contingent of auxiliaries. Antonius Primus had but five legions, together with the Prætorians who had been disbanded by Vitellius, and a large band of Suevians, led by their Kings, Sido and Italicus.

And come to action.

The two armies fought in the dark with various success, and with great loss and confusion on both sides. Courage, strength, and skill, were worse than useless, where no one could distinguish friend from enemy. Both parties were armed alike, their language was the same, and the word was so often given and returned, that it soon ceased to discriminate those who fought for Vitellius from those who fought against him. A glimpse of moonlight restored a momentary order to their ranks, but it was not till the sun arose upon the field of battle, that the advantage was observed to be on the side of Vespasianus, whose Generals had manifested throughout the protracted and sanguinary struggle an equal degree of

The result.

* Suet. *Vitell.* 15, and Tacit. *ut suprà.* Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiphil. in Vitell.*

† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 96. ‡ Ibid. c. 98, 99.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 1—5 † Ibid. c. 12—14.

‡ Ibid. c. 25—32.

Biography. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

resolution and military talent. Of the vanquished legions, some found an asylum in Cremona, and others in the fortified camp by which that city was surrounded; and since the victory could not be regarded as complete so long as the army of Vitellius remained entire, the troops of Antonius formed the determination of storming the lines, and even of forcing the town itself to surrender.*

The victors resolve to storm the camp at Cremona.

The camp now mentioned was constructed by the German legions in the war against Otho, and carefully strengthened by means of a ditch and rampart; to which other works of a more regular description had been recently added. Primus saw the hazard of attempting to carry such fortifications, and afterwards a town surrounded by strong walls, with troops so much harassed and fatigued. But the ardour of the soldiers themselves put an end to his hesitation. According to Tacitus, they feared danger much less than delay. They suspected all measures that savoured of prudence and reserve; the rashest schemes gave them the greatest satisfaction; and they regarded wounds, the loss of blood, and even of life as matters of no moment, compared with the honour and booty which they hoped to obtain.

Fury and obstinacy of the assault.

The assault made upon the camp is minutely described by the Roman Annalist, and with an ostentation of professional terms for which modern language, with all its resources, does not supply an adequate list of synonymes. Suffice it to say, that the fury of the assailants was equalled by the courage and obstinacy of those who defended the ramparts; and that, when at length the conquerors forced their way over the ditch and mound, a battle ensued which covered the whole space between the camp and town with blood and mangled bodies. Cremona itself still held out, and was even prepared for a formidable resistance. The walls were high, the towers were strong, and the gates were lined with iron; the soldiers of Vitellius, burning with shame, indignation, and revenge, longed for another opportunity to come to blows with the enemy, and to signalize the defence of that important place by deeds of valour or despair, which would preserve the memory of it to the latest posterity.†

Camp and city taken.

Primus had already burnt down the suburbs, and prepared his machines for levelling the walls, when the principal officers within the city, thinking it imprudent to strive any longer against fortune, came to the resolution of opening their gates to the conqueror. They took down the name and statues of Vitellius from all the public edifices; and releasing Cæcina from confinement, begged that he would employ his influence with the prevailing party to procure for them favourable terms of capitulation. Cæcina, whose pride and anger were equally roused, refused to intercede in their behalf; and enjoyed, says Tacitus, a malignant satisfaction in seeing so many brave men reduced to the necessity of imploring the good offices of a miscreant who had sold them to the enemy. The legions within the walls surrendered at discretion, and were allowed to retire stripped of their arms and standards. The conquerors were drawn up on each side, and at first insulted and threatened them; but when they saw them so humbled and abashed, as scarcely to notice the contumelies with which they were assailed, their resentment was turned into pity; and they called to mind that those were the very same men who only a few months before had behaved with great moderation when victors in the field of Bebriacum. Both armies were deeply incensed at the perfidy of Cæcina; and when he was observed to advance from the gate with all the pomp of Consular authority, arrayed in a robe of state, and preceded by his Lictors, the indignation of the soldiers gave vent to the most cutting reproaches on his pride, cruelty, and treason. Antonius screened him from the violence with which he was threatened, and sent him to Vespasianus; who, though he rewarded his defection with a few kind words, never conferred upon him either employment or respect.

Aulus Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

Cremona destroyed.

Primus, who could direct the valour of his soldiers in the field, soon discovered that he had not power to controul their turbulence and cupidity in the hour of victory. They demanded the spoil of Cremona as a solace for the fatigues and dangers which they had lately encountered; while he, either unable to oppose their determination, or unwilling to hazard his popularity by refusing a gratuity which he could not otherwise supply, was induced to connive at their licentiousness, and to permit the ruin of one of the finest towns in Italy. During four days Cremona was a prey to the rapacious troops; who, consisting of various nations, Romans, allies, and foreigners, were not restrained by those feelings of kindred and brotherhood, which might otherwise have alleviated the horrors inseparable from the sacking of a populous city. The adherents of Vitellius are said to have lost in the siege and the two preceding battles not less than fifty thousand men; their antagonists, according to Josephus, had to lament the slaughter of four thousand five hundred officers and soldiers.*

Continues inactive Vitellius.

Vitellius continued to divide his time between useless fears and the debasing pursuits of the lowest sensuality. Being acquainted with the treason of Cæcina and the defection of Bassus, he sent Valens at the head of a small force to assist the legions on the Po, which were still faithful to his interests, in repelling the invasion of the Pannonian insurgents. But this General had scarcely removed from the Capital, when he received intelligence, that the troops on whom all his hopes had rested, were completely beaten and dispersed at Cremona; upon which, instead of advancing to dispute the conquests of Antonius, he formed the bold resolution of sailing into Gaul, of raising soldiers in that country, of joining the legions in Germany under Hordeonius Flaccus, and then of descending into Italy with such an army as would enable him to renew the war on an extensive scale, and with a more certain prospect of success. This plan was rendered abortive by an accident. Being driven ashore upon an island near the coast of Gaul, he was taken prisoner. His ships and men fell into the hands of Valerius Paulinus, a steady friend of Vespasianus; and the unfortunate Consul soon afterwards was put to death.†

The capture of Valens proved a signal to all the Western Provinces to declare for the new Emperor.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 25, 32. † Ibid. c. 32—33.

* Tacit. *ut suprà. Hic exitus Cremonæ anno CCLXXXVI. a primordio ejus. Condita erat Ti. Sempronio et Cornelio Consulibus, ingruente in Italiam Hannibale.*

† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 36.

Biography. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

In Spain, the Ist, VIth, and Xth legions, assumed the standards of Vespasianus; and in Britain, the IId legion, which had served under the immediate command of that General, and was well acquainted with his bravery and virtues, acknowledged him with the greatest alacrity. In fact, at this stage of the war, Vitellius possessed only that part of Italy which is bounded by the Appennines and the Western Sea; the rest of the Empire, including the principal Provinces, having abandoned his cause, and proffered their allegiance to the conqueror of Judæa.*

Primus advances to Rome.

Primus having begun his march to Rome, occasioned considerable alarm in that Capital. To ward off the danger with which the city was threatened, Vitellius despatched the two Prætorian Præfects, Julius Priscus and Alphænus Varus, with fourteen cohorts and all the auxiliary horse, to secure the passes of the Appennine range, and thereby to check the progress of the insurgents. The Emperor himself, whose presence was solicited by the soldiers, joined the camp at Mævania in Umbria; but his ignorance of war, his sottish habits, and the evil omens which attended his person, contributed to depress the hopes and extinguish the zeal of his troops. When bad news arrived, Vitellius discovered by the paleness of his countenance the fears which agitated his bosom; and the only refuge which he sought from the terrors by which he was pursued, was in speedy and complete intoxication. The approach of Primus towards the central mountains, soon afforded an excuse for his return to Rome; and, as was to be expected, the troops finding themselves deserted by the man for whom they were called to hazard their lives, followed the example of his prudence, and left the passes of the Appennines open to the legions of Vespasianus.†

The citizens bestir themselves.

After a momentary effusion of zeal on the part of the citizens, Vitellius found himself reduced to the necessity either of dying in arms, or of submitting to negociate with the conqueror. His temper naturally disposed him to prefer the latter alternative. Flavius Sabinus, the Præfect of the city, had several private conferences with him relative to an abdication of the Throne; and, at length, it was agreed that he should resign the Supreme power to Vespasianus, on condition that he should receive a yearly pension of about eight hundred thousand pounds, have the expenses of his kitchen defrayed, and be allowed to retire to Campania, where he proposed to spend the rest of his days.‡

Vitellius resolves to abdicate.

On the eighteenth of December this unhappy Prince left his Palace, clothed in mourning and followed by his household, in extreme dejection and melancholy. He walked in procession through a crowded part of the city, to the place where he was to make a solemn renunciation of his rank and power; a spectacle nothing similar to which had ever before engaged the thoughts or awakened the compassion of the People of Rome. The Dictator Cæsar, as Tacitus remarks, had perished by the sudden explosion of a conspiracy. Caligula was cut off in the same manner. Nero's humiliation was concealed by the darkness of the night, and few were witnesses of his death. Galba and Piso fell as it were in battle; but Vitellius in the midst of his People, surrounded by his soldiers, and even by women, whose curiosity had brought them to behold so extraordinary an event, walked forth with a sorrowful heart to renounce the Empire.

Aulus Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

The act of renunciation, which he read with much feeling, declared that, for the peace and welfare of the Republic, he resigned for ever the Supreme power; trusting for protection and maintenance to the generosity of the Roman People. A flood of tears choked his utterance, upon which he took the sword from his side, and presented it to the Consul Cæcilius Simplex, who stood next him, denoting by that action the relinquishment of his judicial authority. The Consul declined to receive the sword, and the multitude, whose sympathies were now fully excited, would not permit him to divest his person of the badges of the Imperial dignity. Vitellius could not resist the affectionate importunity of his People; and, accordingly, instead of retiring as a private individual to the house of his brother, he was conducted back to his Palace with acclamations of vows of everlasting fidelity.*

Changes his mind, and returns to his Palace.

The Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus destroyed.

This change in the conduct of Vitellius led to a deplorable catastrophe. Sabinus, the city Præfect, happening to appear in the street, during this transient fit of enthusiasm, was attacked by a party of soldiers attached to the opposite interest, and compelled to take refuge with his surviving attendants in the fortress of the Capitol. The troops which continued faithful to the abdicated Sovereign assembled in haste, and laid siege to this stronghold; during which they employed a variety of inflammatory substances as missiles, which set fire to the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and consumed it to ashes; an august edifice, says the Historian, the sanctity of which neither Porsenna, to whom Rome capitulated, nor the Gauls, who took it by storm, presumed to violate.†

The soldiers of Vitellius urged the assault with so much vehemence, that the citadel soon fell into their hands. Sabinus and Quintus Atticus were brought forth loaded with chains, and carried prisoners to the Palace; where the former was almost instantly murdered by the mob, notwithstanding the earnest entreaties of the Emperor, who did all in his power to save him.

Rome taken by the soldiers under Primus.

The victorious army under Primus had been for some time within a few days march of Rome, waiting either the arrival of Mucianus, who was desirous to enter the Capital at the head of Vespasianus's legions, or the result of certain private negociations, of which the object has not been distinctly announced. The destruction of the citadel, and the death of Sabinus, put an end to the unseasonable delay. The soldiers pressed forward to the walls of Rome; where the last effort for Vitellius was about to be made by the remains of his German cohorts, whose zeal appears to have increased in proportion as the chance of success diminished. Their hopes were crushed in a double defeat. The authority of Primus could not prevent his men, at once heated with resentment and flushed with victory, from entering the city as conquerors, and from indulging in those excesses which too frequently disgrace both valour and good fortune, when soldiers take forcible possession of a crowded town. It has been remarked, that during the day on which this violence was committed, (being one of those dedicated to the Saturnalian festival,) the appearance of Rome was strange beyond all imagina-

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 42. † Ibid. c. 56. ‡ Ibid. c. 65.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 67. † Ibid. c. 71, 72.

Biography. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

tion. In one place were bloodshed and slaughter; in another, the baths were open, and the taverns full of drunkards. Scenes of debauchery were associated in the same street with torrents of blood and heaps of dead bodies; every concomitant of voluptuous sloth and licentiousness, was intermixed with the horrors that attend storm and pillage; so that the city appeared to be at once raging under fury and madness, and intoxicated with pleasure and festivity.*

Capture of the Prætorian camp.

The capture of the Prætorian camp, which continued to hold out for Vitellius, alone remained to complete the success of the party of Vespasianus. A dreadful conflict took place between the victorious Pannonians and the few brave men who had retreated to that asylum; the former having resolved to force it, and the latter to maintain it, as their last hope and resource, at the expense of their lives. The Prætorians, who had been disbanded by the one Emperor, and restored to their rank by the other, carried to the assault all the animosity which the remembrance of an affront could kindle in their minds, and all the emulation that could be excited by beholding their former quarters in the hands of those, whose unquestioned fidelity had raised them to the dignity of Imperial guards. The besieged were actuated by motives equally strong, and thought of nothing but how they might sell their lives at the dearest price, and preserve to the end their high reputation for courage and constancy. Covered with blood they embraced their standards and altars, the last consolation of dying soldiers; many of them who were mortally wounded strove to ascend the rampart, that they might expire in the presence of an enemy; and at length, when the gates were forced, the few remaining combatants rushed upon the victors, received their swords in their bosoms, and sank dead at their feet.†

The reign of Vitellius was now at a close; but before we let the scene drop on his unhappy and disgraceful history, we must give the outline of certain events connected with the fate of the Empire; which, though they did not affect the personal character or proceedings of that Prince, are nevertheless of too much importance to be passed by unnoticed.

Insurrection of the Dacians.

Two slight insurrections were occasioned in the East, by the removal of the troops which were sent to Italy to serve against Vitellius. The first, which was an inroad of the Dacians into Mœsia, was easily subdued by the Governor of Syria, who happened at the time to be marching along the borders of that Province in order to join Antonius Primus. He sent the VIth legion against them under the command of Fonteius Agrippa; and, with the view of preventing any renewal of the attempt, he farther strengthened the camp in Mœsia by a detachment from the Illyrian armies.‡

Suppressed

And of Anicetus.

Another disturbance originated in the ambition of Aniceetus, a freedman of Polemon, the last King of Pontus, who, impatient of the yoke imposed upon that country by the Romans, induced some of the neighbouring tribes to flock to his standard, and endeavour to regain their independence He attacked Trapezus, or Trebisond, an ancient Greek colony, and took it, cutting the garrison to pieces; and, finding that the Roman fleet in the Euxine had been greatly weakened by Mucianus, who withdrew many of the ships to Byzantium, for the purpose of conveying his army from Asia to Europe, he fell upon it with fire and sword, ravaged the coasts of Pontus, and made himself master of the adjoining seas. Vespasianus had not yet left Judæa; and hearing of these disturbances, he sent Virdius Geminus, a brave and experienced officer, who having with him a considerable detachment of excellent troops, found no difficulty in defeating the barbarian Chief, whose followers were ignorant of discipline and loaded with plunder. Anicetus fled for shelter to the Court of the King of the Sedochezians, whom he had gained over to his cause by large sums of money and a share of his booty; but the terror of the Roman arms, or the promise of a larger bribe to the venal Monarch, soon deprived him of that asylum, and he was delivered up to Virdius, together with the principal individuals among his adherents.*

Aulus Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

Suppressed.

Of the Britons.

In connection with these events, Tacitus mentions a considerable commotion in Britain, occasioned by the intrigues of Cartismandua, Queen of the *Brigantes*, and of Vellocatus, the armour-bearer of her husband.

Of the Batavians.

But the most important foreign defection during the reign of Vitellius, was the Batavian war which broke out in Germany, and gave rise to much bloodshed and alarm. The Batavians were descended from the *Catti*, a nation of distinguished fame in that part of Europe. In order to escape from the dissensions which frequently agitated their tribes, they had fixed their residence on the right arm of the Rhine, near its junction with the sea. At the period in question, Claudius Civilis was at the head of their councils; who besides his personal bravery and knowledge of affairs could boast a royal lineage, and a long series of warlike ancestors. Having taken some umbrage at the Romans, who without any good cause had put one of his brothers to death, he resolved to avail himself of the confusion incident to a Civil war, and to lead his countrymen into the field against the enemies of German independence. He soon obtained the concurrence of the inferior Chiefs, who like himself thirsted for revenge; nor had he more difficulty in securing the cooperation of a powerful horde, the *Canninefates*, who had the same origin, language, and territory, with the *Batavi*, and were equal to them in every thing but number. He likewise gained the eight Batavian cohorts, formerly attached as auxiliaries to the XIVth legion, which, being suspected by Vitellius, were ordered to rejoin the camp under the command of Hordeonius Flaccus.†

Success of the Insurgents.

The *Canninefates*, led by their General, Brinno, were the first to commence hostilities; for Civilis, unwilling to throw off the veil till his plans should be completely matured, continued to profess allegiance to the Romans, and even to act in conformity to their instructions.‡ Success attended the first motions of the insurgents, who cut in pieces two cohorts, which they surprised in their tents; and at length the Batavian Prince, discovering that his artifice was exposed, conducted his people, accompanied by the *Canninefates* and the *Frisii*, to try their fortune in a regular battle.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 83. *Prorsus ut eandem civitatem et furere crederis et lascivire.*
† Ibid. c. 84.
‡ Ibid. c. 46.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 47, 48. † Ibid. lib. iv. c. 12—15.
‡ Ibid. c. 15. *Erat in Canninefatibus, ritulidæ audaciæ Brinno*, a characteristic description of the barbarian Chief.

An important victory again crowned the efforts of the barbarians. The *Tongri* deserted to them in the middle of the fight, and the Gauls, who composed a large proportion of the Roman army, appeared to waver in their attachment to the Eagles under which they were accustomed to rally, and only to wait a sufficient opportunity or inducement to turn their weapons against their masters.*

Hordeonius Flaccus had hitherto in some degree connived at the proceedings of Civilis, because he wanted to retain on the Rhine the legions which Vitellius had more than once ordered to be sent into Italy. But when he saw an encampment forced, cohorts cut to pieces, and the Romans driven out of the Batavian territory, he regarded the commotion as much too serious to be longer neglected, and forthwith directed Mummius Lupercalus, who commanded two legions stationed at Vetera, to take the field and march against the enemy. Among the auxiliaries belonging to the corps of Mummius was a regiment of Batavian horse, who in the battle that ensued deserted to Civilis, and thereby once more secured a decided advantage in favour of their countrymen. Immediately after this victory, the army of the rebels was augmented by the arrival of the eight cohorts of Batavians, whom Civilis had persuaded to abandon the service of the Romans; but, it is remarked by Tacitus, that this great accession of strength did not unduly elate the barbarian General, nor make him forget for a moment the fearful odds with which he had to contend. On the contrary, he persisted so far in his plan of dissimulation, as to make all the troops under his command swear allegiance to Vespasianus; and even solicited the two legions which he had recently defeated, and which had shut themselves up in Vetera, to exhibit the same proof of loyalty. Upon their refusal, which was conveyed to him in haughty and insulting language, Civilis resolved to besiege the camp; a step which was attended with very important results, as affecting the interests of either party.†

iege of Vetera.

The ignorance of his Germans in all the arts of attack and defence, soon rendered it necessary for him to convert the siege into a blockade, and at the same time to adopt measures for averting the hazard of a general action with the forces under Hordeonius Flaccus. This Commander, upon hearing that the camp at Vetera was invested, thought it his duty to send relief; for which purpose he despatched Dillius Vocula, a brave and resolute officer, with a strong body of legionary soldiers, intending to follow in person at a convenient distance. Civilis was no sooner informed of Vocula's approach than he renewed his attempt on the camp, hoping to be able to take it by storm, before the succours could arrive; but meeting with the same obstacles which baffled his former endeavours, and having lost a great number of his bravest men, he was compelled a second time to withdraw his cumbrous engines, and to rest satisfied with the confinement of his enemies within their fortifications.‡

pulse of ilis.

When matters had arrived at the crisis we have now described, intelligence was received in Germany that the battle of Cremona was gained by Antonius Primus. It was expected that an event so important, which had decided the dispute between Vitellius and Vespasianus, would also bring over the Germans to the cause of the victor, and force Civilis either to submit to the Emperor to whom he had voluntarily sworn allegiance, or at once declare himself an enemy to the Romans. With this view, Vocula who, as well as all the other chief officers, was friendly to the interests of Vespasianus, sent a messenger to Civilis, with orders to remind him that the time was now gone by, when he could hope successfully to disguise a foreign war under the false pretence of Civil discord; and that if his real design were to assist Vespasianus to ascend the Throne, he should no longer continue in arms, as that object was already happily accomplished.

Propositions to Civilis.

The person employed on this delicate service was by birth a Gaul, named Montanus, and was not, at heart, more attached to the Government for which he bore arms, than the individual was to whom he carried the remonstrance of Vocula. Civilis soon discovered the bent of his character, and dexterously turned the resentment and pride which he perceived rankling in his bosom, to promote his own ulterior designs. He impressed upon the envoy a deep sense of the degradation and shame, which were now branded upon the vanquished tributaries of Rome; he magnified the numerous blessings of liberty and independence; he placed before him, in a vivid light, the advantages of the present opportunity and the certainty of success; and he concluded by assuring him, that, even if they should fail in their attempt, their circumstances could not be rendered more hopeless or painful than they were in their actual predicament. These considerations produced the desired effect on the unsteady mind of Montanus. He returned to Vocula with an evasive answer; concealed the change which his sentiments had undergone; and was prepared to watch every opportunity in order to practise upon the minds of his countrymen, and lead them on to the measures which they were soon afterwards induced to take.*

His intrigues.

Civilis had resolved to prosecute the war with vigour. Dividing his forces, and leaving a part before Vetera, he marched with the remainder to attack Vocula, who had encamped his men at Golduba; and he succeeded so completely in surprising his antagonist, that had not some Spanish auxiliaries arrived during the battle, and afforded succour to the Romans, their army would have been entirely destroyed. But the seasonable aid of the Gascon cohorts decided the fortune of the day in favour of Vocula, who soon afterwards gained another victory over the rebels, which enabled him to raise the siege of Vetera, and thereby free from restraint the two legions so long hemmed in by the barbarian conquerors.

His defeats.

Instead of pursuing the beaten enemy, Vocula thought it enough to enter the camp which they had invested, and to repair the breaches which had been made in the ramparts by the repeated assaults of the Batavians. Confining his cares to the supply of provisions, he sent parties of soldiers into the neighbouring country, to collect corn and other necessaries for his legions. A convoy being attacked by the vigilant squadrons of Civilis, Vocula found himself compelled to march out, in order to protect his detachment; upon which the active German threw his troops round

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 16.
† Ibid. *ubi suprà*, c. 17, 18.
‡ Ibid. *ut suprà*, c. 23.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 23.

Biography. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

the camp of Vetera, and a third time renewed the blockade, which the other had fought two battles to raise. By these means, all the advantages which Vocula had gained were not only lost, but the affairs of the Romans were reduced to a worse situation than before. Civilis seized every post, which, through neglect or weakness, was left undefended; and, on one occasion, he attacked the cavalry of his antagonist with so much skill and impetuosity, as to defeat them with great slaughter.

And successes.

But the Romans themselves, now every where turbulent and seditious, presented to him the most favourable opportunity to avenge the liberty of his countrymen, and to concert his schemes of future conquest. Incensed against Flaccus, whom they otherwise disliked for his inactivity and want of courage, the legionary soldiers resolved to call him to account for the gratuity which had been sent to them by Vitellius, upon his accession to the Throne. Hordeonius intimidated by their threats, produced a sum of money, which he delivered to them in the name of Vespasianus. But the military were not satisfied either with the grant, or with the manner in which it was bestowed. They charged him with perfidy to the Emperor, and treason towards the Republic; and, accordingly bursting into his bed-chamber, during the darkness of the night, they dragged him forth, and put him to instant death. Vocula would have suffered the same fate, had he not effected his escape, dressed in the habit of a slave.*

Assassination of Hordeonius Flaccus.

This occurrence, as well as the revolt of the Gauls which followed it at no great distance of time, had a great effect on the proceedings of the Batavian war; but as the subsequent events connected with that insurrection belong strictly to the reign of Vespasianus, we shall now interrupt the narrative until we have described, in a few sentences, the last hours and character of his miserable predecessor.

Vitellius, upon finding that Rome was taken and the Prætorian camp stormed, conveyed himself privately out the Palace by a back door, and went to his wife's residence on Mount Aventine, carrying with him only two domestics, a cook and a baker. Pursued by his own fears he could not remain in that asylum. He returned to the Palace, but found it quite deserted. Even the lowest of his slaves refused their assistance. His cook and baker followed the example of the rest, and forsook him in his distress. The solitude terrified him. He ran from one apartment to another, and finding them all silent and empty, his spirit sank within him. He shuddered at the reflection of his own fall. At length, exhausted by fatigue and despair, he tied about his waist a girdle stuffed with gold, and hid himself in a cell or hut belonging to a slave. But this shameful retreat did not save his life. The conspirators who had traced his flight dragged him from the hole, the entrance to which he had endeavoured to block up, put a rope about his neck, and led him to the *Forum* like a criminal about to be executed; the mob meanwhile pelting him with mud, and the soldiers pricking him with the points of their spears. At length, having loaded him with every invective and contumely which their brutal malice could invent, they hewed him in pieces with their swords, stuck his head on a pike, and drew his mangled body through the Tiber with a hook.*

Aulus Vitellius. A. D. 69. From APRIL to DECEMBER.

Death of Vitellius.

Such was the miserable termination of a life which extended to fifty-five years, a considerable part of which was spent in the service of the public, and in the enjoyment of the highest dignities. But Vitellius, it has been remarked, owed little to his personal merit. He was indebted for his great preferment to the reputation of his father; and he rose to the Consulship and a distinguished place in the Senate, in virtue of hereditary fame, and the good character of his family. Those who raised him to the Empire, says Tacitus, did not know him. He had no talent for Government, was indolent, and even cowardly; and yet his liberality and frankness of manners secured him many friends, and gained for him in the eyes of the Army a degree of favour which is not always bestowed on the bravest and most skilful Generals. It was, no doubt, for the welfare of the Commonwealth that Vitellius should fall; but his death reflected no honour upon those, by whose counsels or by whose hands the cruel deed was perpetrated.†

His character.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 36.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 85. Suet. *Vitell.* 16, 17. Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiphil. in Vitell.*

† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 86.

TITUS FLAVIUS VESPASIANUS.

FROM A. D. 69 TO 79.

Biography. From A. D. 69. to 79.

THE name of this Emperor did not derive much lustre from the wealth or power of his ancestors. His grandfather, Titus Flavius Petro, after fighting in the cause of Pompey at the battle of Pharsalia, retired from the army to pursue in his native town the humble occupation of a banker's agent. Nor was his immediate progenitor of higher rank, or employed in a more dignified office. Titus Flavius Sabinus, the father of Vespasianus, discharged the duties of a subordinate collector of taxes in Asia; in fulfilling the claims of which appointment he displayed so much lenity and justice, that his memory was long afterwards preserved in the principal towns by means of tablets and statues, which the gratitude of the people erected to his honour.

Lineage of Vespasianus.

This upright Publican married a daughter of Vespasianus Pollio, the representative of an ancient and honourable race, and he thereby laid the foundation of that eminence to which his family was destined to rise in the affairs of the Commonwealth. Vespasia Polla gave two sons to Sabinus; the elder of these, who inherited the name of his father, became Præfect of the City under Nero, Otho, and Vitellius; the younger, who drew his surname from his maternal lineage, enjoyed a still higher fortune, and placed himself at the head of the Roman Government.*

Mild disposition and simplicity.

It is asserted by Suetonius, that Vespasianus had originally no ambition in his nature, and that he showed an early preference of the peaceful retirement of a country life to the agitation and fatigues of a military or a political career. His mother assailed him with the bitterest reproaches; and at length, says the Biographer, more by abuse than by entreaty or authority, she compelled the youth to seek for distinction in the Camp, as well as among the candidates for Civic and Senatorial promotion. He served first in Thrace in quality of a Military Tribune, and afterwards obtained the appointment of Quæstor in Crete and Cyrene. In competing for the office of Ædile he sustained several repulses; but his success was more immediate and gratifying when he aspired to the Prætorship in the reign of Caligula.†

His character changes under Caligula.

His subserviency at the Court of the Emperor just named, was not very honourable either to his virtue or to the dignity of his sentiments. He desired permission to entertain the people with feasts and games, to celebrate the imaginary victory which that Prince thought proper to claim over German armies whose ranks he had never seen; and, again, when the conspiracy of Lepidus was discovered Vespasianus allowed himself to enter so far into the vindictive policy of Caligula, as to propose that the guilty should not only be put to death, but that their bodies should be deprived of the accustomed honour of funeral rites. In his marriage, too, which took place about the same period, he made a choice more suitable to the obscurity of his birth, than to the rank which he had already attained. He espoused Domitia, the discarded mistress of a Roman Knight, and the daughter of a slave; by whom he had two sons, Titus and Domitianus, who successively swayed the Sceptre of Augustus, and who became respectively the objects of the most intense love and hatred that the people of Italy ever directed towards the Throne.

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 69. to 79.

His military reputation.

In the reign of Claudius, the son of Sabinus was raised to the command of a legion; at the head of which he served with great distinction, first beyond the Rhine, and afterwards in Britain; and his merits were rewarded, through the influence of the favourite Narcissus, with the honours of a Triumph, and with the power of the Consulate. When Nero ascended the Throne, the suspicions of Agrippina kept Vespasianus back from the scenes of business and of intrigue. He was sent as Proconsul into Africa; where his administration was neither so prudent nor so pure as to allow him to retire without reproach, or even without encountering the shame and terror of an insurrection. He afterwards accompanied the Emperor in his foolish expedition into Greece; but being incapable of admiring the fine voice on which his Imperial master placed his greatest glory, and having repeatedly either fallen asleep or walked out of the room while the former was exercising his transcendant talent, he was banished from Court, and peremptorily forbidden to enter into the presence of his Sovereign. But Vespasianus had scarcely time to weigh the pressure of the disgrace which had fallen upon him, when he received a commission to proceed into the East, as the Emperor's Lieutenant, and to undertake the management of the war which had been recently renewed against the Jews.*

Fame not spotless.

We have already stated, under the reign of Vitellius, the leading events which paved the way for the accession of Vespasianus to the Throne of the Cæsars. His high military talents, as well as his character for moderation, pointed him out to the distracted Senate, and to the great body of the Army, as the fittest person to consolidate the Government, and to restore to all orders of the people that peace and confidence to which, owing to the weakness of their late rulers, they had for some time been entire strangers. The fame of Vespasianus, indeed, was not altogether spotless. In his transactions with certain individuals who put confidence in his integrity, he incurred the suspicion of mercenary motives, and even of gross injustice; and Tacitus, after telling us that the reputation of the General was ambiguous before he came to the Empire, makes the remarkable observation, that he was the first instance of a Prince becoming a better man, upon obtaining the possession of supreme power. But, as a soldier, he was not surpassed by any Commander of his age. He was ever active and vigilant; marching on foot at the head of his legions, and giving instructions suitable to all emergencies. The night as well as the day was

* Suet. *Vesp.* 1, 2.

† Ibid. *ubi suprà.* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 50.

* Suet. *Vesp.* 4.

Biography. From A. D. 69. to 79.

which had so long appertained to the descendants of Æneas.*

Such were some of the reasons which induced the Gauls to take up arms, immediately after the death of Hordeonius Flaccus. Civilis, finding his views encouraged, entered into a negociation with Julius Classicus, a native of that country, and Commander of an auxiliary regiment of horse; an active and restless spirit, who, claiming a relationship to the ancient Princes of Gaul, cherished a deep dislike to the Romans, as the conquerors of his family and nation. He procured the cooperation of two Chiefs who had great influence among their countrymen, Julius Tutor and Julius Sabinus; the latter of whom boasted that he was the descendant of the great Cæsar, the fame of whose military exploits now inflamed the fickle youth with the desire of a similar distinction.†

Defection of the Chiefs.

Plans of the insurgents.

The leaders of the confederacy, in the first instance, directed their intrigues against Vocula, who had succeeded Flaccus in the command of the German legions. The Chiefs of the Gauls urged him to march towards Vetera, which was still blockaded by Civilis, and to give battle to that traitor, who continued to insult the Roman Eagles, shut up within the narrow limits of a camp. He listened to their advice. and fell into the snare which they had prepared for him. Tutor and Sabinus, who were yet in his ranks, left him on his march, under pretence of examining the position of the enemy, and went over to the German insurgents, to whom they had already plighted their faith. The remonstrances and reproaches of Vocula were of no avail; his complaints and menaces were alike disregarded. The rebels were determined to oppose him both by stratagem and force; and so confident were they in their strength and resources, that they pitched their camp in the immediate neighbourhood of the legions, and began to practise on the fidelity of his men.

Defection of the legions and death of Vocula.

A scene of perfidy ensued which has had no parallel in the History of Rome. By promises and money lavished upon the Centurions and soldiers, a Roman army was prevailed on to swear allegiance to a foreign Power, or rather to the Chiefs of a rebellious Province, and to seal that shameful bargain by the death or captivity of its Commanders. In this hazardous predicament, the friends of Vocula advised him to provide for his safety by flight; but he, unmoved by the fate with which he was threatened, refused to save his life at the expense of his duty; and, trusting to the remains of honour which still animated a part of his troops, he endeavoured by an eloquent address, to recall them to a sense of shame, and to make them defend those standards which they were about to desert. His firmness was not rewarded with the success which it merited. A few transient emotions testified that the patriotism of the soldiers was not quite extinct; but these were not followed by any resolution worthy of the Roman name, or of the ancient character of the legions. Vocula, in these circumstances, attempted to put himself to death; but was prevented, only that he might fall a victim to the malice of Classicus, who after depriving him of a life which he no longer valued, threw the other two Generals, Herennius and Numisius, into close confinement.‡

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 69. to 79.

They take the oath of allegiance to the Gauls.

Elated by his success, Classicus assumed the dress of a Roman General; and, entering the camp, accompanied by Lictors and other ensigns of supreme authority, proceeded to exact from the soldiers the customary oath of obedience, whereby they bound themselves to fight courageously and truly for the Empire of the Gauls. Having taken this important step, he divided the cares of the Province between himself and his confederate, Tutor; upon which the latter immediately advanced to *Colonia Agrippinensis*, the modern Cologne, and compelled the inhabitants to take the same oath which had been imposed upon the legions. The troops on the Upper Rhine were induced to follow the same example; such officers as refused to comply, being either expelled from the service, or put to instant death.*

The soldiers at Vetera surrender and take the oath of obedience.

The camp at Vetera had not yet betrayed any symptoms of inconstancy or treason. The soldiers had been for some time reduced to the most painful privations, having devoured their horses and beasts of burden, and even attempted to satisfy the cravings of hunger by eating grass and leaves of trees. Classicus availed himself of their distress; and, sending as messengers the most faithless of those officers who had sanctioned the defection of the other legions, he proposed terms of capitulation, threatening that if they did not immediately surrender, they should be completely destroyed by famine or the sword. The troops hesitated between the horrors of the death with which they were menaced, and the disgrace of forfeiting, by an act of base submission, the honour which they had acquired in former wars, as well as by a brave defence against the arms of Civilis. Before they came to a decision, they sent deputies to that Commander, soliciting terms more worthy of Roman soldiers, and begging that their lives might be spared. Civilis, in reply, declared that he would not hear them until they had sworn allegiance to the government of the Gauls; whereupon the unfortunate legionaries submitted to this infamous oath, in the hope that they would be allowed to march out of the camp with their arms, and to reserve themselves for a change of fortune.†

The troops massacred by order of Civilis.

But the barbarian, doubtful of their fidelity, and apprehensive that his new allies might avenge their injuries by turning against him in the field, gave orders to the Germans, who were appointed as an escort, to cut them in pieces on their march from the camp. A miserable conflict ensued. The bravest of the Romans were killed on the spot; many ran away, and were massacred in their flight; while a few who returned to their fortifications were inhumanly burnt to death under the eyes of Civilis.

It is remarkable, that while Civilis insisted on the legionary soldiers taking the oath of allegiance to the Gauls, he himself acknowledged no such supremacy. His policy was to employ the arms and enthusiasm of his confederates, in order to diminish the power of Rome northward of the Alps, and thereby to pave the way for his own independence as a German Prince; a distinction to which his hopes were raised by the obscure predictions of a rude prophetess, who dwelt in the mountains of Helvetia. The success of his arms, too, gave countenance to his ambitious views. Encountering Claudius Labeo on the banks of the *Mosa*,

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 54. † Ibid. c. 55, 56. ‡ Ibid. c. 58, 59.

* Tacit. *Hist. ubi suprà*, and c. 60. lib. iv.
† Ibid. *ubi suprà*.

now called the Maese, he gained a considerable advantage; and, at the same time, drew to his standards the two nations of the *Nervi* and *Tongri*. The only check, indeed, which he sustained at this period, was inflicted upon Julius Sabinus, who had publicly assumed the name of Cæsar; and in that capacity, but with talents very unequal to those of the conqueror of Gaul, advanced against the warlike tribes of the Sequani. These faithful allies of Rome defeated the foolish Sabinus with great loss; so that, unable to rally his men, or retrieve his affairs, he sought an asylum in a subterranean chamber, where he is said to have passed nine years in the society of a female companion.*

Julius Sabinus defeated.

Sensation at Rome, and preparations by Mucianus.

These events produced a great degree of surprise, as well as of alarm at Rome. Mucianus, who in the absence of the Emperor held in his hands the administration of affairs, lost no time in making arrangements to check the progress of revolt in Germany and Gaul. He made choice of two distinguished officers, Annius Gallus and Petilius Cerialis, to take the command on the Upper and Lower Rhine; and determined to follow them thither in person, as soon as the condition of affairs in the Capital would permit his absence. It was resolved that Domitianus should accompany the General on this expedition; and in the mean time, the latter issued orders to the troops in several Provinces to assemble without delay on the confines of Germany. Seven legions proceeded on this destination; four from Italy; two from Spain; and one, the celebrated XIVth, from the shores of Britain.†

The rebels begin to waver.

The repulse sustained by Julius Sabinus had already shaken the constancy of many of the rebels, and confirmed in their obedience some towns which were ready to revolt. Civilis alone retained his activity, and kept steadily in view the great object of his insurrection. He continued the pursuit of Labeo, whom he had worsted in battle; stimulated not less by private animosity than by the love of conquest. But the Batavian Chief was badly supported. Classicus, intoxicated with the fame of victory, thought of nothing except enjoying its fruits; while Tutor, who had undertaken to guard the passes of the Alps, proved so remiss, or so faithless, as to allow a large body of horse and legionary soldiers to penetrate into Gaul without molestation.‡

Cerialis advances to Gaul.

Such was the state of things when Cerialis arrived at *Magontiacum*, or Mentz, eager to engage the enemy and to reduce the rebellious Provinces to submission. Full of confidence himself, he inspired his troops with the assurance of victory, as well as with contempt for the undisciplined Germans, and the fickle Gauls. He dismissed from his ranks all the young men who had been raised in those countries; declaring his resolution to use only the arms of Rome to recover her conquests and punish her revolted tributaries.

He defeats Antinus, chief of the Treviri.

He began the campaign by attacking Valentinus, the principal leader of the Treviri, and a determined enemy of the Roman name. This ferocious Chief had stained his hands with the blood of the two Commanders, Herennius and Numisius, who were delivered up by their respective legions when they went over to the Gauls; and having thereby precluded all possibility of reconciliation with the Romans, he prepared his mind for the worst that could befall him, opposed as he now was to an enraged and powerful antagonist. Following the counsel of Civilis, he shut himself up in a fortress on the river Moselle, where he hoped he would be able to resist the arms of Cerialis, until the forces of the confederated Gauls and Batavians could be assembled in the field. But the Roman General, who knew the skill and spirit of his troops, attacked the stronghold with so much fury, that he soon found the garrison, and Valentinus their guilty Commander, entirely at his mercy. It was not without difficulty that he saved Treves, (*Trevirorum Civitas*,) the Capital of the colony, from the just resentment of his victorious army. More desirous of revenge than of booty, they entreated permission to inflict upon the native country of Classicus and Tutor, some of the calamities of a war which they had so traitorously provoked, and to requite the sufferings and disgrace of their comrades who had been betrayed and massacred at Vetera.*

The disaffected legions resume their duty.

This signal advantage gained over one of the most determined of the insurgents, brought back to a sense of duty and repentance the several cohorts which had been seduced from their allegiance, and had plighted their faith to the Gauls. Cerialis, now master of Treves, invited them to join his army in that neighbourhood; a measure which created a very painful emotion on both sides, as the guilty soldiers were now compelled to acknowledge their crime in the presence of their victorious countrymen. Nothing, says Tacitus, could be more moving, than their first arrival. Conscious of the shameful act which they had committed, and penetrated with grief and confusion, they stood motionless, and with downcast eyes, before the legions which were drawn up to receive them. They could make no return to the salutation of their brethren; they had not courage to answer the expressions of condolence and affection with which they were greeted; on the contrary, they sought to hide themselves in their tents, and to shun the light of day. It was not the fear of punishment, but a deep feeling of remorse and a sense of guilt which closed their mouths, and seemed to confound all the faculties of their souls. Their comrades were so moved at the melancholy sight, that, unable to speak, they interceded for them by the more impressive language of tears and sighs. Cerialis showed his usual good sense and knowledge of human nature, by treating them with mildness; imputing all that had passed to an unhappy fatality which blinded both officers and soldiers, and exposed them at once to the fraud of the enemy and to the intrigues of the demon of dissension. "Regard this day," said he, "on which you return to your duty, as the first day you have entered into the service of your Country. Both the Emperor and I forget all that has taken place." He then received them into the same camp with his own legions; and strictly enjoined every man never to upbraid his unfortunate comrade either with his disaffection to the Commonwealth, or with the humiliation which he had suffered at the hands of a barbarian enemy.†

Clemency and wisdom of Cerialis.

Nor was the clemency of Cerialis confined to the penitent cohorts. He displayed the same gentleness and forbearance towards several of the towns and States which had, by their treacherous conduct, excited the resentment of the Roman Government. His wisdom and self-denial contrasted strongly with the

* Dion Cassius, *in Vesp.* and Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv.
† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 68. ‡ Ibid. c. 69, 70.

* Tacit. *ubi suprà*, c. 72. † Ibid.

Biography. From A. D. 69. to 79.

which had so long appertained to the descendants of Æneas.*

Defection of the Chiefs.

Such were some of the reasons which induced the Gauls to take up arms, immediately after the death of Hordeonius Flaccus. Civilis, finding his views encouraged, entered into a negociation with Julius Classicus, a native of that country, and Commander of an auxiliary regiment of horse; an active and restless spirit, who, claiming a relationship to the ancient Princes of Gaul, cherished a deep dislike to the Romans, as the conquerors of his family and nation. He procured the cooperation of two Chiefs who had great influence among their countrymen, Julius Tutor and Julius Sabinus; the latter of whom boasted that he was the descendant of the great Cæsar, the fame of whose military exploits now inflamed the fickle youth with the desire of a similar distinction.†

Plans of the insurgents.

The leaders of the confederacy, in the first instance, directed their intrigues against Vocula, who had succeeded Flaccus in the command of the German legions. The Chiefs of the Gauls urged him to march towards Vetera, which was still blockaded by Civilis, and to give battle to that traitor, who continued to insult the Roman Eagles, shut up within the narrow limits of a camp. He listened to their advice, and fell into the snare which they had prepared for him. Tutor and Sabinus, who were yet in his ranks, left him on his march, under pretence of examining the position of the enemy, and went over to the German insurgents, to whom they had already plighted their faith. The remonstrances and reproaches of Vocula were of no avail; his complaints and menaces were alike disregarded. The rebels were determined to oppose him both by stratagem and force; and so confident were they in their strength and resources, that they pitched their camp in the immediate neighbourhood of the legions, and began to practise on the fidelity of his men.

Defection of the legions and death of Vocula.

A scene of perfidy ensued which has had no parallel in the History of Rome. By promises and money lavished upon the Centurions and soldiers, a Roman army was prevailed on to swear allegiance to a foreign Power, or rather to the Chiefs of a rebellious Province, and to seal that shameful bargain by the death or captivity of its Commanders. In this hazardous predicament, the friends of Vocula advised him to provide for his safety by flight; but he, unmoved by the fate with which he was threatened, refused to save his life at the expense of his duty; and, trusting to the remains of honour which still animated a part of his troops, he endeavoured by an eloquent address, to recall them to a sense of shame, and to make them defend those standards which they were about to desert. His firmness was not rewarded with the success which it merited. A few transient emotions testified that the patriotism of the soldiers was not quite extinct; but these were not followed by any resolution worthy of the Roman name, or of the ancient character of the legions. Vocula, in these circumstances, attempted to put himself to death; but was prevented, only that he might fall a victim to the malice of Classicus, who after depriving him of a life which he no longer valued, threw the other two Generals, Herennius and Numisius, into close confinement.‡

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 69. to 79.

Elated by his success, Classicus assumed the dress of a Roman General; and, entering the camp, accompanied by Lictors and other ensigns of supreme authority, proceeded to exact from the soldiers the customary oath of obedience, whereby they bound themselves to fight courageously and truly for the Empire of the Gauls. Having taken this important step, he divided the cares of the Province between himself and his confederate, Tutor; upon which the latter immediately advanced to *Colonia Agrippinensis*, the modern Cologne, and compelled the inhabitants to take the same oath which had been imposed upon the legions. The troops on the Upper Rhine were induced to follow the same example; such officers as refused to comply, being either expelled from the service, or put to instant death.*

They take the oath of allegiance to the Gauls.

The soldiers at Vetera surrender and take the oath of obedience.

The camp at Vetera had not yet betrayed any symptoms of inconstancy or treason. The soldiers had been for some time reduced to the most painful privations, having devoured their horses and beasts of burden, and even attempted to satisfy the cravings of hunger by eating grass and leaves of trees. Classicus availed himself of their distress; and, sending as messengers the most faithless of those officers who had sanctioned the defection of the other legions, he proposed terms of capitulation, threatening that if they did not immediately surrender, they should be completely destroyed by famine or the sword. The troops hesitated between the horrors of the death with which they were menaced, and the disgrace of forfeiting, by an act of base submission, the honour which they had acquired in former wars, as well as by a brave defence against the arms of Civilis. Before they came to a decision, they sent deputies to that Commander, soliciting terms more worthy of Roman soldiers, and begging that their lives might be spared. Civilis, in reply, declared that he would not hear them until they had sworn allegiance to the government of the Gauls; whereupon the unfortunate legionaries submitted to this infamous oath, in the hope that they would be allowed to march out of the camp with their arms, and to reserve themselves for a change of fortune.†

The troops massacred by order of Civilis.

But the barbarian, doubtful of their fidelity, and apprehensive that his new allies might avenge their injuries by turning against him in the field, gave orders to the Germans, who were appointed as an escort, to cut them in pieces on their march from the camp. A miserable conflict ensued. The bravest of the Romans were killed on the spot; many ran away, and were massacred in their flight; while a few who returned to their fortifications were inhumanly burnt to death under the eyes of Civilis.

It is remarkable, that while Civilis insisted on the legionary soldiers taking the oath of allegiance to the Gauls, he himself acknowledged no such supremacy. His policy was to employ the arms and enthusiasm of his confederates, in order to diminish the power of Rome northward of the Alps, and thereby to pave the way for his own independence as a German Prince; a distinction to which his hopes were raised by the obscure predictions of a rude prophetess, who dwelt in the mountains of Helvetia. The success of his arms, too, gave countenance to his ambitious views. Encountering Claudius Labeo on the banks of the *Mosa*,

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 54. † Ibid. c. 55, 56. ‡ Ibid. c. 58, 59.

* Tacit. *Hist. ubi suprà*, and c. 60. lib. iv.
† Ibid. *ubi suprà*.

now called the Maese, he gained a considerable advantage; and, at the same time, drew to his standards the two nations of the *Nervi* and *Tongri*. The only check, indeed, which he sustained at this period, was inflicted upon Julius Sabinus, who had publicly assumed the name of Cæsar; and in that capacity, but with talents very unequal to those of the conqueror of Gaul, advanced against the warlike tribes of the Sequani. These faithful allies of Rome defeated the foolish Sabinus with great loss; so that, unable to rally his men, or retrieve his affairs, he sought an asylum in a subterranean chamber, where he is said to have passed nine years in the society of a female companion.*

Julius Sabinus defeated.

Sensation at Rome, and preparations by Mucianus.

These events produced a great degree of surprise, as well as of alarm at Rome. Mucianus, who in the absence of the Emperor held in his hands the administration of affairs, lost no time in making arrangements to check the progress of revolt in Germany and Gaul. He made choice of two distinguished officers, Annius Gallus and Petilius Cerialis, to take the command on the Upper and Lower Rhine; and determined to follow them thither in person, as soon as the condition of affairs in the Capital would permit his absence. It was resolved that Domitianus should accompany the General on this expedition; and in the mean time, the latter issued orders to the troops in several Provinces to assemble without delay on the confines of Germany. Seven legions proceeded on this destination; four from Italy; two from Spain; and one, the celebrated XIVth, from the shores of Britain.†

The rebels begin to waver.

The repulse sustained by Julius Sabinus had already shaken the constancy of many of the rebels, and confirmed in their obedience some towns which were ready to revolt. Civilis alone retained his activity, and kept steadily in view the great object of his insurrection. He continued the pursuit of Labeo, whom he had worsted in battle; stimulated not less by private animosity than by the love of conquest. But the Batavian Chief was badly supported. Classicus, intoxicated with the fame of victory, thought of nothing except enjoying its fruits; while Tutor, who had undertaken to guard the passes of the Alps, proved so remiss, or so faithless, as to allow a large body of horse and legionary soldiers to penetrate into Gaul without molestation.‡

Cerialis advances to Gaul.

Such was the state of things when Cerialis arrived at *Magontiacum*, or Mentz, eager to engage the enemy and to reduce the rebellious Provinces to submission. Full of confidence himself, he inspired his troops with the assurance of victory, as well as with contempt for the undisciplined Germans, and the fickle Gauls. He dismissed from his ranks all the young men who had been raised in those countries; declaring his resolution to use only the arms of Rome to recover her conquests and punish her revolted tributaries.

He defeats Valentinus, Chief of the Treviri.

He began the campaign by attacking Valentinus, the principal leader of the Treviri, and a determined enemy of the Roman name. This ferocious Chief had stained his hands with the blood of the two Commanders, Herennius and Numisius, who were delivered up by their respective legions when they went over to the Gauls; and having thereby precluded all possibility of reconciliation with the Romans, he prepared his mind for the worst that could befall him, opposed as he now was to an enraged and powerful antagonist. Following the counsel of Civilis, he shut himself up in a fortress on the river Moselle, where he hoped he would be able to resist the arms of Cerialis, until the forces of the confederated Gauls and Batavians could be assembled in the field. But the Roman General, who knew the skill and spirit of his troops, attacked the stronghold with so much fury, that he soon found the garrison, and Valentinus their guilty Commander, entirely at his mercy. It was not without difficulty that he saved Treves, (*Trevirorum Civitas,*) the Capital of the colony, from the just resentment of his victorious army. More desirous of revenge than of booty, they entreated permission to inflict upon the native country of Classicus and Tutor, some of the calamities of a war which they had so traitorously provoked, and to requite the sufferings and disgrace of their comrades who had been betrayed and massacred at Vetera.*

The disaffected legions resume their duty.

This signal advantage gained over one of the most determined of the insurgents, brought back to a sense of duty and repentance the several cohorts which had been seduced from their allegiance, and had plighted their faith to the Gauls. Cerialis, now master of Treves, invited them to join his army in that neighbourhood; a measure which created a very painful emotion on both sides, as the guilty soldiers were now compelled to acknowledge their crime in the presence of their victorious countrymen. Nothing, says Tacitus, could be more moving, than their first arrival. Conscious of the shameful act which they had committed, and penetrated with grief and confusion, they stood motionless, and with downcast eyes, before the legions which were drawn up to receive them. They could make no return to the salutation of their brethren; they had not courage to answer the expressions of condolence and affection with which they were greeted; on the contrary, they sought to hide themselves in their tents, and to shun the light of day. It was not the fear of punishment, but a deep feeling of remorse and a sense of guilt which closed their mouths, and seemed to confound all the faculties of their souls. Their comrades were so moved at the melancholy sight, that, unable to speak, they interceded for them by the more impressive language of tears and sighs. Cerialis showed his usual good sense and knowledge of human nature, by treating them with mildness; imputing all that had passed to an unhappy fatality which blinded both officers and soldiers, and exposed them at once to the fraud of the enemy and to the intrigues of the demon of dissension. "Regard this day," said he, "on which you return to your duty, as the first day you have entered into the service of your Country. Both the Emperor and I forget all that has taken place." He then received them into the same camp with his own legions; and strictly enjoined every man never to upbraid his unfortunate comrade either with his disaffection to the Commonwealth, or with the humiliation which he had suffered at the hands of a barbarian enemy.†

Clemency and wisdom of Cerialis.

Nor was the clemency of Cerialis confined to the penitent cohorts. He displayed the same gentleness and forbearance towards several of the towns and States which had, by their treacherous conduct, excited the resentment of the Roman Government. His wisdom and self-denial contrasted strongly with the

* Dion Cassius, *in Vesp.* and Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv.
† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 68. ‡ Ibid. c. 69, 70.

* Tacit. *ubi suprà*, c. 72. † Ibid.

Biography. From A. D. 69. to 79.

furious measures and unbridled passions of Tutor and Classicus. All orders of people were made to perceive that their peace and safety depended on the ascendancy of the Romans; and meeting with kindness where they had been led to expect a vindictive and inexorable severity, the promises of the General at once raised their courage and gained their hearts. The whole of Gaul, accordingly, was soon detached from the interests of the rebels; and the victorious legions found that they had no other enemy to contend with besides Civilis and his Batavians, assisted by a few German tribes on either side of the Rhine.

Craft of Civilis.

The Batavian Commander was no less a master of guile and intrigue, than of military science and the practice of war. He wrote to Cerialis in his own name, and in that of Classicus, stating, that they knew Vespasianus to be dead, though that event was studiously kept a secret; that Rome and Italy, exhausted by the Civil wars, had neither soldiers nor money remaining; that Mucianus and Domitianus were but empty names, which no one either respected or feared; but that if Cerialis would take upon himself the sovereignty of Gaul, they would acknowledge him as their master, and retire to their respective districts as his vassals and dependents. They added, at the same time, that if he preferred to the Empire which they were ready to put into his hands the subordinate station he occupied as the Lieutenant of Domitianus, they had no objection to meet him in the field, and to abide by the decision of war. To these proposals Cerialis returned no answer; holding it sufficient that he sent the bearer of them as a prisoner to the son of Vespasianus.

And his attempt to gain Cerialis.

The Roman camp attacked and carried.

Civilis, finding himself reduced to the necessity of fighting, made preparations for attacking his adversary. Consulting with his adherents, he found no other ground for doubt except whether he should commence hostilities immediately, or wait for the reinforcements which he expected from beyond the Rhine. In the end it was resolved, that they should without delay make an assault on the Roman camp, which Cerialis, not apprehending any danger, had only slightly fortified; and so sudden and fierce was the onset, that the works were carried, and the legions thrown into confusion, before intelligence could be conveyed to Treves, where that Commander passed the night. Repairing to the camp in haste, he found his lines forced, his cavalry routed, and the bridge over the Moselle in the possession of the enemy; all hope of retrieving affairs being lost, except that which he placed in his own intrepidity, and in the discipline of his troops. Forthwith rallying such of the soldiers as were near enough to receive his commands, he rushed at the head of a party of brave men into the thickest body of the Germans, drove them back at the point of the sword, retook the bridge, and stationed a guard to defend it.

But retaken by Cerialis.

Then hastening to the camp itself, he discovered that the legions, which he had so lately restored to their Eagles, were in a state of terror, and meditating flight. He upbraided them with their cowardice, and reproached them with their ingratitude. He compe led them to form a line and present a front to the enemy, great numbers of whom were already within the ramparts. At length the XXIst legion came to their assistance, when a general charge was made upon the assailants, who gave way on all sides, and left the Romans in possession of a decided victory. The troops of Civilis, loaded with plunder, could neither fight nor defend themselves from the weapons with which they were borne down. It was in vain for that spirited barbarian to exhort his fugitives to return to the attack, or to secure the advantages which they had already gained. Yielding to the consternation which a nocturnal assault so commonly produces, their retreat could not be checked till they had reached their camp; an asylum which was almost immediately attacked, forced, and demolished by the Roman General.*

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 69. to 79.

Mucianus detains Domitianus from the seat of war.

The success which attended these movements on the part of the Romans occasioned great perplexity to Civilis and his followers, who found their resources becoming every day more precarious, and their confederates less worthy of confidence. The plans of Mucianus, on the other hand were not, free from embarrassment. He was accompanied on his march by Domitianus, whose vices, mixed with a depraved sort of ambition, had already begun to excite serious apprehensions, and rendered him a very unfit person to assume the command of an army employed against rebellious subjects. Mucianus, upon receiving tidings of the successful progress of the Roman arms, suggested to the Prince that it would be improper for him to place himself at the head of the legions, when there was no longer in the field an enemy whose defeat would afford a triumph worthy of an Emperor's son; and, moreover, that to supersede Cerialis when he had already accomplished the main object of the war, could not be held as either generous or just.

Views of Domitianus thwarted.

Domitianus had too much penetration not to understand the specious reasoning of the General, and to detect his real motives. He yielded accordingly to the suggestions of Mucianus, and refrained from going to the seat of war; while he resolved to make a private application to Cerialis, and induce him by promises of favour to resign the command of the legions. Cerialis did not reply to any of his letters; calling his schemes and proposals only childish fancies, and pretending not to comprehend the deeper views which the dissimulation and affected modesty of the Prince could not entirely conceal.†

Civilis recruits his army, and takes the field.

But the war was, in fact, so far from being finished, that the management of it still required all the experience and courage of the able officer to whose charge it was intrusted. Civilis had recruited his troops beyond the Rhine, and had already occupied a position near Vetera, at the head of a very numerous army. Cerialis followed him thither with a force likewise considerably augmented; having received the addition of three legions, and some considerable bodies of auxiliary horse and foot. Neither of the Commanders was inclined to delay the action which both saw to be unavoidable; but the marshy nature of the ground by which they were separated, aggravated at that period by the overflowing of the river, prevented them from putting in motion the heavy-armed troops. A skirmish ensued, indeed, provoked by the mutual reproaches of the soldiers, whom the sight of Vetera inspired on the one side with feelings of triumph, and, on the other, with sentiments of the deepest hatred and revenge. The advantage on this occasion was gained by the Germans, whose light armour and knowledge of the ground gave them a decided superiority to the Romans, loaded with the heavy weapons, and igno-

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 77, 78. † Ibid. c. 85, 86.

Biography. From A. D. 69. to 79.

rant of the country, now almost every where covered with water.*

Preparation for battle.

The issue of this trifling engagement, however, induced the two Commanders, for contrary reasons, to hasten on a general battle. The conqueror was desirous to push his fortune while it was favourable, and Cerialis longed to retrieve his honour, which was somewhat affected by the late tumultuous onset. The Batavians were emboldened by success; the Romans were urged by shame. The former spent the night in shouts of joy and songs of triumph; the latter in meditating and anticipating revenge. Next day both armies drew up for battle; each General forming his line according to the nature of the position which he occupied, and the mode of discipline in which his men had been trained. Cerialis placed his auxiliary cohorts in the first rank, and his horse in the wings; the legions as usual composing the second line. Civilis drew up his troops in battalions, pointed after the form of a wedge, and covered on each flank by the marshes and river. The action began on both sides by a discharge of missile weapons; but the Batavians, succeeding at length in their attempt to draw the Romans into the wet ground, renewed the mode of fighting which they had so successfully practised the day before. Cerialis had the mortification to see his light-armed cohorts repulsed; upon which he ordered the legions to advance and support the first line, already on the point of giving way. This movement restored the confidence of his army, and checked the ardour of the Batavians; but the Romans owed the victory which soon fell into their hands to the treachery of a deserter, who offered to conduct their cavalry by a secret path through the morass into the rear of the enemy. Cerialis detached two bodies of horse, who, conducted by the Batavian, wheeled round the enemy's right wing, and attacked them from behind; while the legions, hearing the shouts of their mounted comrades, renewed the assault in front with increased vigour and alacrity. The effect of this combined attack did not remain long doubtful. The Germans were broken, and fled towards the Rhine; and this victory would have put an end to the war, had the Roman fleet, stationed on the river, cooperated with the land forces, or had the condition of the ground allowed the horsemen to pursue the fugitives.

Victory gained by Cerialis.

Civilis attempts to retreve his affairs, but is not succeed.

Civilis, abandoning all the open country, retired into his native district, an Island formed by two branches of the Rhine; and immediately proceeded to strengthen his position, by diverting the greater part of the water into the southern channel which divided his territory from that of the Romans. He soon afterwards crossed over into Germany, accompanied by Tutor and a numerous deputation of Senators from Treves; where, by lavishing sums of money upon the Chiefs, and by appealing to the warlike propensities of the People, he succeeded once more in raising a considerable army. Cerialis in the meanwhile did not remain inactive. On the contrary, availing himself of the absence of his adversary, he invaded the lands of Batavia, took four of the principal fortresses, and, placing in them strong garrisons, determined to keep them as the keys of the whole country. Civilis made a fruitless attempt to recover these strongholds, and to expel the conquerors from his paternal dominions; but his rude Germans disappointed his hopes in every undertaking. Deserted by his allies, and suspected by the Chiefs of his own nation, the Batavian at length turned his thoughts to peace. He listened to the proposals of Cerialis, who, by means of secret messengers, gave assurances of pardon, and even of favour, both to him and to his followers; and, confessing that he was tired of struggling against an unkindly fortune, he requested an interview with the Roman General.

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 69. to 79.

He makes his submission to the Romans.

The two Commanders advanced to meet each other on the opposite banks of a stream, where the bridge had been purposely broken down; and after the usual preliminaries, Civilis began to state his reasons for engaging in war against so powerful an enemy, and the motives which induced him to persevere in it, after the severe and repeated disasters which he had sustained. But the speech in which this exposition was made is lost; the valuable history of Tacitus not being preserved to a later date than the conclusion of the Batavian Insurrection. We merely find in that Author the beginning of Civilis's harangue; in the course of which he appears to have rested his chief apology on the pretence that he had taken up arms in the cause of Vespasianus, and that he had been intentionally kept in ignorance of the happy change of affairs which succeeded the death of Vitellius. At all events, his submission was received, and peace was forthwith restored to those Provinces, which had so long been the theatre of sedition and Civil war.

The events now mentioned took place in the first year of the reign of Vespasianus, and before he had returned to Rome to assume in person the administration of the Government. History has to bewail the loss of authentic materials for constructing a regular narrative of the public transactions which occupied the attention of the Roman world during the tranquil period this Monarch occupied the Throne. A few notices are supplied by Dion Cassius, Orosius, and Aurelius Victor, which, with the biographical details furnished by Suetonius, constitute the principal source of information, in regard to the foreign and domestic policy of Vespasianus. We find, for example, that in A. D. 71 he enjoyed the honour of a Triumph, in company with his son Titus, for the conquest of Judæa, and destruction of Jerusalem; that he closed the Temple of Janus, and erected a magnificent Temple to the Goddess of Peace. It is also related that, in the following season, he suspected Antiochus, King of Commagena, of holding a guilty correspondence with the Parthians; for which reason he directed Cæsennius Pætus, Governor of Syria, to attack him and strip him of his dominions. Commagena was reduced into the form of a Province; and Antiochus, with his two sons, was invited to Rome, where they lived many years in affluence and repose. In this Prince expired the Royal race of the Seleucidæ, who had governed a large portion of Western Asia since the time of Alexander the Great.

A. D. 71.

Commagena reduced into a Province.

Application from Parthia. A. D. 72.

We learn also that about the same period Vologeses, the King of Parthia, menaced by the barbarous tribes who dwelt on the borders of the Armenian range, applied, in virtue of an alliance then subsisting, to the Roman Government for succour, and requested that a body of troops, commanded by one of the Emperor's sons, might be sent to reinforce his army. Domitianus, whose views were perhaps consulted in this application,

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. v. c. 14.

Biography. From A. D. 69. to 79.

entreated his father to comply with the wishes of the Parthian, and to intrust him with the care of the legions which were to compose the expedition. Vespasianus refused the assistance which was solicited, and gave, at the same time, to his son a lesson full of political wisdom, in regard to the inexpediency of interfering in the concerns of foreign nations, which the honour and interests of Rome were not bound to support.

Greece deprived of liberty. A. D. 73.

In consequence of some disturbances in Greece, the Emperor thought proper to deprive that country of the free Constitution which had been conferred upon it by Nero; remarking, that the Greeks had forgotten how to enjoy liberty. He subjected them to their wonted tribute, and to the restraint of a Roman Governor; treating Rhodes, Samos, and the neighbouring Islands in the same manner, and forming these last into an insular Province, of which the seat of Proconsular authority was placed at Rhodes. He made similar arrangements for the political administration of Upper Cilicia and Cappadocia; having learned to distrust the fidelity of the petty Kings who had long borne sway in those countries, and who seldom proved either steady friends or safe allies.

A Census held by the Emperor and Titus. A. D. 74.

The following year is only remarkable for a Census of the Roman People by the Emperor and his son Titus, who exercised jointly the office of Censors. Pliny makes some remarks on this enumeration of citizens, which are valuable, inasmuch as they prove that the average length of human life since that period has not in any degree diminished. This Naturalist informs his readers, that between the Apennines and the Po, there were found about eighty individuals upwards of a hundred years old; fifty-four of whom had just completed a century; fourteen were a hundred and ten; two, a hundred and twenty-five; four, a hundred and thirty; four, a hundred and thirty-five to thirty-seven; and three, a hundred and forty: Making allowance for inaccuracies and exaggerations, we have no doubt that as many aged persons would be found at the present day, in any rural district of equal population, whether in Great Britain or on the continent of Europe.

Dedication of the Temple of Peace.

In the fifth year of his Government Vespasianus held a magnificent dedication of the Temple of Peace. It is said that he placed in it the golden vessels which had belonged to the Temple of Jerusalem, and a great number of the finest paintings and statues which the wealth, the taste, and the ambition of a Roman Emperor could select or command; rendering this sumptuous fane the repository of all those rare and precious specimens of art, which had previously attracted the curiosity of travellers, when scattered over different parts of Asia and Europe.

The three succeeding years were not marked by any event of a civil or political nature worthy to arrest the attention of the Annalist or Biographer. The Island of Cyprus was visited by a dreadful earthquake; while at Rome the ravages of the plague were felt to so dreadful an extent, that ten thousand are reported to have died in one day. The last event of importance which gives any historical interest to the reign of Vespasianus, is the conspiracy of Cæcina and Marcellus. This occurrence is mentioned both by Suetonius and Dion Cassius; but the motives of the chief actors, as well as the progress which they had made in their treasonable undertaking, are so faintly and so inaccurately depicted, that we can only find evidence of the death of Cæcina by the command of Titus, who is said to have had in his possession a written address composed by the former, with the design of seducing the Army from their allegiance to the Imperial family. The sedition was suppressed before it had time to assume an alarming aspect, or to endanger the lives of any, besides those of the few individuals with whom it originated.

Conspiracy of Cæcina and Marcellus

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 69. to 79.

The cares of Vespasianus were chiefly occupied with matters in which neither military power nor the terrors of law are of any avail, when unaccompanied by example. The luxury of the Roman table had already proved itself a great evil, and one which was not to be corrected by the wisest statutes; on which account, the Emperor undertook to reform the manners of his subjects, by practising in his own person and domestic establishment the most rigid temperance. The simplicity of his life shamed the most voluptuous of his subjects into some degree of restraint. Private individuals, however wealthy, saw the propriety of limiting their expenses, when the Master of the Empire set the example of economy and retrenchment. He checked likewise, by the revival of salutary laws, the growing licentiousness of women, many of whom in the highest ranks had begun to hold in contempt the decencies and obligations of the married state. With the same mind he directed against usurers the full penalties of the severest statutes which had been enacted in the better times of the Republic, for the punishment of such as should lend money to young persons under age. In particular, he disabled them by law from suing for payment, even when their debtors should become their own masters, and be in possession of the estates, on the security of which they had accommodated them with loans. By these and similar regulations, he improved the spirit of society among the more influential ranks of his people; and by exhibiting simplicity and moderation in the Palace, he rendered these virtues fashionable in the houses of Senators and Consuls, of Knights, and of private Citizens.*

Wise and moral enactments of Vespasianus.

Military reform.

The Army presented an extensive and difficult field for reform. The conquerors in the Civil war, elated with victory, were become extremely insolent; the vanquished indulging their resentment were sullen and intractable. Vespasianus conducted himself towards both with that steadiness and resolution which had uniformly marked his character. By a strict system of discipline, he subdued the noisy turbulence of the one party; and, by confining the attention of the other to their duty, he left them no time for cherishing gloomy reflections, or for meditating revenge. Even the troops who raised him to the Throne, received at his hands no such marks of gratitude as might create in their ranks a sentiment of superiority to their fellow-soldiers, or lead them to the slightest insubordination.†

It became with him an object of primary importance, to restore the Senatorial and Equestrian Orders to their ancient dignity and splendour. In quality of Censor, he formed a new list of both; and finding that, on his accession to the Throne, the number of families belonging to the former did not exceed two hundred, he increased them to two thousand; at the same time expelling from the class of Knights all who

* Suet. *Vesp.* 8, 9. Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiph.*

† Suet. *ubi suprà.* Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiph.*

Biography. From A. D. 69. to 79.

had disgraced themselves by bad actions, and put in their place the most distinguished and meritorious persons that he could discover in any part of the Empire. He likewise created new Patricians; of whom the three whose names are about to be mentioned, did great honour to his choice: Agricola, the father of the Emperor Trajan, Arrius Antoninus, grandfather of the Emperor Antoninus, and Annius, progenitor in the same degree of the celebrated Marcus Aurelius. But while he repaired the dignity, and renewed the lustre of these important Orders, Vespasianus was not regardless of the rights and prosperity of the inferior class of citizens. In giving consequence to the Patrician and Knight, he meant to create a counterpoise and check to the overwhelming weight of Imperial authority; taking care to reserve in the hands of the Sovereign such a degree of power as would, at all times, enable him to repress the tyrannical haughtiness of the Nobles, so often prejudicial to the liberty of the more humble subject. He stimulated, too, and encouraged the Judges to accelerate the business of their

Civil and Judicial regulations.

departments. The violence and rapacity incident to Civil wars had created many disputes, and given rise to many processes at law; for which reason the Emperor instituted a special tribunal for determining all such questions, with power to order restitution of all that had been taken or usurped during the late troubles. In fact, during his whole reign Vespasianus paid unremitting attention to the due administration of Justice; and with this view he frequently attended the Courts, assisting by his advice, encouraging the good by his approbation, and deterring from wicked courses by the severity of the looks, or by the bitterness of his reproaches.

Social and

We are informed by Dion Cassius, that he cultivated a familiar acquaintance with the Senators, inviting them to his table, and receiving entertainments at their houses in return; showing himself Emperor in no other respect than in his extraordinary care and exertions for the public welfare. For the Senate, as a body, he expressed a degree of deference and regard, not exceeded by the submissive demeanour and respectful language of Augustus. He constantly attended their meetings, consulted them on all occasions, and if at any time he was prevented by illness from being present at their deliberations, he thought it suitable to their dignity as well as his own, to send one of his sons as his representative. Acting on all occasions for the good of his people, he dreaded no one as his enemy, but had the most unbounded confidence in every person with whom he was officially connected. Depending on their affection, because he knew he deserved it, he abolished, even during the continuance of the war, the odious practice of searching and examining every individual who was admitted into the Emperor's presence. His Palace gates were always open; and Dion Cassius asserts that access to the Imperial chambers was never impeded by suspicious and insolent guards.

His mildness, moderation, and love of simplicity underwent no change, from the beginning of his reign to the time of his death. He never attempted to conceal the lowness of his birth; and when some officious dependents assured him that they could trace his pedigree to the Princes who founded his native city, he treated their paltry adulation with ridicule. Perhaps there was a slight taint of affectation in the care which he took to preserve his grandfather's cottage in the exact state in which the old man had left it, and to exhibit in his Palace some pieces of antique furniture which had belonged to that rural mansion. It admits of doubt, too, whether he did not occasionally compromise his dignity by answering placards against him posted on the walls, in the same way in which he was attacked; returning satire for satire, and jesting for buffoonery. But in all circumstances he preserved command of temper, and great benignity of disposition. When, for example, he was admonished to be on his guard against a certain Patrician, whom the planets, it was said, had destined to fill the Imperial Throne, he laughed at the absurdity; and taking the first opportunity which occurred to raise the suspected officer to the Consulship, he remarked, that "if ever he is Emperor, he will remember that I have been his benefactor."*

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 69. to 79.

Personal habits of Vespasianus.

In one instance only did he find himself compelled to deviate from his moderate tolerating system. The Stoics had recently acquired great credit at Rome, and they were foolish enough to employ the influence to which they had risen, in declaiming against Monarchy and all the principles of regular Government. Many weak and hot minds had, through their influence, become possessed of the most extravagant notions respecting political liberty; and the leaders of the Sect, regardless of times and circumstances, persisted in abusing the first persons in the State, and in attempting to undermine that salutary authority which they should have taught the people to cherish and support. Vespasianus was inclined to overlook the absurdity and licentiousness of their conduct; but Mucianus, alarmed at the fatal consequences which threatened to ensue, urged him to impose some restraint on those preachers of sedition, or to banish them from Rome. The Emperor adopted the latter alternative, and issued an edict commanding the whole band of Stoics to depart immediately from the Capital. Demetrius, the Cynic, refused to comply, and even affected insolently to throw himself in the way of the Emperor, and not to rise to salute him, or to show him the smallest token of respect. Vespasianus took no notice of the intended insult at the moment, but contented himself with sending to the rude Philosophist the following message, more expressive of contempt than anger: "Thou dost all thou canst to make me take away thy life, but I do not kill dogs merely because they bark."

Banishment of the Stoics.

This wise Sovereign did not neglect to employ the peace and wealth which blessed his reign, in patronising learning, and in adding to the decorations and magnificence of the city. He encouraged authors of merit, and appointed liberal stipends for Professors of Grecian and Latin eloquence. But his chief cares were directed to repair the losses sustained by the Capital, under the government of Nero. Rome was still disfigured by the ruins and void spaces which were occasioned by the dreadful conflagration that continues to dishonour the memory of that weak-minded Prince; for which reason Vespasianus held out the greatest encouragement to all who chose to build new houses, or to fit up again such as were damaged. He himself rebuilt several public edifices which had been burned down. He spared no pains to have the Capitol finished in a style worthy of its history and object, and he laid

Patronage of Letters.

* Suet. *Vesp.* 12, 13. Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiph.*

Biography. From A. D. 69. to 79.

the foundations of the vast and magnificent Amphitheatre, called the *Coliseum*, part of which remains until the present day.

False imputation of avarice.

To accomplish these great undertakings, economy was not less necessary than zeal and perseverance. Vespasianus was a lover of money, and the charge of avarice still darkens his reputation on the page of History; but it is admitted by those who are the loudest in condemning this frailty, that he expended his revenue in furtherance of the most beneficial purposes, and returned to the public in the shape of the wisest improvements, all the sums that he drew from the trade or luxuries of his people. He lavished nothing on personal enjoyment or on official pomp; and he never was profuse in his disbursements, except when he studied the ornament or the happiness of his great Capital. He supplied the wants of many noble families, whose estates had been diminished by the waste and violence of Civil war. He compensated the loss which several cities sustained either by earthquakes or fire; he spent large sums in improving the roads in various parts of Italy, without harassing the inhabitants either by labour or by taxes; and he was never slow to reward those who made inventions or improvements in the useful Arts.

His mode of daily life.

He was as great an economist of time as of money, and not less systematic and self-denied in the distribution of it. Rising early in the morning, he devoted the first part of the day to public and private business, not permitting even the claims of friendship to interfere with the duties which he owed to his family and Country. Afterwards he received the Ministers of State, and other officers who came to communicate intelligence, or to solicit instructions relative to their several departments. The deliberations of the Senate, or the pleadings in the Courts of Justice, next engaged his leisure; after which he talked or walked, and, having partaken of a light refreshment, he set apart the remainder of the evening for conversation and amusement in the company of a few select friends.

Vespasianus had nearly completed his seventieth year, without having been subject to any other illness than a few slight attacks of the gout, when his life and reign were brought to a close. Finding that a disease with which he was seized in Campania was not yielding to the usual remedies, but rather gaining ground upon his constitution, he jocularly remarked, that he would soon be ranked among the Divinities; alluding to the Apotheosis which he knew would be granted to his memory. His increasing weakness diminished neither his alacrity in business, nor his flow of spirits. On the contrary, he omitted none of his customary occupations, but continued to read and write on public affairs as long as he was able to leave his chamber, and, when he could no longer rise, he gave audiences in bed. At length, feeling that nature had exhausted all her powers, he made an effort to start from his couch, exclaiming that an Emperor should die on his feet. He expired on the twenty-fourth of June, after having swayed the sceptre of the Roman Empire ten years, and having done more than any Ruler after Augustus, to restore the institutions, improve the character, and enlarge the power and happiness of the great nation over which Divine Providence had placed him.*

His death. A. D. 79.

In compiling the history, we have purposely avoided all allusion to the numerous presages and indications of this Emperor's elevation, which are recorded by Suetonius, and glanced at by the more philosophical Tacitus. Both these authors mention an interpretation in favour of Vespasianus, of a prediction which appears to have been derived from the Sacred Writings, and which, in that case, must have borne a reference to a more exalted character. It does not appear, however, that either the Annalist or the Biographer was acquainted with the source whence the expectation arose of a great personage who was to appear in the East, and to assume the Government of the Nations. The prophecy was applied at random to Vespasianus, without carrying with it any feeling of importance; for Tacitus remarks, that such predictions were not intelligible until after the event had come to pass, to which they were supposed to invite the attention of the learned.*

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 69. to 79.

Supposed prophecies of his reign.

Miracles imputed to his agency.

Mention is likewise made by the same Historians, as well as by Dion Cassius, of some miracles said to have been performed by Vespasianus at Alexandria, just before he set out from that city to take possession of the government at Rome. Two men of the lower class of the people, the one almost blind, and the other having a maimed hand, went to him, pretending that the God Serapis, who presides over Medicine among the Egyptians, had revealed to them that the Emperor would cure them. Vespasianus, averse to such quackery, laughed at them at first, and rejected the proposal; but finding that they were about to retire greatly disappointed, he ordered them to be examined by Physicians. Their report stated that the organs of sight were not destroyed in him who complained of blindness; and that the hand of the other was only dislocated, and might be set right by a strong pressure. Vespasianus, finding that he had a great chance of effecting a cure, desired the patients to be called into his presence; and performing the operations which had been suggested to him by his medical counsellors, his attempt was crowned with the most complete success, and a great multitude of persons who stood by to witness the miracle, attested all the circumstances of the case to the people of Alexandria, who doubted not for a moment that the power of the Gods had been displayed through the ministry of the Roman General.† But nothing is more certain than that the two cases, as described by Tacitus, were altogether within the reach of human means; and moreover, that when Vespasianus anointed the eyes in the one instance, and pressed the hand in the other, he neither invoked nor expected supernatural aid. He was not weak enough to imagine that he had procured the intervention of Divine influence to heal his patients; for it was not until he found the ailments were curable by ordinary means, that he consented to the expedients which were pointed out by the Physicians. We need not add, that there is the greatest want of candour in such Authors as have compared the pretended miracles of Vespasianus to those performed by the Divine Author of Christianity; and the Roman Emperor himself would have been the first to declare, that as no miracle was necessary, none was either performed or pretended.

---

* Suet. *Vesp.* 23, 24. Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiph.*

* *Occultâ lege fati, et ostentis ac responsis destinatum Vespasiano liberisque ejus imperium*, post fortunam evedidimus. Tacit. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 10.

† Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. c. 81. Suet. *Vesp.* c. 7. Dion Cassius, *Epit. Xiph.*

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXVI.

OF THE JEWS.

FROM THE DEATH OF HEROD THE GREAT TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

FROM B. C. 3 TO A. D. 70.

History. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

State of public opinion on the death of Herod.

Massacre in the Temple.

The death of Herod the Great left Judæa virtually without a Governor, the Will of the late King requiring to be confirmed by Augustus, before Archelaus could inherit the Crown bequeathed to him by his father.* The Army and the Court readily admitted the title of Archelaus to the Throne, and the people at large were willing to purchase promises of future favours by demonstrations of present loyalty; for a few days nothing therefore was perceived but expressions of joy. The weak hold upon the Government which Archelaus possessed, presented a favourable opportunity to the friends of Judas and Matthias, and of those whom Herod had put to death for throwing down the Golden Eagle, to demand from him the revenge of this innocent blood. The fate of Judas and Matthias was purposely made the subject of public lamentation by their friends, who assembled in the Temple at the time of the Passover, and there bewailed the death of their leaders and the cruelty of Herod. Archelaus, well aware of the necessity of hastening speedily to Rome, was unwilling at first to attempt to repress by force the manifestation of these feelings; but the increasing boldness of the party determined him to adopt decided measures. A Centurion was commanded to arrest the ringleaders in the Temple, the multitude protected them against the soldiers; upon which Archelaus with his whole army surrounded the Temple, and attacked the assembled people, three thousand of whom were put to death. A general dismay pervaded the city, and a proclamation for every one to depart from Jerusalem and to break up the Feast was immediately obeyed. After such a proof of the severity of Archelaus, we cannot wonder at the narration of St. Matthew,† respecting the fears entertained by Joseph on his return from Egypt, "who, when he heard that Archelaus reigned in Judæa in the room of his father Herod was afraid to go thither."

* Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 1. *Antiq.* xvii. 8. † Ch. ii. 22.

Of the Jews. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

Archelaus visits Rome

After the Passover Archelaus proceeded to Rome, attended by Herod Antipas and the chief members of his family.* From motives either of fear or of jealousy the family of Herod used every exertion to defeat the pretensions of Archelaus, and to procure a grant of the Kingdom in favour of Antipas. The whole nation of the Jews appear at this time to have been weary of a despotic government; for whilst Archelaus was at Rome, an embassy arrived there from Judæa, to solicit from Augustus the reduction of the Kingdom to the form of a Roman Province; a measure which would have been very gratifying to a body of eight thousand Jews then resident at Rome, and to none more than to all the members of Herod's family, whose desire for the advancement of Antipas arose solely out of dislike to Archelaus. The Jews accused Archelaus of assuming the Royal authority without the sanction of Augustus, and urged against him his cruel and unjustifiable attack upon the people at the Passover. Augustus heard the charges, which were answered on the part of Archelaus by Nicolaus Damascenus;† (an orator whose services in the affairs of Herod the Great have been before mentioned;) and shortly afterwards‡ confirmed the appointments of Herod's Will, by committing the Government of Judæa to Archelaus, with the inferior title of Ethnarch. That of King was promised as a future reward, if he should prove himself worthy a higher distinction.

Appointed Ethnarch of Judæa.

Distribution of Herod's dominions.

The dominions allotted to Archelaus included Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa; the remainder of the territories of Herod the Great were formed into two Tetrarchies, that containing Galilee and Peræa was given to Herod Antipas; the other, which comprised Batanea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, to Philip, who is described by St. Luke as Tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of

* *Antiq.* xvii. 9. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 2. † *Antiq.* xvii. 11.
‡ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. *Antiq.* xvii. 13.

History. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

Trachonitis. A comparative judgment of the power thus intrusted to these three Princes may be formed from their respective revenues. That of Archelaus amounted to 400 talents,* of Herod to 200, and of Philip to 100. A Palace at Ascalon, with three cities, Jamnia, Azotus, and Phasaelis, producing 60 talents yearly, became the portion of Salome, the sister of Herod the Great, the civil jurisdiction of these cities being reserved to Archelaus.

Abuses of the Procurator Sabinus.

Whilst the Jewish embassy was labouring to procure the reduction of Judæa to the condition of a Roman Province, their countrymen experienced some of the evils attendant upon that form of Government. In the division of the Provinces of the Empire, which were allotted to Augustus, and termed *Provinciæ Imperatoriæ*, that of Cæle-Syria was included. In each of these Imperial Provinces the officer next in rank to the Governor was called the *Procurator Cæsaris*, and was charged with the entire management of the revenue. Sabinus was at this time *Procurator* in Cæle-Syria, a man of unprincipled habits and avaricious temper, who made the duty of protecting the interests of Cæsar a pretext for plunder, and occasioned disturbances in Jerusalem, which proceeded to an alarming extent. On the death of Herod,† Sabinus was hastening to Jerusalem to take charge on the behalf of Augustus of all the late King's treasure and effects. Archelaus availed himself of the kind interposition of Varus, the Roman Governor, to stop his proceedings; but no sooner had Archelaus departed to Rome, than Sabinus went up to Jerusalem, seized the Palace, and required the officers of Herod both to give an account of the treasures in their hands, and to surrender the strong places in their charge; to these demands compliance was universally refused, and the officers excused themselves by saying that they held these places more for Cæsar than for Archelaus.

Tumults in Jerusalem.

The foresight of Varus had furnished Jerusalem with one of the three legions of the Province, a force sufficient to have repressed any ordinary tumult, had not his precaution been defeated by the madness and misconduct of Sabinus, who not content with irritating the minds of the people by publicly displaying himself attended by his guards, attempted to obtain forcible possession of the Royal treasures. At the Feast of Pentecost when the feelings of the people were displayed in open hostility against the Roman soldiers, the Temple was forced by the troops, the porticoes were burnt, and the Treasury was plundered. From its spoils Sabinus was not ashamed to appropriate to himself no less a sum than 400 talents.‡ These tumults in Jerusalem were the signal for universal disorder. In the anarchy which then arose, numerous robber-chieftains attached to themselves large bodies of the people, and assuming the title of Kings plundered the country around.§ It is probable that the Theudas,‖ who is mentioned in the speech of Gamaliel, (*Acts*, v. 36,) as having made an insurrection and placed himself at the head of a party, in the time prior to the rise of the Sect of Judas of Galilee, was one of these persons, or at least that he followed the example which they had given in the interval between these troubles and those which arose from the taxing of Cyrenius.

And the rest of Judæa.

Conjecture as to Theudas.

Of the Jews. B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

The attack made upon the Temple by Sabinus, roused the people to a vigorous resistance, and the Roman legion was in imminent danger of perishing in the Palace, now besieged by the multitude, when it was rescued by the arrival of Varus with the whole army of the Province. Sabinus ashamed of his conduct retired privately from the city. This decisive movement of Varus once more restored peace. Many of the conspirators were taken, and two thousand of the most guilty were crucified.* Of ten thousand who surrendered in Idumæa, the principal leaders were sent to Rome for the judgment of Augustus. Some of them were pardoned, whilst others who were of the kindred of Herod were put to death as persons who had rebelled against their King. Varus, having settled these disturbances, returned to Antioch, leaving one legion in garrison at Jerusalem. Of the acts of Archelaus during his reign, no particulars are recorded, except his twice deposing the High Priest, and building a city called Archelais. All that we learn from Josephus† and from Dion Cassius, amounts only to this, that having been accused by his own family and countrymen of cruelty and misgovernment, he was banished by Augustus to Vienne in Gaul. This event is placed by Dion Cassius in the Consulship of Lepidus and Arruntius, U. C. 759. A. D. 6.‡

Punishment of the insurgents.

Banishment of Archelaus. A. D. 6.

The history of Philip and Herod Antipas, the two sons of Herod the Great who shared with Archelaus in the division of their father's Kingdom, derives its sole importance from their being persons whose names are recorded in the Gospel. Of Philip, whom we have before mentioned as possessing the Tetrarchy of Trachonitis, nothing more is related by Josephus,§ than the fact that he governed the country for thirty-seven years, and, that dying in the twentieth year of Tiberius, he left no heirs; he was an amiable and just Prince. His only public acts were the building the cities Cæsarea, Philippi, and Julias, in the latter of which he was buried. On his death, the government of the Tetrarchy was attached to the Province of Cæle-Syria, but the collection of the revenue remained distinct.

Reign of Philip, Tetrarch of Trachonitis. A. D. 33. U. C. 786.

In the fate of Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of

* *Antiq.* xvii. 13, 14. 600 talents. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 400.
† *Bell. Jud.* ii. 2. *Antiq.* xvii. 12.
‡ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 3. *Antiq.* xvii. 12.
§ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 4. *Antiq.* xvii. 12.
‖ Lardner's *Credibility*, part i. book ii. ch. vii.

* *Bell. Jud.* ii. 5.
† *Antiq.* xvii. 15.
‡ There is some difficulty in ascertaining the exact duration of Archelaus's reign. Josephus, *Antiq.* xvii. 15, mentions his being accused to Augustus in the tenth year of his reign, and at the commencement of "*his Life*" relates that his father was born in the tenth year of the reign of Archelaus. But in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7, the banishment is placed in the ninth year of his reign. The difficulty is solved by Mr. Benson, in his *Treatise on the Chronology of Christ*, p. 50, in the following manner, The *Book of Antiquities* being written for the Jews, the Jewish method of computation is preserved in it; according to which, the years of their Kings are dated from the month Nisan, so that if an accession take place in any month prior to Nisan, that portion of the year forms the first year of the reign. If then Archelaus came to the crown before Nisan of 4711, Jewish Period, and was banished after Nisan in 4719, Jewish Period, it would be correct, according to their computation, to say that the event took place in the tenth year of his reign. But in the *Jewish War*, which was written for the Romans, it is supposed that the author would follow the Roman method of dating events; according to which, if the death of Herod took place in February 4711, the year after February 4719, would be strictly and exactly the ninth current year of Archelaus's reign.
§ *Antiq.* xviii. 5.

History. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

Galilee,* we take a greater interest, on account of his name being frequently mentioned in the Gospels, and his being known to us as the Prince who put John the Baptist to death, and who examined and insulted our blessed Lord on the morning of his crucifixion.† The immediate cause of the murder of the Baptist, is stated by Josephus to have been the jealousy entertained by Herod of the influence which John had gained over the minds of the people, who seemed prepared to perform whatever the Baptist would command. But the Evangelist ascribes his death to the anger of Herodias, who would not forgive him for opposing her unlawful marriage with Herod, the brother of her husband. Ample traces of the Baptist's authority and influence may be discerned in what is affirmed by St. Luke (iii. 10) concerning the common people, the publicans, and even the soldiers applying to him as their spiritual teacher and guide. The public and the private reason might well exist together: and if Herodias demanded the head of the Baptist from motives of revenge, Herod's own fear of the popularity of the man whom he had already imprisoned, might have induced him to fulfil his promise to Herodias, even if the presence of his Lords had not made him ashamed to retract it.

Of Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee.

Murder of John the Baptist.

This Herodias was sister of Herod Agrippa,‡ whom Caligula made King of the Tetrarchy which had belonged to Philip. Upon her brother's elevation to a Throne, she used every argument to persuade her husband to seek from the Emperor an equal distinction, and in compliance with her wishes he made a voyage to Rome, the object of his journey being not unknown to Agrippa, who entertaining no very friendly views towards him, sent letters beforehand to Caligula charging Herod with secret disaffection, and with holding intercourse with Artabanus the Parthian; in confirmation of his statement he asserted, that Herod had made a great collection of military stores. The charge of being thus, though but in appearance, prepared for war, Herod could not deny; and Caligula persuaded of his having had it in intention to revolt, deprived him of his Tetrarchy, and banished him to Lyons. His wife, whose ambition had thus paved the way for her husband's fall, refusing to be separated from him, became the faithful partner of his exile. From Lyons he removed into Spain, where he died.§

nish-
ent and
ath of
erod
ntipas.
A. D.
39.
—
V. C.
792.

On the banishment of Archelaus, Judæa was reduced to the condition of a Roman Province.‖ The Governor of Cæle-Syria, Quirinus, or (as he is called by St. Luke and by Josephus) Cyrenius, came thither in person, attended by Coponius as Procurator; and having completed the confiscation of the estate of Archelaus, and the taxing of the people, left the Procurator in charge of that portion of his Province. Judæa had been for many years as truly a part of the Roman Empire as any other conquered country; but the nation did not feel this perfect dependence, until they were compelled to seek justice at the tribunal of a Roman Governor, and to pay tribute and taxes directly to Cæsar. The taxing of Cyrenius does not derive its sole importance from the apparent disagreement between St. Luke and Josephus in their account of this transaction;* to it may be ascribed the rise of those feelings of hatred against the authority of Cæsar, which originating in religious scruples and increased by various political circumstances, eventually produced the war which terminated in the destruction of Jerusalem. That Sect now arose, the Sect of Judas Gaulonites, a native of Gamala,† and an inhabitant of Galilee, to whose principles and practices Josephus ascribes the ruin of his country. They inculcated that the Roman Census was a badge of slavery, that it was disgraceful for men who had God for their Lord to pay any tribute, or to own any human master. It is plain that the Sect of Judas was a religious faction, and not merely a political party, from its being termed by Josephus the fourth Sect, following those of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. We may trace the prevalence of the opinions which they held, in the question put to our Lord respecting the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar, and in the charge made against him of forbidding to give this tribute. That the influence of this party alone produced the rebellion of the Jews is hardly credible; at the same time, we may easily conceive, that an opinion entertained by the common people of the sinfulness of submitting to the Roman authority would aggravate their sense of the injuries committed by the Roman Governors, and help to forward the designs of those who from motives of personal aggrandizement fomented the revolt.

Of the Jews. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

Sect of Judas Gaulonites.

With the exception of that grand and most important event, the rise and progress of Christianity, the consideration of which belongs to Christian History, and from which we therefore purposely in this place abstain, Judæa, under the Roman Procurators, presents few points worthy attention. During the latter years of Augustus the administration of the country was successively confided to Coponius, Marcus Ambirius, and Annius Rufus; and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is fair to conclude, that under their government the Jews had no reason to lament the change of their political condition. The short duration of their office, and the prospect of being speedily recalled to give an account of their administration, must have tended materially to prevent injustice and oppression; but under the reign of Tiberius, the great length of time during which Valerius Gratus, and Pontius Pilate held the office of Governor, the one for eleven, the other for ten years, must have given opportunities for maladministration, though it does not appear that Valerius Gratus abused his power. Whilst the Jews in Judæa were enjoying peace under his government, their less fortunate brethren at Rome were by a decree of the Senate forbidden the observance of their ceremonies, and commanded either to renounce their religion or to depart from the city. This severe measure was owing to the conduct of four Jews, who were banished from Judæa, and undertook to teach at Rome the doctrines of the Mosaic Law. A Roman lady of noble family, who had embraced Judaism, had been induced to commit to their charge offerings of purple and money for the service of the Temple at

Banishment of the Jews from Rome. A. D. 19.

---

* *Antiq.* xviii. 6.
† Ibid.
‡ Ibid. 8.
§ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9.
‖ *Antiq.* xviii. 1. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8.

* For a solution of the difference here stated, see Lardner's *Credibility*, part i. vol. ii. book ii. ch. i.
† *Antiq.* xviii. 6. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8.

History. From A. C. 3. to A. D. 70

Jerusalem, which they converted to their own use. Tiberius received information of this fraud, and made it a plea for the expulsion of the Jews; a more genuine motive probably existed in his want of troops; for under sanction of this decree the Consuls made a levy of four thousand soldiers from amongst the Jews, and sent them to Sardinia. Many who from religious scruples refused to serve in the army were put to death.

Pontius Pilate, Procurator. A. D. 26.

Pontius Pilate was the first of the Roman Governors whose tyrannical conduct contributed to excite disaffection in Judæa.* It had been hitherto the custom for the Roman army, in compliance with the religious feelings of the Jews, to leave outside the city of Jerusalem those ensigns which bore the image of the Emperor; but when Pilate sent his troops from Cæsarea to winter at Jerusalem, the standards were secretly introduced under cover of the night. This violation of the sanctity of the Holy City excited the indignation of the people, who flocked in crowds to Cæsarea to intreat that the idolatrous emblems might be removed. For six days they continued in vain their supplication to Pilate; on the seventh he surrounded them with soldiers, and threatened them with instant death unless they desisted from their demands. With one accord they declared themselves willing to die; and Pilate wondering at their courage and patience, found it expedient to comply with their requests, and to give orders for the removal of the standards from Jerusalem. Philo† relates a similar circumstance respecting some shields which Pilate had dedicated in the Temple in honour of Tiberius, and which he refused to remove, until an embassy from the Jews had obtained from the Emperor an order to that effect.

Pilate seems to have taken pleasure in opposing the prejudices and violating the feelings of the Jewish nation;‡ having expended the sacred treasure of the Temple in building an aqueduct 300 stadia in length, on his return to Jerusalem he was surrounded by the people, who complained aloud of this sacrilege. Pilate foresaw that such complaints would be made, and the means which he took to repress them were consistent with his tyrannical temper; mixing his troops in private dresses amongst the people, he suddenly gave the signal for an assault. Many were killed by the hands of the soldiers, many more by the pressure of the crowd; terror silenced complaint, and the people fled from the tribunal in dismay.§ Some tumults of a formidable character having broken out in Samaria, Pilate led his troops to repress them. The Samaritans besought the protection of Vitellius, the Proconsul of the Province, who inquired into the causes of the disturbance, and being convinced of the misconduct of Pilate, deposed him from his office, and commanded him to appear before the Emperor at Rome. Tiberius died before the arrival of Pilate, who thus escaped the punishment due to his crimes. But Eusebius‖ relates that Pilate fell into such great troubles under the Emperor Caligula, that in despair he committed suicide. It is also stated that he died in banishment at Vienne in Dauphiny; and a tradition to this effect still exists in that neighbourhood.*

His despotism,

A. D. 37.

And death.

Of the Jews. From A. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

The conduct of the Roman Governors was not always oppressive; there were found amongst them not unfrequently men, who in the execution of their office united justice with kindness, and who gained a corresponding influence over the affections of the Jewish nation.

Mildness of Vitellius.

The year prior to Pilate's deposition, Vitellius, the Proconsul of Syria, came to Jerusalem; his visit was one of kindness, and he testified his care of the temporal condition, not less than his respect for the religious scruples of the Jews, by relieving them from some vexatious imposts, and restoring to the Priests the custody of the robes worn at the festivals by the High Priest,† which had been from the time of Herod kept in the castle of Antonia, and came, together with that fortress, into the possession of the Romans. Nor was this the only testimony of regard which Vitellius displayed to the opinions of the nation; for when the army was advancing to a war against Aretas, which was interrupted by the death of Tiberius, he changed the order of march, that the Holy territory might not be polluted by the presence of heathen standards, and came himself to sacrifice at Jerusalem.

During the reign of Caligula, Judæa still remained attached to the Province of Syria,‡ and the nation began to experience the commencement of those calamities which were prophesied by our Lord as preludes to the destruction of the city and Temple. At this period we observe the rise of that spirit of contention between the Jewish and Greek inhabitants of cities situate in Syria, in Egypt, and in the East, which occasioned the destruction of thousands of the Jews. The Romans generally took part with the Greeks, and by aiding to dispossess the Jews of their ancient privileges, and in some cases permitting the utmost violence to be exercised, they contributed to alienate from themselves the affection of the nation in general.

Contention between Jews and Greeks.

Persecution at Alexandria. A. D. 38.

The Alexandrine Jews, by the connivance, and in some respects by the open encouragement of Flaccus, the Governor,§ were subjected to a dreadful persecution by the Macedonian inhabitants of Alexandria. For a time the heathen rabble of that great city revelled in the most lawless cruelty. The synagogues of the Jews were polluted by statues of the Emperor, their houses plundered, the great body of the Jewish inhabitants forcibly thrust out of the city, and many persons put to death with every kind of torture and insult. These tumults occasioned that embassy to Caligula, in which Philo Judæus bore a chief part; an account of which, as well as of this persecution, which he has recorded, forming if not the most curious, certainly a very instructive and interesting part of his writings.

Embassy of Philo Judæus.

Insults on account of their religion were not confined to the Alexandrine Jews alone, those of Judæa soon experienced the violence of Caligula, when his flatterers attempted to force compliance with the desires which he had expressed to be honoured as a God. Frequent disputes had taken place in Jamnia,‖ between the Greek and Jewish inhabitants; and the

Attempt to erect a statue of Caligula in the Temple.

* *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. *Antiq.* xviii. 5.
† *Leg. ad Caium.*
‡ *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. *Antiq.* xviii. 4.
§ *Antiq.* xviii. 5.
‖ *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 7.

* Tillemont, *Hist. des Emper.* vol. i. p. 721.
† *Antiq.* xviii. 5. ‡ Ibid. 9, 10.
§ Philo, *Leg. ad Caium.* Ibid. *Flaccus.*
‖ Ibid. *Leg. ad Caium.*

History. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

impious vanity of Caligula, gave the former the fairest opportunity of gratifying their malice. They accordingly erected an altar to the Emperor;* and when the Jews destroyed it, being near to their Synagogue, they maliciously informed Caligula of the proceedings, who gave orders to Petronius to erect a still greater abomination, his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem. Well aware of the resistance which the Jewish nation would make to the execution of his decree, he at the same time gave direction to Petronius to reinforce his army, by drawing to his aid one-half the troops stationed upon the Euphrates. Whilst Petronius was at Ptolemais collecting his forces, and waiting the arrival of the statue from Sidon, a body of several thousand Jews came to implore him to desist from the attempt. Alarmed by the determined spirit which they displayed, he went to Tiberias, there to observe the disposition of the people. For forty days together the Jews here continued their supplication, professing their determination to die rather than witness the pollution of the Temple. The Roman General found himself compelled to yield, and promised to write to the Emperor in their behalf. Before the arrival of the letter of Petronius, Agrippa had procured, as a personal favour, the reversal of the decree, and despatches had been sent with the announcement. Soon after came the letter of Petronius; the rage of Caligula was unbounded; in his answer he reproached him with corrupt motives in yielding to the Jews, and ordered him to put himself to death. But the news of the Emperor's decease reached Judæa before the despatch which contained this sentence, and the life of Petronius was thus preserved.

A. D. 41.

rly history of grippa.

On the accession of the Emperor Claudius, Judæa was once more, for a period of four years, restored to the dominion of a native Prince, in the person of the elder Agrippa.

Agrippa was the grandson of Herod the Great, his father was Aristobulus, the son of Mariamne, his mother Bernice, the daughter of Salome.† From his earliest childhood he resided at Rome, under the care of Bernice, where he formed an early friendship with Drusus, the son of Tiberius. As he grew up, his intercourse with the Court led him into habits of expense inconsistent with the slender fortune which he enjoyed during his mother's life-time, and upon her death he speedily dissipated his remaining wealth in splendid entertainments, and presents conferred to purchase favours at the Court. The death of Drusus destroyed his hope of advancement at Rome, and he determined to return to Judæa. Here he married Cypros, the daughter of Phasael, a woman of very superior conduct, and devotedly attached to her husband. For some time he remained in Judæa, but disdaining his dependent station he once more went to Rome to try his fortunes.

. D. 23.

Being accompanied by Cypros to Alexandria, by her means he borrowed a considerable sum, with which he set sail for Italy, whilst his consort returned with her children to Judæa. At Rome, Agrippa once more renewed his intimacy with the family of Tiberius, and became the frequent companion of Caligula; but some words which he one day uttered, expressive of his hope that Caligula might ascend the Throne, having been communicated to Tiberius, he was put in prison, and there remained until the death of the Emperor released him from his confinement.

Of the Jews. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

Caligula did not forget the sufferings of his friend. A few days after his accession he sent for him, and placing a diadem upon his head gave him the Tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, with the title of King, at the same time presenting him with a golden chain equal in weight to the fetters in which he had been bound. Caligula advised him to visit Alexandria on his way to Judæa, and his arrival there occurred during the troubles which the Jewish inhabitants were enduring from their Greek fellow-citizens by the connivance of Flaccus. Agrippa himself was exposed to insult, and undertook on behalf of his afflicted brethren to communicate to Caligula information respecting their condition; his application, however, entirely failed of success.

He is invested with the title of King. A. D. 37.

Agrippa did not long remain in Syria after taking possession of his territory, but returned to Rome, and it was at this time that he prevailed upon Caligula to forbear the proposed erection of his statue. When the Emperor was assassinated, Agrippa took part in the counsels of the Senate, and Claudius was much indebted to him for the peaceable manner in which he came to the Throne; and in grateful remembrance of this assistance, he conferred upon Agrippa, in addition to the two Tetrarchies received from Caligula, the Sovereignty of Judæa and Samaria, and other districts,* which together formed a Kingdom of equal extent with that of Herod the Great. As a further testimony of his favour, he gave to his brother Herod the Kingdom of Chalcis.

A. D. 40.

Judæa is added to his dominions. A. D. 41.

Agrippa now hastened to Jerusalem, and offering sacrifices of thanksgivings in the Temple, there dedicated the golden fetters which Caligula had given him, as a monument of his former sufferings and a token of the kindness of Providence. The Sovereignty of Agrippa was purely dependent upon the Court at Rome; but with the Jews his power was supreme; and he so used his authority as to become universally popular, and to gain the character of a wise and beneficent Prince. To the Christian Church, however, he was a persecutor, and put James, the brother of John, to death. His motives for this act, and for his attempt on the life of St. Peter, are described by the Sacred Historian† to have been the desire of "pleasing the Jews," a statement quite in unison with the assertion of Josephus respecting the popularity of his government.‡ The splendour of his Court, the liberal presents which he made, his constant residence at Jerusalem, and his exertions to strengthen the city by enclosing the new town, Bezetha, with fortifications, all tended to procure for him the favour of the people. His reign over Judæa lasted little more than three years, though for seven he had enjoyed the title of King over the Tetrarchies of Lysanias and Philip. In the account of his death there is that sort of agreement between the Christian and Jewish Historian§ which bespeaks truth in each; they both relate the place, Cæsarea: the time, the celebration of a public solemnity; the adulation of the people in calling him a God; and his allowing such praise to pass unreproved. Josephus writes, that on a sudden he beheld a bird

His popularity,

And death.

* *Antiq.* xviii. 9. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10.
† *Antiq.* xviii. 6, 7. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9.

* *Antiq.* xix. 5. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 11.
‡ *Antiq.* xix. 7. sec. 3.
† *Acts*, xii. 3.
§ Ibid. 8.

History. From B. C. 3 to A. D. 70.

of ill omen, which he recognised as the messenger of evil, and that he was seized with the pains of that disease of which in five days he died. The author of the *Acts of the Apostles* informs us, that immediately the Angel of God smote him, "because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost."*

His children.

Agrippa left one son of his own name, a young man of seventeen years of age, and three daughters, Bernice, Mariamne, and Drusilla. With the names of Drusilla and Bernice we are familiar; the one as the companion of Agrippa, when Paul pleaded before Festus, the other as the wife of Felix, the Roman Governor. Before her marriage with Felix, Drusilla had been the wife of Azizus, King of Emesa, whom Felix persuaded her to divorce. They had one son, Agrippa, who perished in an eruption of Vesuvius, in the time of the Emperor Titus.

His son Agrippa.

Claudius would have placed the younger Agrippa upon the Throne of Judæa, but was dissuaded from it by his friends. On the death of Herod, King of Chalcis, four years after the death of his father, Agrippa was appointed to succeed him in that Kingdom; which, in the twelfth year of Claudius, he exchanged for the Tetrarchies of Philip and of Lysanias, a territory which Nero increased by the addition of a part of Galilee.†

Fadus, Procurator.

On the death of Agrippa the Elder, Judæa thus became again a Roman Province under the Procurator Fadus. The only points in which the authority of the Governor was restrained, appear to have been the nomination of the High Priest, the government of the Temple, and the appropriation of the sacred treasure. Herod, King of Chalcis, obtained these privileges by grant from Claudius at the death of his brother. Josephus adds‡ that this power remained with his descendants from that time until the destruction of the Temple; an assertion in which there appears some slight mistake, since it is more probable that this power should have been continued with the younger Agrippa, and we find, in fact, that he exercised the privilege of deposing the High Priest in the time of Felix and of Festus.§

Tiberius Alexander, Procurator. A. D. 44—48.

Fadus early rendered himself unpopular by resuming the custody of the High Priest's garments, which Vitellius had restored to the people; but by the intercession of Agrippa, a decree was obtained from the Emperor reversing this proceeding. During the Procuratorship of Fadus, and of his successor, Tiberius Alexander, that famine prevailed in Judæa which is related, *Acts*, xi. 28, to have been foretold at Antioch by the Christian Prophet Agabus.‖ The public distress gave rise to a very extensive system of plunder. The violence of the robbers was in some measure kept in check by Fadus, but the religious impostors took advantage of this season to draw after them great multitudes.¶ Amongst them was Theudas, who persuaded the people to follow him to the Jordan, pretending that he would enable them to cross it on dry land. Fadus dispersed the assembly by his cavalry, who killed and took many prisoners, and brought the head of Theudas to Jerusalem. The sons of Judas, the Galilean, were seized by Tiberius Alexander and crucified, having probably renewed the endeavours of their father to excite the people to revolt.

Famine.

Theudas.

Of the Jews From B. C. 3 to A. D. 70.

Tiberius Alexander was succeeded in the Procuratorship by Cumanus,* whose misconduct occasioned much bloodshed. At the feast of the Passover, a Roman soldier having insulted the assembled multitude of worshippers, a tumult arose, which ended in the destruction of ten thousand persons. On another occasion a servant of the Emperor having been robbed, Cumanus sent a party of soldiers to plunder the neighbouring villages, and to bring before him the chief inhabitants.- This tyranny they might have endured, had not one of the soldiers added a gross insult to their religion, by tearing in pieces a copy of the Law. The news of this injury spread around, and multitudes of Jews assembled at Cæsarea, to demand the punishment of the soldier from Cumanus, a request which under the appearance of a rising revolt he was afraid to deny, and the soldier was put to death. A sort of predatory warfare soon afterwards was waged between the Jews and Samaritans, occasioned by some Galileans being murdered by the latter on their way to Jerusalem. Cumanus at first aided the Samaritans, but at length he left the combatants to themselves, and Judæa in consequence became overrun with banditti. The Samaritans at length applied for protection to Quadratus, the Governor of the Province, who upon investigating the grounds of their complaint, and understanding that Cumanus was not less blamable than themselves, sent both the Procurator, and also the Samaritans to Rome. Claudius exiled Cumanus, and put the Samaritans to death.†

Cumanus, Procurator. A. D. 48.

Massacre

A. D. 52.

His banishment.

Felix, Procurator

The interest of Pallas, the freed-man of Claudius, procured for his brother Felix the Procuratorship of Judæa. Tacitus states, that both Cumanus and Felix were indifferent to the maintenance of civil order. He adds that Felix being Governor of Samaria whilst Cumanus was Governor of Galilee, they encouraged the mutual inroads of the inhabitants, and themselves shared in the spoil.‡ This account does not agree with that of Josephus, who nowhere mentions the command of Cumanus in Galilee, or of Felix in Samaria. It is scarcely probable that Josephus can have committed any error in his narration, but it is not impossible that Tacitus may have mentioned Galilee as the seat of the Government of Cumanus, intending thereby Judæa, and that Felix might have had some subordinate command in Samaria, before he became Procurator, which might have escaped the notice of Josephus. There is however a particularity in this account of Felix given by Tacitus, which bears the appearance of correct information. He speaks of him as sitting on the day of the trial of Cumanus amongst the Judges, being placed there by Quadratus to overawe the accusers; and he adds, that Cumanus alone was condemned for crimes which Felix, as well as Cumanus, had committed. He describes the Government of Felix in these powerful expressions, *per omnem sævitiam et libidinem, jus Regium servili ingenio exercuit*;§ a character fully confirmed by the history of his amours, and his employing the *Sicarii* to put the High Priest, Jonathan, to

* *Acts*, xii. 23.
‡ *Antiq.* xx. 1.
‖ Ibid. 2, 4.
† *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12.
§ Ibid. 7. sec. 8. 11.
¶ Ibid. 4.

* *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12.
† *Antiq.* xx. 6. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13.
‡ *Annal.* xii. 54. Tillemont, *Hist. des Emper.* vol. i. p. 806. 1075.
§ *Hist.* v. 10.

History. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

death. The impunity which the *Sicarii* henceforth enjoyed, increased the growth of that dreadful association.* The country became infested with robbers, the city was full of assassins, the public mind was perpetually agitated by the appearance of religious impostors and false Prophets. Against the robbers, Felix directed his force, and kept them in check, having taken Eleazar their Chief. The impostors, and those whom they deceived, he frequently punished. Amongst these was an Egyptian false Prophet, who collected a great assembly at the Mount of Olives; the multitude was attacked by Felix, and five hundred persons were killed, but the Egyptian escaped; a circumstance which illustrates the question of the Roman Captain to St. Paul, "Art not thou that Egyptian, &c."† The *Sicarii* alone remained uncontrolled, murders were perpetrated in open day by these men, who mixing with the crowd unperceived, aimed the fatal blow at their victim. Felix had availed himself of their services, and they requited his protection by exciting the people to revolt, and by attacking the houses, and burning the villages of those who did not yield to their views. The spirit of cruelty which thus pervaded the country, at length corrupted the ministers of religion. The higher sacerdotal orders, forming themselves into a party, seized the tithes throughout the country, and left the poorer Priests with their wives and families to perish from want.

iseries of Judæa.

A. D. 60.

Festus, Procurator. A. D. 62.

Such was the condition of Judæa when Festus became Procurator; his Government lasted two years, and on his death he was succeeded by Albinus.‡ At his first entrance upon the duties of his charge, Albinus employed his whole care to the restoration of public order, and put many *Sicarii* to death; but in the end he became careless and oppressive; justice was bought and sold; crimes were suffered to go unpunished; taxes were heaped upon the people; the formation of parties, and the establishment of petty tyrannies was universally allowed. Much of the misconduct of Albinus is to be attributed to the influence which Ananias the High Priest gained over him; and the increase of disorder was materially owing to the surrender of some captive *Sicarii*, at the suggestion of Ananias, in exchange for the Scribe of Eleazar, whom others of their party had carried off by night. Henceforward the confidence of these banditti was unbounded; for they had learned that by capturing the friends of Ananias, and detaining them as hostages, they might secure the release of any of their own associates.

Albinus, rocurator.

buses of e High riest, Ananias.

The misconduct of Albinus was in some degree concealed, if not sanctioned by the Jewish Chiefs, who availed themselves of his authority to establish tyrannies each within his own sphere.§ Nevertheless, contrasted with Florus, who succeeded him, Albinus appeared to have been just and merciful. The new Procurator acted like an executioner, sent to inforce the sentence of condemnation upon the whole Jewish nation. Cruel, and regardless even of the semblance of equity and truth, he did not confine his tyranny to the oppression of individuals, but he amassed wealth by the destruction of multitudes, and the spoil of whole cities. Every robber might plunder at will if Florus shared the booty. Extensive districts were reduced to the solitude of a desert; and men left Judæa to seek in distant countries that protection which was denied to them at home. At the Passover, A. D. 66, Cestius Gallus the Governor of Syria, coming to Jerusalem, was there made acquainted with the tyranny of Florus by the multitude, who besought his protection. Cestius answered them with fair promises, but did nothing; and returning to Antioch, was accompanied on his way thither by Florus. Florus still continued the same line of conduct, in the hope, as Josephus states, that, in the breaking out of a rebellion, his own crimes might pass unpunished.

oppression.

Of the Jews. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

Tacitus, in speaking of the conduct of the Roman Governors from the time of Felix, says, *Duravit patientia Judæis usque ad Gessium Florum Procuratorem. Sub eo bellum ortum;** an honourable testimony in favour of the nation, which requires some qualification; for it is impossible to read the History of Josephus without discerning, that the misgovernment of the Romans was not the only trial of the patience of the nation. What they had to endure at the hands of the Governors, was in itself nothing when compared with those greater evils, which were inflicted by the general demoralization of society, the entire absence of all justice, the murders of the *Sicarii*, and the tyranny of the higher orders. In a state of anarchy, such as we have described, it is not surprising that a rebellion should have commenced upon comparatively slight grounds, and without any definite object in view. The Jewish Historian dates the breaking out of the war from some tumults which took place at Cæsarea, in the month Artemisium, (May,) of the year A. D. 66, the twelfth of Nero's, and the seventeenth of Agrippa's reign. These disturbances were occasioned by the arrival of the final decree of Nero, upon an appeal which had been made to him by the Greek and Jewish inhabitants respecting the rights of citizenship. The rejection of the claims of the Jews was the signal for tumult.† In the contest between the two parties at Cæsarea, the Jews were the aggressors, and Florus interposed to preserve order; but the Jews, as they believed, purchased his protection by a present of eight talents. The tumult increasing, the Jews began to entertain serious apprehensions for their safety, and retired with the books of their Law to Narbata, a place which belonged to them, about sixty stadia distant from Cæsarea. Florus had retired to Sebaste, having left the Jews and Greeks to decide their own quarrel: but when he was reminded by the Jews who came thither, that they had good reason to demand his protection in return for the money which he had received; he construed their removal from Cæsarea to Narbata into an act of rebellion, and put their Ambassadors into prison. The inhabitants of Jerusalem beheld this tyranny with indignation; but they remained quiet, until Florus anxious, as it might seem, to compel them to give vent to their feelings, sent his officers to take seventeen talents from the sacred Treasury, pretending that they were required for the service of Cæsar. The multitude on this occasion insulted Florus, by carrying round a bag, and pretending to beg alms for their poor and distressed Governor; an insult which he pretended to consider of more consequence than the tumults which he still suffered to con-

The Jewish war commenced in tumults at Cæsarea. A. D. 66.

* *Antiq.* xx. 7. † *Acts*, xxi. 38.
‡ *Antiq.* xx. 8. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14.
§ *Antiq.* xx. 18. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14.

* *Hist.* v. 9. † *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14.

History. From B. C. 3 to A. D. 70.

tinue at Cæsarea, and therefore brought all his force to Jerusalem to demand satisfaction. The chief Jews tried to appease his anger, but he refused to be satisfied, and ordered his soldiers to plunder the upper market-place, and to put to death those who resisted. The soldiers ravaged the whole city, and no less than 3600 persons, of every age and sex, perished on this occasion. To complete the measure of his tyranny, he violated all the laws and privileges of Rome itself, by scourging and crucifying Jews, who had been admitted to the Roman order of Knights.* Bernice, the sister of Agrippa, entreated Florus to spare the people from the violence of the soldiers, whose attack she herself only escaped by flying for refuge to the palace; but he turned a deaf ear to her remonstrance and prayers. The Priests, alarmed at the prospect of rebellion, endeavoured to persuade the people to submission; but the sedition was too far gone to be repressed, and when it was evidently the intention of Florus to plunder the Temple, the people perceiving his purpose broke down the porticoes which connected it with the castle of Antonia.

Severities of Florus at Jerusalem.

Florus thus foiled in his purpose, left one cohort in Jerusalem to assist the Priests in maintaining order, and returned to Cæsarea. Cestius Gallus, the Governor of Syria, being informed of these disturbances, despatched one of his Generals, Neapolitanus, in company with Agrippa, to Jerusalem, to ascertain the real state of affairs. Here Agrippa remained after the departure of Neapolitanus, and exerted all his influence to put a stop to the rebellion. Florus was not without some pretext for seizing the sacred treasure; for when Agrippa reminded the people of their refusal to pay the tribute which was due, and amounted to forty talents, and of their violent conduct in pulling down the porticoes, they instantly began to repair the damage and to collect the tribute for payment. Thus far Agrippa succeeded; but when he began to recommend submission to Florus until another Governor should be appointed, the flame of sedition which had been smothered burst forth, in an attack of the populace upon himself, and compelled his hasty abandonment of the city.

Conciliatory measures of Agrippa.

He quits Jerusalem.

The sedition now began to display a more decided character. The occupation of the castle Masada, and the destruction of the Roman garrison, together with the refusal to offer any more sacrifices in the Temple in behalf of the Romans, amounted to an open declaration of war.† In this latter proceeding they adopted the advice of Eleazar, the son of Ananias the High Priest, a young man of bold and daring temper, who became the first leader of the rebellion. These transactions were, however, in accordance with the feelings of but one party in the city. The Nobles applied to Florus and Agrippa for aid; the former purposely took no notice of their request, but Agrippa aided them with a force of three thousand men. The party which sought for peace was in possession of the Upper City; the Lower City and Temple was entirely in the hands of the rebels, who by continued attacks upon the King's troops, endeavoured to weary out their patience, and to force them to retire; until at length, (August,) they succeeded in taking the castle of Antonia, and put the garrison to death.

Rise of Eleazar.

A new Chief arose to give fresh vigour to the siege of the Upper City, in the person of Manahem the son of Judas the Galilean; and by his assistance, the King's troops were forced to surrender, whilst the Romans shut themselves up in the three towers, Phasael, Herod, and Mariamne. The pride and cruelty of Manahem became soon insupportable, and both he and his friends were put to death, the people willingly assisting Eleazar to remove his rival. The Roman garrison soon surrendered to Eleazar, under a solemn promise of safety; a promise which he impiously violated, profaning the sabbath day by putting all his prisoners to death, with the exception of Metilius their Commander, who saved his life by consenting to be circumcised. The blood of these Romans was revenged upon the Jewish nation, by a massacre of 20,000 Jews at Cæsarea,* which took place on the very same day and hour on which this crime was perpetrated at Jerusalem. Not one Jew remained in that city, the few that escaped the slaughter being sent by Florus to serve in the gallies. This enormity drove the whole nation into a state of desperation; they rushed forth upon the neighbouring Syrian cities with fire and sword; and the Syrians in return avenged the inroad by putting to death not only every one that was outwardly a Jew, but all whom they suspected of being Jews in affection. Antioch, Sidon, and Apamea, were the only cities wherein anarchy and plunder did not prevail. As at Antioch so perhaps at Sidon and Apamea, the number of Christian converts might have proved, under Providence, a defence from this dreadful storm. The vengeance thus inflicted on the nation, extended also to Alexandria, where 50,000 Jews were put to death at this time by the Roman soldiers.

Of the Jews. From B. C. 3 to A. D. 70. And Manahem. Massacre at Cæsarea. And at Alexandria.

A short time before the Feast of Tabernacles, Cestius collected his troops, in number about 20,000, and having first delivered Galilee from the inroads of the rebels, advanced from Cæsarea towards Jerusalem, and encamped at Gabao, fifty stadia distant from Jerusalem. A vigorous assault upon the city would have at once put an end to the war; but Florus bribed the officers of Cestius to encourage delay, and give the Jews time to prepare for resistance. The same secret influence occasioned Cestius to break up the siege, which he had prosperously begun, and to commence his retreat from Jerusalem at the very time when the seditious despaired of further resistance. In the pass at Bethoron the intervention of night alone preserved the Roman army from being destroyed by the Jews, who pursued them with unceasing alacrity; Cestius reached Antipatris, having lost 5000 men, with all his stores, in the retreat; whilst the rebels returned in triumph to Jerusalem, having experienced very little loss. This defeat took place on the 18th of the month Dius, (November.) Many of the chief Jews availed themselves of this opportunity to retire from the city; and it is probable, that at this time the Christians withdrew to Pella, a city beyond the Jordan. The traditionary account preserved by Eusebius† places this event at a period prior to the war; that is, probably, prior to the campaigns of Vespasianus, which terminated in the destruction of the city.

Cestius advances to Jerusalem. Success of the Jews. A. D. 66.

* *Bell. Jud.* ii. 15. † *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. * *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. † *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 5.

Preparations for regular war

On the defeat of Cestius,* the Jews commenced their first regular preparations for war. The city was committed to the care of Joseph, the son of Gorion, and Ananias the High Priest. Idumæa, and Peræa, with other districts and cities, were given in charge to various leaders. Josephus, the Historian, was invested with the Government of the whole of Galilee; and has left us very full particulars of his own conduct, of his care in the administration of justice, in fortifying the cities, and organizing an army for the defence of the country: and making every allowance for the personal vanity of the Historian, he appears to have been admirably suited to the office thus intrusted to him.

Vespasianus appointed to conduct the war.

The despatches from Cestius, which announced his defeat, and attributed the whole misfortune to Florus, reached the Emperor Nero in Achaia,† who without delay appointed Vespasianus to conduct the war in Judæa. Vespasianus proceeded to Antioch, where he found Agrippa waiting his arrival, whilst his son Titus went to Alexandria, and thence brought two legions to reinforce the army of the Province. The army assembled during the winter at Ptolemais, and consisted of more than four Roman legions, which with the auxiliaries furnished by Agrippa and other native Princes, amounted together to above 60,000 men.

A. D. 67.

Josephus is taken prisoner.

In the spring of A. D. 67, Vespasianus commenced his operations,‡ and occupied the remainder of the year in the reduction of Galilee. The chief feature of the campaign was the siege of Jotapata, which Josephus defended for forty-seven days, and in which 40,000 persons perished. Josephus being taken prisoner, was treated with respect, and by degrees contrived to ingratiate himself with Vespasianus and Titus. 30,000 of the inhabitants of Tarichea, a city taken in the autumn by Titus, were sold as slaves. Giscala, amongst other places was also taken, a city which gave name to John of Giscala,§ who escaping from the siege took refuge in Jerusalem, and was preserved to be one of the chief scourges by which Providence inflicted vengeance upon that devoted city.

John of Giscala escapes.

The success of the Romans threw every city in Judæa into contending factions;‖ each family was divided, as its members advocated peace or war. Universal discord reigned. Robberies increased; the whole country was pillaged; and the devastation thus produced could not have been exceeded even by the invasion of the Roman army. In Jerusalem, John of Giscala was most conspicuous in urging resistance to the Romans, and proclaiming that the city was impregnable. The robbers, who had hitherto wasted the country, gradually introduced themselves into Jerusalem; and being received by the people as allies, at length assumed the mastery, putting to death those who opposed them, appointing High Priests, and exercising the most absolute tyranny. The people rose against them, and had nearly subdued these *Zealots*, (for so the robbers now called themselves, pretending the most perfect devotion to the cause of religion,) when the treachery of John of Giscala turned the scale in their favour.¶ Having undertaken to negociate a surrender of those who kept possession of the Temple; instead of forwarding the purport of his mission, he took the opportunity of intimating to them that assistance might be procured from Idumæa. The Idumæans were accordingly informed that the party under Ananus, and the Priests who were opposed to the Zealots, were meditating the surrender of the city to the Romans, upon which they instantly assembled to the number of 20,000 men, and came with all speed to Jerusalem. Ananus closed the gates; but during the night the Zealots, under the cover which a violent storm afforded, came forth from the Temple and admitted the Idumæans. The guards of Ananus to the number of 3000 were put to death. Ananus and 12,000 of the Nobles were afterwards taken and slain. The Idumæans were soon undeceived,* and convinced how fallacious was the charge of treachery, which had induced them to commit these cruelties, and becoming ashamed of their conduct returned home; whilst the zealots, now left to themselves, ceased not the work of destruction, killing every man of rank or property, and allowing poverty alone to be a defence from injury.

Murder of the Nobles

Such was the state of affairs in Jerusalem at the commencement of the following year, A. D. 68, the Zealots being divided into two parties, (one of them headed by John of Giscala,) were united in no other purpose but that of plunder. Vespasianus still delayed the commencement of the siege; a line of conduct which increased the sufferings of the Jews, by lengthening the period of the tyranny which they endured under the dominion of the Zealots. The Roman army was employed in subduing Peræa, and had nearly gained possession of the whole surrounding country, when intelligence arrived of the death of Nero,† the war was immediately suspended. A gracious interval of repentance was thus allowed to the nation, an interval of which they took no account, but by their crimes heaped still greater vengeance upon themselves.

A. D. 68.

Pause in the campaign.

Simon son of Gioras.

Simon, the son of Gioras, appeared at this time as a leader of banditti. Idumæa was the chief scene of his plunder; but his whole purpose was the possession of Jerusalem. Wherever he led his followers, he left behind him a desolation like that of the locust. Surrounded by havoc and slaughter, he happened to approach the gates of Jerusalem at a time when the rapine and insatiable lust of the soldiers of John of Giscala, had prepared the people to look for protection to any power which might prove stronger than that possessed by the Zealots; whilst the disputes which had arisen between the Idumæan and the other Zealots, having induced the former to combine with the people, there was little difficulty in admitting Simon into the city. Simon was received with acclamations as a deliverer, and in the month Xanthicus (March) of the year 69, became master of Jerusalem.

Simon in possession of Jerusalem.

A. D. 69.

In July, Vespasianus was proclaimed Emperor at Alexandria, and before the fifteenth of that month, the whole of Syria had invested him with the Imperial purple; whereupon going to Rome, he left Titus to pursue the war in Judæa. During this year the Roman army remained inactive; but a war, more dreadful than any which the Romans could have waged, was carried on within the city. Eleazar, the son of Ananias, who had obtained considerable influence amongst the Zealots‡ previous to the arrival of John of Giscala, unwilling any longer to submit to his authority, conspired with his friends, and took pos-

* *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. † Ibid. iii. 1. ‡ Ibid. 6, 7.
§ Ibid. iv. 2. ‖ Ibid. iv. 3. ¶ Ibid.

* *Bell. Jud.* iv. 5. † Ibid. 9.
‡ Ibid. v. 1.

History. From B. C. 3 to A. D. 70.

tinue at Cæsarea, and therefore brought all his force to Jerusalem to demand satisfaction. The chief Jews tried to appease his anger, but he refused to be satisfied, and ordered his soldiers to plunder the upper market-place, and to put to death those who resisted. The soldiers ravaged the whole city, and no less than 3600 persons, of every age and sex, perished on this occasion. To complete the measure of his tyranny, he violated all the laws and privileges of Rome itself, by scourging and crucifying Jews, who had been admitted to the Roman order of Knights.* Bernice, the sister of Agrippa, entreated Florus to spare the people from the violence of the soldiers, whose attack she herself only escaped by flying for refuge to the palace; but he turned a deaf ear to her remonstrance and prayers. The Priests, alarmed at the prospect of rebellion, endeavoured to persuade the people to submission; but the sedition was too far gone to be repressed, and when it was evidently the intention of Florus to plunder the Temple, the people perceiving his purpose broke down the porticoes which connected it with the castle of Antonia.

Severities of Florus at Jerusalem.

Florus thus foiled in his purpose, left one cohort in Jerusalem to assist the Priests in maintaining order, and returned to Cæsarea. Cestius Gallus, the Governor of Syria, being informed of these disturbances, despatched one of his Generals, Neapolitanus, in company with Agrippa, to Jerusalem, to ascertain the real state of affairs. Here Agrippa remained after the departure of Neapolitanus, and exerted all his influence to put a stop to the rebellion. Florus was not without some pretext for seizing the sacred treasure; for when Agrippa reminded the people of their refusal to pay the tribute which was due, and amounted to forty talents, and of their violent conduct in pulling down the porticoes, they instantly began to repair the damage and to collect the tribute for payment. Thus far Agrippa succeeded; but when he began to recommend submission to Florus until another Governor should be appointed, the flame of sedition which had been smothered burst forth, in an attack of the populace upon himself, and compelled his hasty abandonment of the city.

Conciliatory measures of Agrippa.

He quits Jerusalem.

The sedition now began to display a more decided character. The occupation of the castle Masada, and the destruction of the Roman garrison, together with the refusal to offer any more sacrifices in the Temple in behalf of the Romans, amounted to an open declaration of war.† In this latter proceeding they adopted the advice of Eleazar, the son of Ananias the High Priest, a young man of bold and daring temper, who became the first leader of the rebellion. These transactions were, however, in accordance with the feelings of but one party in the city. The Nobles applied to Florus and Agrippa for aid; the former purposely took no notice of their request, but Agrippa aided them with a force of three thousand men. The party which sought for peace was in possession of the Upper City; the Lower City and Temple was entirely in the hands of the rebels, who by continued attacks upon the King's troops, endeavoured to weary out their patience, and to force them to retire; until at length, (August,) they succeeded in taking the castle of Antonia, and put the garrison to death.

Rise of Eleazar.

A new Chief arose to give fresh vigour to the siege of the Upper City, in the person of Manahem the son of Judas the Galilean; and by his assistance, the King's troops were forced to surrender, whilst the Romans shut themselves up in the three towers, Phasael, Herod, and Mariamne. The pride and cruelty of Manahem became soon insupportable, and both he and his friends were put to death, the people willingly assisting Eleazar to remove his rival. The Roman garrison soon surrendered to Eleazar, under a solemn promise of safety; a promise which he impiously violated, profaning the sabbath day by putting all his prisoners to death, with the exception of Metilius their Commander, who saved his life by consenting to be circumcised. The blood of these Romans was revenged upon the Jewish nation, by a massacre of 20,000 Jews at Cæsarea,* which took place on the very same day and hour on which this crime was perpetrated at Jerusalem. Not one Jew remained in that city, the few that escaped the slaughter being sent by Florus to serve in the gallies. This enormity drove the whole nation into a state of desperation; they rushed forth upon the neighbouring Syrian cities with fire and sword; and the Syrians in return avenged the inroad by putting to death not only every one that was outwardly a Jew, but all whom they suspected of being Jews in affection. Antioch, Sidon, and Apamea, were the only cities wherein anarchy and plunder did not prevail. As at Antioch so perhaps at Sidon and Apamea, the number of Christian converts might have proved, under Providence, a defence from this dreadful storm. The vengeance thus inflicted on the nation, extended also to Alexandria, where 50,000 Jews were put to death at this time by the Roman soldiers.

Of the Jews From B. C. 3 to A. D. 70.

And Manahem.

Massacre at Cæsarea

And at Alexandria

A short time before the Feast of Tabernacles, Cestius collected his troops, in number about 20,000, and having first delivered Galilee from the inroads of the rebels, advanced from Cæsarea towards Jerusalem, and encamped at Gabao, fifty stadia distant from Jerusalem. A vigorous assault upon the city would have at once put an end to the war; but Florus bribed the officers of Cestius to encourage delay, and give the Jews time to prepare for resistance. The same secret influence occasioned Cestius to break up the siege, which he had prosperously begun, and to commence his retreat from Jerusalem at the very time when the seditious despaired of further resistance. In the pass at Bethoron the intervention of night alone preserved the Roman army from being destroyed by the Jews, who pursued them with unceasing alacrity; Cestius reached Antipatris, having lost 5000 men, with all his stores, in the retreat; whilst the rebels returned in triumph to Jerusalem, having experienced very little loss. This defeat took place on the 18th of the month Dius, (November.) Many of the chief Jews availed themselves of this opportunity to retire from the city; and it is probable, that at this time the Christians withdrew to Pella, a city beyond the Jordan. The traditionary account preserved by Eusebius† places this event at a period prior to the war; that is, probably, prior to the campaigns of Vespasianus, which terminated in the destruction of the city.

Cestius advances to Jerusalem.

Success of the Jews.

A. D. 66.

* *Bell. Jud.* ii. 15. † *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. * *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. † *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 5.

History. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

Preparations for regular war

On the defeat of Cestius,* the Jews commenced their first regular preparations for war. The city was committed to the care of Joseph, the son of Gorion, and Ananias the High Priest. Idumæa, and Peræa, with other districts and cities, were given in charge to various leaders. Josephus, the Historian, was invested with the Government of the whole of Galilee; and has left us very full particulars of his own conduct, of his care in the administration of justice, in fortifying the cities, and organizing an army for the defence of the country: and making every allowance for the personal vanity of the Historian, he appears to have been admirably suited to the office thus intrusted to him.

Vespasianus appointed to conduct the war.

The despatches from Cestius, which announced his defeat, and attributed the whole misfortune to Florus, reached the Emperor Nero in Achaia,† who without delay appointed Vespasianus to conduct the war in Judæa. Vespasianus proceeded to Antioch, where he found Agrippa waiting his arrival, whilst his son Titus went to Alexandria, and thence brought two legions to reinforce the army of the Province. The army assembled during the winter at Ptolemais, and consisted of more than four Roman legions, which with the auxiliaries furnished by Agrippa and other native Princes, amounted together to above 60,000 men.

A. D. 67.

Josephus is taken prisoner.

In the spring of A. D. 67, Vespasianus commenced his operations,‡ and occupied the remainder of the year in the reduction of Galilee. The chief feature of the campaign was the siege of Jotapata, which Josephus defended for forty-seven days, and in which 40,000 persons perished. Josephus being taken prisoner, was treated with respect, and by degrees contrived to ingratiate himself with Vespasianus and Titus. 30,000 of the inhabitants of Tarichea, a city taken in the autumn by Titus, were sold as slaves. Giscala, amongst other places was also taken, a city which gave name to John of Giscala,§ who escaping from the siege took refuge in Jerusalem, and was preserved to be one of the chief scourges by which Providence inflicted vengeance upon that devoted city.

John of Giscala escapes.

The success of the Romans threw every city in Judæa into contending factions;‖ each family was divided, as its members advocated peace or war. Universal discord reigned. Robberies increased; the whole country was pillaged; and the devastation thus produced could not have been exceeded even by the invasion of the Roman army. In Jerusalem, John of Giscala was most conspicuous in urging resistance to the Romans, and proclaiming that the city was impregnable. The robbers, who had hitherto wasted the country, gradually introduced themselves into Jerusalem; and being received by the people as allies, at length assumed the mastery, putting to death those who opposed them, appointing High Priests, and exercising the most absolute tyranny. The people rose against them, and had nearly subdued these *Zealots*, (for so the robbers now called themselves, pretending the most perfect devotion to the cause of religion,) when the treachery of John of Giscala turned the scale in their favour.¶ Having undertaken to negociate a surrender of those who kept possession of the Temple; instead of forwarding the purport of his mission, he took the opportunity of intimating to them that assistance might be procured from Idumæa. The Idumæans were accordingly informed that the party under Ananus, and the Priests who were opposed to the Zealots, were meditating the surrender of the city to the Romans, upon which they instantly assembled to the number of 20,000 men, and came with all speed to Jerusalem. Ananus closed the gates; but during the night the Zealots, under the cover which a violent storm afforded, came forth from the Temple and admitted the Idumæans. The guards of Ananus to the number of 3000 were put to death. Ananus and 12,000 of the Nobles were afterwards taken and slain. The Idumæans were soon undeceived,* and convinced how fallacious was the charge of treachery, which had induced them to commit these cruelties, and becoming ashamed of their conduct returned home; whilst the zealots, now left to themselves, ceased not the work of destruction, killing every man of rank or property, and allowing poverty alone to be a defence from injury.

Of the Jews. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70

Murder of the Nobles

Such was the state of affairs in Jerusalem at the commencement of the following year, A. D. 68, the Zealots being divided into two parties, (one of them headed by John of Giscala,) were united in no other purpose but that of plunder. Vespasianus still delayed the commencement of the siege; a line of conduct which increased the sufferings of the Jews, by lengthening the period of the tyranny which they endured under the dominion of the Zealots. The Roman army was employed in subduing Peræa, and had nearly gained possession of the whole surrounding country, when intelligence arrived of the death of Nero,† the war was immediately suspended. A gracious interval of repentance was thus allowed to the nation, an interval of which they took no account, but by their crimes heaped still greater vengeance upon themselves.

A. D. 68.

Pause in the campaign.

Simon, the son of Gioras, appeared at this time as a leader of banditti. Idumæa was the chief scene of his plunder; but his whole purpose was the possession of Jerusalem. Wherever he led his followers, he left behind him a desolation like that of the locust. Surrounded by havoc and slaughter, he happened to approach the gates of Jerusalem at a time when the rapine and insatiable lust of the soldiers of John of Giscala, had prepared the people to look for protection to any power which might prove stronger than that possessed by the Zealots; whilst the disputes which had arisen between the Idumæan and the other Zealots, having induced the former to combine with the people, there was little difficulty in admitting Simon into the city. Simon was received with acclamations as a deliverer, and in the month Xanthicus (March) of the year 69, became master of Jerusalem.

Simon son of Gioras.

Its influence in Jerusalem.

A. D. 69.

In July, Vespasianus was proclaimed Emperor at Alexandria, and before the fifteenth of that month, the whole of Syria had invested him with the Imperial purple; whereupon going to Rome, he left Titus to pursue the war in Judæa. During this year the Roman army remained inactive; but a war, more dreadful than any which the Romans could have waged, was carried on within the city. Eleazar, the son of Ananias, who had obtained considerable influence amongst the Zealots‡ previous to the arrival of John of Giscala, unwilling any longer to submit to his authority, conspired with his friends, and took pos-

* *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. † Ibid. iii. 1. ‡ Ibid. 6, 7.
§ Ibid. iv. 2. ‖ Ibid. iv. 3. ¶ Ibid.

* *Bell. Jud.* iv. 5. † Ibid. 9.
‡ Ibid. v. 1.

session of the inner court of the Temple. Three parties within its walls disputed the possession of Jerusalem. Eleazar with a garrison of 2500 followers held the Temple; the Upper City was the station of Simon's force, which amounted to 15,000 men; in the Lower City John of Giscala kept his post with 6000 Zealots. Between these factions an unceasing warfare was waged; every place, whether within or without the Temple, was polluted with blood. The people alternately a prey to each, could hardly refrain from praying earnestly for the arrival of the Romans. In the midst of the horrors which prevailed, the private charities of life lost all their influence; death was so common an event, that no man took pains to bury the body of his dearest friend; as not knowing whether himself should survive the succeeding hour. The sacrifices of the Temple were however continued; and the leaders of the factions still promised protection to those Jews and foreigners who brought victims to be offered to the Most High; but those who trusted to this promise, as well as the Priests themselves, were often killed by stones and weapons, hurled into the Temple from the Upper City, and mingled their blood with that of the victim upon the altar.

Three factions within the city.

Titus commences the siege of Jerusalem. A. D. 70.

Early in the spring, Titus came from Alexandria to Cæsarea, and a short time before the Passover, his army, which consisted of about 60,000 men from different points, directed its march towards Jerusalem. Josephus, the Historian, and Tiberius Alexander, a former Governor of Egypt, were in attendance upon Titus.* The line of march passed through Samaria to Gibeah of Saul, a place distant thirty stadia from Jerusalem; the army here encamped, whilst Titus went forward with 600 horse to take a view of the city, to which he advanced so near as narrowly to escape from an ambush which the Jews had laid. On the following day the army encamped at Scopus, a place seven stadia distant, on a plain rising towards the north, from which there was a view of the whole extent of the Temple and city. Two legions took post at Scopus itself; a third, three stadia in the rear; the fourth, which advanced from Jericho, was stationed on the Mount of Olives, which lies on the east of Jerusalem, and is separated from it by the deep valley of Cedron. The city was at this time crowded with inhabitants, who had assembled from all parts to celebrate the Passover; the whole nation being thus collected as within a prison, to undergo the Divine judgment.

The large assembly of the Jews which thronged to the Feast from so many distant and different countries, might give rise to the belief expressed by Dion Cassius, (L. lxvi.) that the rebels received reinforcements from the parts beyond the Euphrates; and that many Kings of the Barbarians sent troops to defend the city. It was certainly one of the charges brought by Titus against them to justify his attack, that they had sent embassies to their brethren beyond the Euphrates to demand assistance.†

Description of the fortifications.

Josephus has given a very accurate description of Jerusalem and of its fortifications; at the same time we must lament, that neither the measurements nor the bearings of the different places are sufficiently detailed to enable us to lay down with certainty any plan of the city. The north appears to have been the part most on a level with the surrounding country, and on that side Titus carried on the siege as Pompey had done before him. In circuit the walls of the city extended thirty-three stadia, and towards the north-west presented a triple line of fortification. Upon the outer wall, which was added by Agrippa to protect the new city, called Bezetha, there stood ninety towers; the whole height of the wall being twenty-five cubits; the middle wall had fourteen towers; the interior, and most ancient, sixty; on the outer wall at the north-west angle stood the tower Psephina, seventy cubits high, and of an octagonal form; and opposite to it in the inner wall the three splendid towers built by Herod, called Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamne. Jerusalem was a place both by nature and art of no ordinary strength. In the spot which Titus selected for his first attack, the outer wall was somewhat lower than elsewhere;* and owing to the city being but thinly inhabited in that part, the second wall had not been continued, so that no obstacle presented itself to the subsequent attack of the third and inner wall. The Jews were well prepared to meet their enemies, by their obstinate resolution, by the despair of safety, and by that bigoted attachment to their Temple and country, in the ruin of which they would rather perish than survive; and although throughout the siege a party existed within the city desirous to submit to the Romans, yet in the time of actual contest not one was found to act the part of a traitor.

Struggles of the Jewish factions.

The factions of Eleazar and John of Giscala had now united, and occupied the Temple, which they had obtained by stratagem, and the Lower City. Simon had the command in the Upper City. For some time after the actual commencement of the siege, the combats between these two factions still continued; nor was it until the battering rams of Titus were brought to bear upon the outer wall, that the nearness of the danger united them against the common enemy. The Jews defended the outer walls for fifteen days, being successful in an early sally, and having partially burned the works of their besiegers; but on the 7th of Artemisium (May) they withdrew, leaving to the Romans possession of the northern part of the city.† Titus pitched his tent within the wall, in a place called the *Assyrian Camp*, and renewed the siege by an attack upon the second wall; in five days more he won this also, and occupied the included portion of the city with a thousand men;‡ neither the houses were burned, nor were any prisoners put to death, for he still hoped by a show of clemency to induce a surrender The besieged interpreted this conduct as if he despaired of taking the city by force; so that the merciful behaviour of the Romans only increased the obstinacy of the resistance opposed to them. A second sally drove the besiegers for three days from their last acquired post; but on the fourth, the Jews were finally repulsed, and compelled to remain within the inner wall.§ During the five following days all active operations were discontinued, while the army was furnished with fresh supplies, and Titus reviewed his troops in the sight of the besieged; the splendour of their equipment, and the discipline and order which the Roman forces displayed, threw a consternation over the leaders of the sedition; but they knew that they had gone too

The two outer walls captured.

* *Bell. Jud.* v. 11. † Ibid. vi. 6, 2.

* *Bell. Jud.* v. 6. † Ibid. 7.
‡ Ibid. 8. § Ibid. 9.

far to be allowed to purchase safety for themselves by submission; and death in war was preferable to either captivity, or to the sword of the executioner. Thus, as Josephus observes, was the will of Providence fulfilled, that together with the leaders of the faction the whole State should perish.

Mission of Josephus.

Still anxious to preserve the city, Titus sent Josephus to address the Jews upon the wall, and persuade them to desist from a hopeless defence; his arguments had no effect upon the Chiefs of the sedition, but many of the common people were induced to desert to the Romans, being kindly received by them, and permitted to pass whithersoever they desired. Against these deserters John and Simon kept the strictest watch, and put to death all whom they suspected.*

Famine.

Famine with all its horrors now began to appear, and with it the fury of the factions proportionally increased. When corn ceased to be openly sold, the robbers searched private houses; if they were disappointed in finding food, the inhabitants were tortured on suspicion of having it concealed; if food was found they were punished for having kept it privately to themselves. For a measure of wheat the rich man sold valuable possessions; for a handful of barley the poor man parted with all that yet remained to him. Families hid themselves while they partook their scanty meal, in hopes to eat it undisturbed by robbers; the table was no longer set, but each man snatched from the hearth his half-baked cake, or devoured in silence unground and undressed corn.† Every moral feeling was extinct; the wife admitted not her husband to share her food; the son suffered his father to perish; mothers snatched the bread from their children's lips. Some wandered out at night to collect herbs, who on their return were robbed of what they had gained at the peril of their lives. Such were the sufferings of the poor, whilst the rich were taken before Simon and John, and plundered and put to death. These Chiefs still at discord with each other, were in union only in committing crimes.‡

Crucifixion of deserters.

The number of persons who now deserted was so considerable, that Titus gave orders that they should be considered prisoners, and crucified in sight of the city; by this severity hoping to hasten the surrender. No less than five hundred were taken in a single day; the crucifixions continued until wood was wanting for the instruments of punishment, and no space was left whereon to erect them. The Roman soldiers made sport of this cruelty, by hanging up their victims in grotesque postures; and thus, unknowingly, requited upon the nation their cruel derision of our Lord's sufferings. Titus finding that this course of severity was ineffectual, contented himself with striking off the hands of the deserters and sending them back.

At the end of seventeen days, between the 12th and 29th of Artemisium, (May,) the Roman army had completed four batteries. Those erected against Antonia were speedily overthrown, by the mines which Simon had constructed; for the besieged had learned by experience to practise every art of defence. The remaining works were also destroyed by fire in a sally, and it was not without difficulty that the Romans repelled the fierceness of this attack, and drove the Jews once more within. It was evident, that the defence would be protracted to the last extremity;* in order therefore to prevent escape, and to hasten the inroads of famine, by cutting off every supply of provision from without, Titus commenced the stupendous work of carrying a line of circumvallation around the entire city. Three days labour, and the united exertions of every officer and man in the whole Roman army, sufficed for the completion of a mound thirty-nine stadia in length, and the erection at intervals of thirteen forts or redoubts, which measured in circuit ten additional stadia. The famine now raged with the utmost fury, and death in its most terrible shapes wasted the wretched population. At first the corpses were buried at the public charge, but the numbers increased so much, that eventually they were thrown over the walls, into the deep hollows which surrounded the city. When Titus beheld this fearful sight, he lifted up his hands to heaven, and called God to witness that he was not the guilty author of such dreadful deeds. The number of dead bodies carried out at one single gate amounted to 110,000;† and it was calculated that altogether not less than 600,000 of the lower orders were thus disposed of, besides those richer persons who were buried in the city in private houses.‡ Many still escaped from the city, but the greater part of these died miserably; some from intemperate eating, others by the hands of the soldiers, who ripped up the captives in search for the gold and precious stones which they were believed to have swallowed. In this way 2000 perished in a single night; and in defiance of the prohibition of Titus this cruelty continued to be practised, chiefly by the Arabian and Syrian auxiliaries. It was during this period of horror that an abomination was perpetrated, so repugnant to the strongest feelings of our nature, that were it not for the indisputable evidence of Josephus, who had ample opportunities of knowing the fact, and no temptation to falsify it, we should reject it altogether as a fable.§ A mother deliberately destroyed her infant child, and having prepared it as food, offered it to the robbers who were attracted by its savour. Her name was Mary the daughter of Eleazar.

Titus draws a line of circumvallation.

The leaders of the sedition supplied their followers by the plunder of the people.‖ To cruelty, John now added the guilt of sacrilege, melting down the vessels of gold which were used in the service of the Temple, and distributing the wine and oil which the Priests had religiously preserved for the purposes of sacrifice. In July, Titus reduced the castle of Antonia; the works which were brought to bear upon it occupied no less than three weeks in their construction; a task of no inconsiderable difficulty, since no timber for that purpose was found within the distance of twelve miles. The famine was so severe, that at last the daily sacrifice ceased;¶ and Titus wisely considering that this must be a favourable opportunity for negociation, gave orders to Josephus to make the attempt, but with no better success than heretofore. At this period many of the Nobles, and the High Priests, Joseph and Jesus, contrived to escape; Titus received them kindly, and upon the circulation of a report within the city that those persons had perished, he showed them to the people on the wall, as an assurance of the safety which they might yet enjoy.

Reduction of the castle of Antonia.

* *Bell. Jud.* v. 10. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. 11.

* *Bell. Jud.* v. 12. † Ibid. 13.
‡ Ibid. 12. § Ibid. vi. 3.
‖ Ibid. v. 13. ¶ Ibid. vi. 2.

History. From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

In an assault upon the Temple, from which he was repulsed, Titus succeeded in destroying some part of its porticoes, the remainder were thrown down by the Jews themselves. On the 8th day of Lois, (August,) Titus finding that the labour of the battering rams for six days incessantly had produced no impression upon the walls of the Temple, and wearied with the obstinate resistance of the besieged, determined to set fire to the gates. For a day and night the work of destruction was thus continued,* when orders were given to the soldiers to extinguish the flames, and to prepare a way for the assault. A severe contest took place between the contending parties, which at last terminated in the Jews being driven into the inner Temple, and leaving the outer court in possession of the Romans. The preservation of the Temple was most anxiously desired by Titus; and every possible exertion was made by the troops to extinguish the fires which were still burning. Whilst thus employed they were again attacked by a sally of the besieged. Amid the confusion a soldier seized a brand, and throwing it in at an open window, set fire to one of the chambers. Titus was alarmed by the cry which the Jews within raised when they beheld the flames, and advanced with the great body of his troops; his most urgent commands were to extinguish the flames, but the soldiers, furious with the prospect of victory, pretended to misunderstand the orders, and excited each other to extend the fire. A dreadful scene of slaughter ensued, chiefly of multitudes of unarmed persons, who had fled for refuge to the inner court and altar, confiding in the predictions of numerous false prophets, who were suborned by the leaders of the sedition to assure them of the certainty of a miraculous deliverance. The flames had penetrated only to the exterior chambers; and Titus, accompanied by his Generals, entered into the Holy place, and there beheld all the glory of this far-famed House of God. The sight only served to increase his regret at the destruction which was raging; and he again endeavoured to inforce his orders, but in vain. The soldiers wilfully disobeyed, and Titus and his officers were compelled to quit the building. By a remarkable coincidence, it happened that this conflagration of the Temple took place on the 15th day of Lois, the same day and month in which the Temple of Solomon had been burnt by Nebuchadnezzar. Josephus dates the burning of Titus in the second year of Vespasianus, 1130 years, 7 months and 15 days, after its foundation by Solomon; and 539 years, 45 days, after the foundation by Haggai, in the second year of the reign of Cyrus.†

The Temple fired,

and burned.

Prodigies related by Josephus.

Josephus has related many prodigies, (in the occurrence of which it is plain that he himself believed,) foretelling the destruction of the city. The key to them, we think, may be found, without referring to supernatural interference, partly in the heat of imagination produced by the calamities under which the besieged were suffering, and partly in that love of the marvellous, which is fond of exaggerating common occurrences into signs and wonders. For a whole year a comet, resembling in shape a sword, stood over the city. Before the war broke out, on the eighth day of Xanthicus, at the feast of unleavened bread, at the ninth hour of the night, a light as bright as that of day shone round the altar. A heifer led to be sacrificed brought forth a lamb in the Temple. The eastern gate, which required twenty men to close it, was seen to open of its own accord at the sixth hour of the night. A few days after that festival, before sunset, chariots and troops in armour were seen carried in the clouds; and at the Feast of Pentecost, at night a voice was heard in the Temple, saying, "Let us remove hence." Four years before the war, during the Feast of Tabernacles, Jesus, the son of Ananus, began to cry in the Temple, "A voice from the east; a voice from the west; a voice from the four winds; a voice against Jerusalem and the Temple; a voice against the bridegrooms and the brides; a voice against the whole people." He was scourged by the Magistrates; but at every stripe he uttered, "Woe to Jerusalem." For seven years and five months he continued this same mournful cry, at length during the siege he went upon the wall, and there crying with the loudest voice, "Woe, woe once more to the city, to the Temple, and to the people," he added, "woe, woe to myself also;" at which instant he was killed by a stone from one of the Roman engines.

Of the Jews From B. C. 3. to A. D. 70.

The siege of Jerusalem did not terminate with the destruction of the Temple. The terms which Titus again offered to Simon and John, were again refused. For themselves they had no expectation of mercy from the Romans, and they trusted at the last to effect their escape by the subterraneous passages within the city. The besiegers soon took the Lower City which fell a prey to the flames; but the Upper City and Palace required to be regularly besieged. On the 20th day of Lois (August)* the works were begun, and they were finished in eighteen days. The Idumæans had made an offer to surrender to Titus, and sent five of their officers for that purpose; but their design being discovered, Simon put their chiefs to death, and doubled the vigilance of the guards to prevent the escape of so large a body; the multitude deprived of their leaders, still continued their purpose, and with some loss deserted to Titus. Great numbers of the captives were sold at a cheap rate, and 40,000 were reserved for Cæsar, who suffered them to depart as they pleased. On the 7th day of Gorpiæus (September) the battering-rams were brought against the walls; but the attack was no longer repulsed with the same vigour as before; and the leaders of the sedition beholding themselves now deserted by all who had before proved faithful, began to fear the result. With little difficulty the Romans found themselves masters of the walls; the people fled to Acra; and the tyrants by a strange infatuation, instead of throwing themselves into the impregnable fortresses, formed by the three towers Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamne, escaped to the subterraneous passages. The slaughter of the multitude continued till evening, until the soldiers were weary of killing. Titus had given orders that none should be put to death, but such as were found in arms; but the soldiers spared only those who were fit to be sold as captives. At night the city was set on fire, and the next day still beheld Jerusalem enveloped in flames. Those who survived this work of devastation were collected in the ruined circuit of the Temple, and divided into lots at the will of their conquerors; some were sent to work in

Defence of the Upper City.

It is stormed

* *Bell. Jud.* vi. 4. † Ibid. 5.

* *Bell. Jud.* vi. 8.

the mines of Egypt, others were condemned to be exhibited as gladiators in the cities of the Empire; and happy were the 11,000 who perished in the Temple from want of food, whilst this dreadful sentence was passing upon their less fortunate countrymen. Hunger at last compelled John of Giscala, together with his friends, to leave their secret hiding places, and surrender themselves to Titus. He was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Simon had retired with his most faithful followers to a cavern, in which provisions had been collected, and where they hoped by mining to be able to find an opening into the country, and thus escape; but their progress was tardy, and their provisions began to fail; when Simon saw no hope of escape, he dressed himself in a white tunic and a purple robe, and suddenly presented himself in the midst of the ruins of the Temple. The Roman soldiers were astonished at this strange appearance; Simon beckoned them to approach him, and desired them to call Terentius Rufus the Governor, to whom he surrendered himself. Being reserved by Titus to grace his Triumph at Rome, he was on that occasion put to death.

After the capture of Jerusalem, the three forts of Herodium, Machærus, and Masada, still remained in the possession of the Jewish rebels, and Titus left the reduction of them to his Generals. Before he finally quitted Syria, he returned to Jerusalem to survey the ruins; amongst which great treasures still continued to repay the labour of the Roman troops in making excavations. The sight of such devastation, contrasted with the remembrance of the ancient splendour of the city, deprived Titus of all the gratification which so great a victory might otherwise have conferred; the fame of conquest obtained by the infliction of such misery, could not be a subject of exultation to a man who had any compassion for the sufferings of mankind. The whole city and Temple was levelled to the ground, with the exception of the three towers, which were left standing as a monument of its former greatness, and a part of the western wall, which served to protect the garrison; but even these scanty relics had perished in the time of Hadrian; thus fulfilling that remarkable prophecy of our blessed Lord, "that not one stone should be left upon another." The whole number of Jews who perished in Judæa, and in the neighbouring countries during this war, is estimated at one million and a half.

The city levelled.

THE HISTORIANS OF ROME.

THEOPOMPUS ..... FLOURISHED CIRCITER	U. C. 400.	A. C. 354.
CLITARCHUS	U. C. 420.	A. C. 334.
THEOPHRASTUS .... BORN U. C. 381. A. C. 373. DIED	U. C. 466.	A. C. 288.
HIERONYMUS, TIMÆUS ..... FLOURISHED CIRCITER	U. C. 500.	A. C. 254.
DIOCLES, UNCERTAIN, BUT BEFORE SECOND PUNIC WAR.		
QUINTIUS FABIUS PICTOR ..... FLOURISHED CIRCITER	U. C. 529.	A. C. 225.
LUCIUS CINCIUS ALIMENTUS	U. C. 542.	A. C. 212.
MARCUS PORCIUS CATO, BORN U. C. 521. A. C. 233. DIED	U. C. 606.	A. C. 148.
LUCIUS CALPURNIUS PISO ..... FLOURISHED CIRCITER	U. C. 620.	A. C. 134.
LUCIUS CÆLIUS ANTIPATER	U. C. 633.	A. C. 121.
CNÆUS GELLIUS	U. C. 630.	A. C. 124.
CAIUS LICINIUS MACER, LUCIUS ÆLIUS TUBERO	U. C. 700.	A. C. 54.
QUINTUS VALERIUS ANTIAS, LUCIUS SISENNA	U. C. 670.	A. C. 84.
POLYBIUS ..... BORN U C. 548. A. C. 206. DIED	U. C. 630.	A. C. 124.
CAIUS CRISPUS SALLUSTIUS, BORN U. C. 668. A. C. 86. DIED	U. C. 719.	A. C. 35.
CAIUS JULIUS CÆSAR .. BORN U. C. 653. A. C. 101. DIED	U. C. 710.	A. C. 44.
TITUS LIVIUS ..... BORN U. C. 661. A. C. 93. DIED	U. C. 737.	A. C. 17.
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS .. FLOURISHED CIRCITER	U. C. 749.	A. C. 5.
DIODORUS SICULUS	U. C. 710.	A. C. 44.
APPIANUS		A. D. 143.
DION CASSIUS		A. D. 229.
VELLEIUS PATERCULUS		A. D. 3.
CAIUS CORNELIUS TACITUS ..... BORN A. D. 57. DIED CIRCITER		A. D. 99.
CORNELIUS NEPOS ..... DIED CIRCITER	U. C. 729.	A. C. 25.
PLUTARCHUS ..... DIED		A. D. 119.
CAIUS SUETONIUS TRANQUILLUS ..... DIED CIRCITER		A. D. 120.
LUCIUS ANNÆUS FLORUS ..... FLOURISHED CIRCITER		A. D. 116.
JUSTINUS		A. D. 148.
VALERIUS MAXIMUS		A. D. 23.

Biography.

IN tracing chronologically the History of Mankind, we have now come in sight of some names and institutions which indicate our gradual approach to the first beginnings of our present state of society. This, then, is the proper place to lay before our readers a general view of one part, at least, of the country through which they have been travelling, and which hitherto they have only seen in its separate details. In other words, we propose in the present Section to give some account of the Progress of Historical Writing from the age of Xenophon to that of Tacitus; or, which is nearly the same thing, to notice the characters of the principal writers, whether Greeks or Latins, to whom we are indebted for our knowledge of the History of Rome.

Earliest writers who have spoken of Rome.

But before we proceed to speak of those Authors, of whose works enough has been preserved to allow us to judge sufficiently of their merits and defects, it will be proper to give a brief sketch of those also who are known to us only through the reports of others; their own writings, with the exception of some scattered fragments, having been long since lost.

Theopompus.

THEOPOMPUS of Chios, a scholar of Isocrates, who continued the History of Thucydides to the end of the Peloponnesian war, and in another work gave an account of the actions of Philip of Macedon, is said by Pliny* to have been the oldest Greek writer who made any mention of the affairs of Rome. However, he merely noticed the capture of the city by the Gauls; an event which seems to have excited some interest in Greece, as it was spoken of not only by Theopompus, but by Aristotle,† and by Heraclides of Pontus, both of whom flourished at the same period.

Historians of Rome.

Clitarchus.

CLITARCHUS, the follower and Historian of Alexander, named the Romans among the different nations who sent embassies to his master, probably to deprecate his displeasure; and

Theophrastus.

THEOPHRASTUS, so well known for his lively sketches of Moral Characters, as well as by his works on plants and minerals,‡ is said to have bestowed some attention on the affairs of Rome. In his *History of Plants*, which is still preserved to us, he speaks of an unsuccessful attempt of the Romans to land on the coast of Corsica; and this is the first mention of their name, which is to be found in any original Greek writer now extant.

Hieronymus.

A few years after Theophrastus, lived HIERONYMUS of Cardia, who, according to Dionysius,§ first gave a connected sketch of the early history of Rome: and

* *Histor. Natural.* lib. iii. c. 5.
† Plutarch, *in Camillo*, c. 22.
‡ Pliny, *ubi suprà*. § Dionysius Halicarnass. lib. i. c. 6.

graphy. Timæus.

Timæus, a Sicilian, besides treating of this first part of the Roman annals in his *Universal History*, wrote also a separate account of the Italian campaigns of Pyrrhus. But, according to Plutarch,* it was not Hieronymus of Cardia, but Diocles of Peparethus, who first published that report of the foundation of Rome, which having been adopted by the most ancient Roman Annalists, has been exclusively transmitted to posterity, and has caused all the other traditions to be forgotten, which once were circulated on the same subject. Plutarch asserts in plain terms,† that Q. Fabius Pictor, the oldest Roman Annalist, borrowed his narrative of Romulus from the work of Diocles; and Dionysius asserts as plainly,‡ that the account of Fabius was in its turn followed as an authority by Cato and L. Cincius; who, together with Fabius, are the most distinguished of the early Roman Historians. If this statement then be true, the original Roman Writers were themselves only the transcribers of the narrative of a foreigner; and we cannot be sure that any part of the story of Romulus is founded on traditions which are unquestionably of Roman origin.

Diocles.

w much the early oman story is obably of mestic gin.

But a more temperate judgment of the matter will pronounce a less sweeping sentence. It is exceedingly probable that Fabius Pictor may have borrowed the story of the birth of Romulus, and of his personal adventures, either from Diocles or from some other Greek writer; because it is exactly the sort of narrative which is apt to originate in the fancy of an injudicious writer of a later age, and there was no Roman Historian older than himself from whom he could have copied it. The accidents of Romulus's infancy bear a remarkable resemblance to the Persian tradition of the birth and early life of Cyrus, to which Herodotus has given celebrity; and the stories of Brutus the Trojan in our own country, and of similar heroes in other countries of modern Europe, prove sufficiently that circumstantial narratives of the first settlement of a people may be composed without resting in the slightest degree on any domestic tradition. But the distinction which Cicero§ makes between the personal adventures of Romulus before the foundation of Rome, and the institutions which were traced back to the period of his government, seems in the main a just one. The first he calls "Fables," the second "Facts;" and although the ignorance of careless writers has materially disguised those facts, yet the outlines are of a kind not likely to have been invented by a mere fabulist, but such as would have been preserved either in actual public records, or by the continued existence in later times of the institutions to which they refer. We may be well satisfied that neither Diocles, nor any other Greek, invented the account of the union between the Romans and Sabines; of the division of the people into three Tribes, the *Ramnenses*, *Titienses*, and *Luceres*, and into thirty *Curiæ*; of the distinction between the Patricians and Plebeians; of the Lictors and other insignia of dignity which were borrowed from Tuscany; and of those curious ceremonies which Plutarch describes as having been practised at the foundation of the city. With regard to the reigns of the successors of Romulus, we may assert the genuineness of many facts transmitted to us by the early Annalists with still greater confidence. The fragments of the laws of Numa preserved to us by Festus; the law of murder in the reign of Tullus Hostilius; the form of the treaty between Rome and Alba; the *Jus Feciale*, which Livy seems to have copied from L. Cincius; the enlargement of the three original tribes by Tarquinius Priscus; and, above all, the account of the Census of Ser. Tullius, and his dividing the whole people into thirty local Tribes, quite distinct from the Tribes in which the citizens of different races had been classed according to their different blood; these, and other points of a similar nature, may be regarded as unquestionably genuine: while the more popular part of the Roman story, the personal characters and exploits of their Kings, the events of foreign war, the causes and merits of domestic revolutions, and, much more, all the details of particular actions, may be safely ascribed to the foolish loquacity of some unwise writer; or to that dishonest vanity which is known to have produced so much falsehood in the memoirs of private families; or to the policy of a predominant party, seeking to give a false colour to the circumstances by which its own ascendency was established.

Q. Fabius Pictor.

It is unfortunate for the Roman History that Quintus Fabius Pictor was the first and most popular of the Roman Annalists. The common account of the events of the first four hundred and fifty years of the State's existence, is doubtless in the main copied from him; and it is quite sufficient to show, how great was his carelessness, how shallow was his judgment, and how blind was his partiality. Instead of labouring to separate the few facts which were preserved to his time by genuine records or unsuspected traditions, from the mass of idle inventions and misrepresentations with which they had been overwhelmed, he presented the whole to his readers in one heterogeneous compound, as if all were to be received with equal confidence. Instead of searching for such original records as were still in existence, though not generally made public; such as the Treaty concluded between Rome and Carthage in the first year of the Republic, and that which Porsenna dictated to the Romans, when they were forced to surrender their city to him; he listened to the memoirs of the Valerian family, and to the temptations of national vanity, which represented P. Valerius Publicola as a colleague of L. Brutus in the Consulship, and described the King of Clusium as abandoning gratuitously a prey, which was confessed to be already within his grasp. The general tenour of the story, usually given as the History of Rome, abundantly confirms that character of Fabius given by Polybius, who describes him as a writer at once partial and injudicious; warping the truth in order to enhance the fame of his countrymen; yet doing this with so little ability, that the inconsistencies and ignorances of his narrative often afford their own confutation.

L. Cincius Alimentus.

The merits of Lucius Cincius Alimentus were apparently of a far higher order than those of Fabius. He was Prætor in the year of Rome 542,* about the middle of the second Punic war; and at one period of that war he became Hannibal's prisoner,† and learned from his own mouth the amount of the army with which he had entered Italy, and of the losses which

* *In Romulo*, c. 3. † Ibid.
‡ Lib. i. c. 79.
§ *De Republicâ*, lib. ii. c. 2. *Ut jam a Fabulis ad Facta veniamus.*

* Livy, lib. xxvi. c. 23. † Ibid. lib. xxi. c. 38.

he had sustained since he crossed the Rhone. He is called by Livy,* a curious investigator of ancient monuments and records; and the fragments which are preserved of his different works seem fully to confirm this character. Most of these related to various points connected with the antiquities and Constitutional history of Rome; such as the *Comitia*;† the *power of the Consuls*;‡ the *duty of a Lawyer*;§ the *Fasti*;‖ *military affairs*,¶ &c. Besides all these, he wrote a regular History of Rome, from the earliest ages down to his own times; and this, if we may believe Dionysius of Halicarnassus,** was composed in Greek; but as he asserts the same thing of the annals of Fabius Pictor, which were clearly written in Latin, it is not improbable that he mistook in both instances a Greek translation for the original work. In the fragments of Cincius, which are preserved by Festus, there are some notices of great value, particularly his account of the alliance between Rome and Latium,†† which he represents in a very different light from that in which it is exhibited by the common Historians of those times. But it should be remarked, that almost all these fragments are quoted from his minor works, which by their titles were evidently more laboured, and of a less popular character than his general history. It is not impossible, that in the latter he may have followed Fabius in repeating the story most adapted to flatter the pride of his readers, and to which the family memoirs, contained in the funeral orations of the most distinguished Patricians had already given a general circulation;‡‡ while in his more scientific works he had really endeavoured to discover and to state the exact truth. When Fabius and Cincius wrote, History was still considered more as a means of giving pleasure, and encouraging patriotic enthusiasm, than as a severe and impartial record of the actions and condition of mankind; and thus Livy and Dionysius, whose Histories bear evident marks of having been *got up* from the mere common sources of information, and who, while they read the annals of Cincius, were not likely to study his other works, have not availed themselves of that more correct information, which his legal and antiquarian Treatises would have afforded them.

M. Porcius Cato.

Marcus Porcius Cato flourished only a few years later than Fabius and Cincius. He was born about sixteen years before the beginning of the second Punic war;§§ and filled the office of Quæstor in the year of Rome 549, in the Consulship of M. Cethegus and P. Tuditanus. He was elected Consul nine years afterwards; and eleven years later, in the year of Rome 569, he obtained the Censorship; from which circumstance, he is usually designated by the title of Cato the Censor, to distinguish him from his equally celebrated great-grandson, Cato of Utica. After a busy and active manhood, and having on all occasions testified the strongest aversion for the Arts and Literature of Greece, he began in his old age* to study the Greek language, and to devote himself to the investigation of the antiquities of Italy, for which he found the Greek writers among his principal authorities. At an earlier part of his life he had published several speeches, as well as a Treatise on Agriculture; but we are at present only considering him as an Historian; and the work which entitled him to this name was called *Origines*, or *Antiquities*, and consisted of seven books;† the first of which contained the history of Rome under its Kings; the second and third treated of the origin of all the several States of Italy; the fourth and fifth embraced the two first Punic wars; and the two last carried on the history of the wars that followed down to the Prætorship of Ser. Galba, in the year of Rome 602. He died in the year 604, at the age of eighty-five, in the Consulship of L. Marcius and Marcius Manilius.

Of Cato's merits as a Historian it is not very easy to form a judgment. His learning is spoken of with praise by Cicero, Cornelius Nepos, and Livy; but it was not merely learning which was required, but an ability to weigh the merits of the numerous writers whose works he read, and to distinguish between that which was trustworthy in them, and that which was worthless. We are told that Cato wrote his *Origines* when he was advanced in years, and whilst he was prosecuting his study of the Greek writers with all the keenness which he derived from the novelty of the pursuit. Under such circumstances he would be likely to attach an excessive value to the information which he found in them; their Greek etymologies of Italian names, however fanciful, would be apt to impose upon him, from the merits and importance which a language newly acquired always assumes, and from our fancied ability to see in it a derivation for many words, the origin of which we had never been able to ascertain. He relates the story of the sow and her thirty pigs,‡ which Æneas found on the banks of the Tiber, and whose number was typical of the number of years which should elapse before the Trojans should build the town of Alba. We are inclined to suspect that the *Origines* of Cato, if we possessed them, would be little more than a transcript of the History of Fabius, or of those Greeks from whom Fabius himself borrowed his narrative. But his particular Treatises on various points of the Constitution, of which so long a catalogue may be collected from Festus, were probably of much greater value; as he was likely in these to have relied more on the authority of laws, or of existing usages, and general traditions, and less on the writings of such Historians as Fabius and Diocles of Peparethus.

Next in order of time to Fabius, Cincius, and Cato, may be ranked Lucius Calpurnius Piso. He was Consul in the year of Rome 620, when Tiberius Gracchus was murdered; and had been Tribune sixteen years before, and had then brought forward the first law ever enacted in Rome for the punishment

L. Calpurnius Pi

* Lib. vii. c. 3.
† Festus, *in Voce, Patricii.*
‡ Festus, *Prætor ad Portam.*
§ Ibid. *Nuncupata Pecunia.*
‖ Macrobius, *Saturnal.* lib. i. c. 12.
¶ Aulus Gellius, lib. xvi. c. 4.
** Id. lib. i. c. 6.
†† Festus, *Prætor ad Portam.*
‡‡ Something of this kind may be observed in Cardinal Fleury's *Ecclesiastical History.* In the body of his work he has repeated the common tales which he found recorded by former writers, and generally received by the Roman Catholics; but in the Essays or Discourses on particular points, which he has prefixed to some of the volumes, he writes in a totally different spirit; he is candid, cautious, and sensible, and has given the fairest account with which we are acquainted, of the subjects on which he treats.
§§ Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 15, 16.

* Cicero, *de Senectute*, c. 8.
† Cornelius Nepos, *in Catone*, c. 3.
‡ Sex. Aurelius Victor, *de Origine Gentis Romanæ.*

Biography. of corruption and extortion in the Provinces.* His Annals seem to have gone back to the earliest times, as A. Gellius† quotes from him an anecdote of the private life of Romulus; and to have been carried down at least to the second Punic war.‡ Of their merits we know nothing; Cicero indeed speaks of them rather contemptuously, but this is on account of what he calls the meagreness of their style;§ and he takes no notice of their character in more important particulars.

L. Cælius, Antipater. Lucius Cælius Antipater, who lived a few years later than Piso, is commended in like manner for the eloquence and correctness of his language,‖ when compared with that of the earlier writers; but we are told nothing further concerning him. There is, however, a passage in Livy¶ which conveys a favourable impression of him, where it is said, that Cælius had given three different accounts of the death of Marcellus; one, according to the common tradition; another, following the statement given by the son of Marcellus, when pronouncing his father's funeral oration; and a third, which he offers as the true story, the fruit of his own investigations of the subject. This certainly implies some carefulness and weighing of testimony on the part of the Historian; and it is confirmed by the character given of him by Valerius Maximus,** "that he was an author to be depended upon;" and by the circumstance that he, almost singly, as far as appears, among the Roman Annalists, has stated with truth the passage of the Alps, by which Hannibal entered Italy, when he says that he crossed by the *Cremonis Jugum*,†† or Little St. Bernard.

Other early Historians. To the names of early Historians already mentioned, may be added those of Caius Sempronius Tuditanus,‡‡ Cneus Gellius, Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius, (who translated his History from one written in Greek by Acilius,§§ and who must have been a most voluminous author, as Aulus Gellius quotes the 150th Book of his Annals;)‖‖ Caius Licinius Macer, Caius Ælius Tubero, and Quintus Valerius Antias. We may be well assured, that none of these writers would have deserved much praise if their works had survived to us; the exaggerations of Valerius Antias are well known; those of Claudius, on some occasions, nearly rival them; and Licinius Macer and Ælius Tubero quote the *Libri Lintei* differently as to the same fact, a circumstance which implies some carelessness in one or both of them.

Sisenna. The name of Lucius Sisenna, who lived, together with Valerius Antias,¶¶ under the Dictatorship of Sylla, is mentioned with much more respect. He was the author of a History of the Civil war between Marius and Sylla; and is said by Cicero to have far surpassed every other Roman Historian; and by Sallust, to have investigated and described the subject of which he treats, better and more carefully than any other writer. His work would have been exceedingly valuable; as we have unfortunately no contemporary account of that eventful period, which intervened between the third Punic war and the commencement of Cicero's political career. Historians of Rome.

One only history of the beginning of the VIIth century of Rome has reached posterity in a state sufficiently uninjured to enable us to judge fully and fairly of its merits; and to this we shall next call the attention of our readers, fatigued perhaps like ourselves with the unsatisfactory review of fragments, and the enumeration of almost forgotten names.

Polybius. Polybius, the son of Lycortas, was a native of Megalopolis, a city situated within the limits of Arcadia, but in its political relations being a Member of the Achaian Confederacy. His father appears to have been a man of ability and patriotism, who exercising a considerable influence in the councils of his country, endeavoured to preserve the independence of Achaia by a manly and free demeanour towards the Romans, without provoking their enmity by displaying a fruitless spirit of opposition. Polybius entered into public life at an early age, and steadily supported and followed the policy of his father; so that his conduct exposed him to the resentment of the Romans, when their victory over the last King of Macedon at once disposed and enabled them to treat every relic of liberty in Greece as an affront to their supremacy. The party amongst the Achaians,* who hoped to win the favour of the Romans by an excessive servility, accused their more independent countrymen of being disaffected to the interests of Rome; and on this charge, Polybius with more than a thousand others was transported into Italy, and there detained for about seventeen years. His fellow prisoners were mostly confined in Tuscany, or in other districts of Italy; but he himself,† through the interest of P. Scipio Æmilianus, and his brother, whose fondness for Greek literature had first led to their acquaintance with him, was allowed to reside at Rome. His acquaintance with P. Scipio, in particular, grew by degrees into an intimate friendship; and when after the lapse of seventeen years, those Achaians who had survived their captivity were allowed to return home, Polybius continued to live with his friend, and was his companion in the third Punic war,‡ when he brought the siege of Carthage to a conclusion, and destroyed the city. In the succeeding year he was an eye witness§ of the miseries brought upon his countrymen by their last ill-advised contest with the Romans; and on this occasion he used his influence with the Roman officers to preserve untouched the statues of Aratus and Philopœmen, who were represented by the flatterers of Rome as having been the enemies of the Roman power. After the final settlement of the affairs of Greece by the ten Commissioners, whom the Senate, as usual, despatched to determine the future condition of the conquered country, Polybius was directed to go round the several cities of Peloponnesus, to endeavour to pacify their mutual jealousies, and to superintend the first operation of the new Constitution, which the

* Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 27.
† Lib. ii. c. 14. ‡ Livy, lib. xxv. c. 39.
§ *Reliquit Annales, sane exiliter scriptos. De Claris Orat.* c. 27.
‖ Cicero, *de Legibus*, lib. i. c. 2. *De Oratore*, lib. ii. c. 13.
¶ Lib. xxvii. c. 27.
** Lib. i. c. 7. *Cælius, certus Romanæ Historiæ Auctor.*
†† Livy, lib. xxi. c. 38.
‡‡ A. Gellius, lib. vi. c. 4. Cicero, *de Legibus*, lib. i. c. 2.
§§ Livy, lib. xxv. c. 39. lib. xxxv. c. 14.
‖‖ Lib. i. c. 7.
¶¶ Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. Cicero, *de Claris Oratoribus*, c. 63. Sallust, *Bell. Jugurth.* c. 95.

* Polybius, lib. xxx. c. 10. Pausanias, *Achaica*, c. 10.
† Polybius, lib. xxxii. c. 9 ‡ Polybius, *Fragment.* lib. xxxix.
§ Ibid. lib. xl. c. 7, 8.

Romans had imposed upon them. The latter years of his life appear to have been passed in his own country, where he is said to have died* in consequence of a fall from his horse, at the advanced age of eighty-two, about 124 years before the Christian æra.

A long life so divided between an active participation in civil and military duties, and a leisure abundantly favoured with the means of acquiring information, was well calculated to form an excellent Historian. The times, too, in which Polybius lived presented him with a most attractive subject; he had witnessed the progress and completion of that career of conquest, which bestowed on a nation of half barbarians the greatest power in the civilized world, and which had established between the different countries bordering on the Mediterranean, a mutual connection till then unknown. Owing to this revolution, Greece could no longer pretend to claim the highest rank amongst nations; she was herself reduced to absolute subjection, while those great offshoots from her vigorous root, the Kingdoms formed by the Successors of Alexander in Syria and Egypt, were themselves obliged to submit to the controul, or to court the protection of Rome. That barbarians should thus have obtained dominion over Greeks, could only be ascribed in the fond persuasion of the latter, to that blind power of Fortune against which the greatest human wisdom must struggle in vain. But Polybius had learnt to appreciate more truly the causes of the Roman ascendency; and found them perfectly agreeable to the acknowledged principles which determine the fate of nations. He saw that the Romans owed their success, in part at least, to the inherent superiority of their institutions, and the undeviating singleness of aim which marked their policy. His long residence at Rome, the acquaintance which he had there gained with the Latin language, and still more his personal intimacy with some of the most distinguished Romans, enabled him to describe faithfully to the Greeks the exploits, character, and institutions of their conquerors; which other writers among his countrymen, partly from ignorance, partly from servility, and partly from the fondness of ordinary minds for splendid fables, had greatly misrepresented.

Perhaps, however, the habit of conversing with men of uncultivated minds, who were always looking to him, as to their teacher, for lessons of moral and political wisdom, produced on the character of Polybius its usual effect, in leading him to expatiate with self-complacency on points which men in general understood as well as himself, and to mistake very trite and ordinary observations for truths at once original and striking. Many parts of his work, however useful they might have been if written in Latin, and addressed to Roman readers, must have appeared absolutely ridiculous to a Greek who had received the ordinary education of his countrymen. His long remarks on the usefulness of Geography, and his tedious way of describing the shapes of different countries, must have appeared at once needless and dull to those of his readers who were familiar with the abundant information, and the lively sketches of Herodotus. When he stops, in almost every page, to descant upon some common place axiom of morals or politics, we can imagine how impatiently an Athenian would have turned over the volume, while he recollected with a sigh, those brief touches of a master's hand, by which Thucydides has furnished matter of thought for twenty centuries. Much indeed of his reflections is really valuable, and even when we are most tempted to complain of their triteness, we must generally allow their soundness. But the *prosing* tone which pervades the work detracts generally from its merit, inasmuch as by fatiguing and disgusting the reader, it prevents his memory from grasping readily the facts contained in the history; and by overlaying the narrative with a mass of cumbrous digression, it adds to the obscurity which the very nature of the subject necessarily entailed upon it. In an Universal History, such as Polybius attempted to write, it requires not only great clearness of arrangement, but great liveliness in the detail, in order to bring out into the most conspicuous light those points on which the reader's attention ought most to dwell; and by rendering the tamer parts of his journey as engaging as possible, to keep his mind in sufficient strength and spirits for observing the relations of the different objects with one another, and forming to himself a connected notion of the ever changing scene. Now there never was a writer endowed with less animation, or with less of a poetic spirit, than Polybius. Though it appears that he had himself visited the Alps for the purpose of ascertaining Hannibal's route, yet not one spark of feeling seems to have been awakened in him by the remembrance of that magnificent scenery; and the tameness of his description diminishes the influence of its fidelity. Throughout the whole of his work there is perhaps no single passage which fixes itself by its excellence on the reader's memory; and this one fact is by itself sufficient to prove, that the mind of Polybius was not of the very highest order. Great men will leave somewhere or other imprinted on their writings the traces of their superior power; and amidst all the sobriety of narrative and patient investigation of particular facts which testify their sound sense and judgment, there will break forth flashes of a comprehensive and magnificent spirit, which show that the peculiar talent of the Historian is directed by the master mind of a wise and good man. But it would have been too much for the ordinary condition of humanity, that even Greece should have produced a second Thucydides.

Yet although Polybius was not a Historian of the very highest class, his merits are still far above mediocrity, and he may be placed amongst the greatest names of the second order. He was sensible, well informed, and impartial; and he possessed the great advantage of a practical familiarity with political and military affairs, which sets him far above the mere garrulous literati of the later ages of the Roman Commonwealth. It is well known that he has preserved the true representation of several events of the early Roman History, in which the Roman Annalists seem unanimously to have followed a false and partial statement: and to him alone are we indebted for our knowledge of the remarkable Treaties concluded between Rome and Carthage, at different times, before the first Punic war. His impartiality, however, may perhaps be suspected when he speaks of the exploits of the family of Scipio; the account of the concluding scene of the second Punic war, and the breach of faith imputed to the Carthaginians, have always seemed to us, to

* Lucian, *Macrobii*, p. 917. ed. Paris, 1615.

Biography.

savour very much of the unfairness of Cæsar in his Commentaries, and to present a picture widely different from that which an unbiassed or unfettered Historian would have transmitted to us. Perhaps, indeed, he copied the memorials of the family of Scipio, without being able, from his close connection with Scipio Æmilianus, to scrutinize their correctness very closely: and the same powerful influence seems to have checked and shackled the free course of his sentiments in much of the latter part of his History; nor was it possible for him to write in the language which justice required of a series of crimes perpetrated by men still living, and who were in the highest stations of power and influence at Rome. Yet if we compare his statements with those of the Roman writers themselves, we shall find that he made every effort to discharge his duty faithfully; and that it is in the cautious tone of his History, and not in the perversion of facts, that we may trace the unavoidable constraint which circumstances imposed on him. The loss of a considerable portion of the sixth Book of his work, in which he had given some notices of the antiquities of the Roman story, may be viewed with unmixed regret; and the same may be said of the loss of the greatest part of the subsequent Books, containing the continuation of Hannibal's operations in Italy, after the battle of Cannæ. In these earlier transactions there was less difficulty in expressing his opinions with perfect freedom; nor are we aware of any thing to detract from the high authority which his narrative of Hannibal's first campaign in his third Book has always deservedly enjoyed.

Exaggerated reputation of Roman Literature.

No nation has ever possessed a literature the real merit of which is so disproportionate to its fame as that of Rome. The political greatness of the Romans gave a general prevalence to their language; and those who learnt it and spoke it were naturally inclined to magnify the excellence of its writers, and to maintain their equality with those of Greece. At a later period, when the communication between the Greek Empire, and the west of Europe, was almost entirely interrupted, the language and authors of ancient Rome were regarded with an almost idolatrous veneration, when compared with the half formed dialects and ignorant writers of France, Spain, Italy, and England, during the darkness of the middle ages. Habit strengthened this admiration, and caused it to continue to a period when it became misplaced and unreasonable; just as men have been known to retain in after life the same exaggerated estimate of their teacher's talents, which they had formed, naturally enough, when contrasting them as boys with their own imperfect powers and scanty knowledge. Thus the Italians still affected to look up to the Poets of Rome as to models of excellence, whom it was their greatest glory to imitate, when they had in fact already equalled, if not surpassed, them. And even at this day, when almost every nation in Europe might justly assert the equality of its own literature with that of Rome, we are still accustomed to talk of the classical writers of Greece and Rome, as if the two nations ought to be placed on the same level, and the admiration which the one may justly claim, should be bestowed in equal measure on the other. From this habit of regarding the Greeks and the Romans as rivals in excellence, it followed that for every Greek writer of eminence, some parallel was sought for among those of Rome. The fame of Herodotus and Thucydides was not therefore to remain unmatched, and two Roman Historians were to be found who might be put in competition with them. And as the style, rather than the matter of a work, was too much the principal object of the criticism of those times, Sallust and Livy were selected for this high dignity; and the conciseness of the former was supposed to point him out as the rival of Thucydides, while the fluency of the latter suggested the comparison between him and Herodotus.

Historians of Rome.

Sallust.

The merits of Caius Sallustius Crispus, though very unequal to the exaltation thus bestowed on them, are yet of a very high order. We can only judge of his character by the two detached narratives which have come down to us entire; his account of the conspiracy of Catiline and that of the war with Jugurtha. Both indeed are strangely tinctured with the besetting fault of Roman literature, a laboured and unnatural tone, which betrays the forced and tardy introduction of a taste for letters among the Roman people. In this respect the Roman and French literature most strongly resemble one another; and the resemblance belongs to the similarity of the two people in some striking points of national character. Both may be considered as eminently deficient in imagination; both were destitute of any natural craving for the higher pleasures of the mind; both waited with great patience till external circumstances brought the existence of such pleasures to their notice, and made them think that it would conduce to their glory to indulge in them. But genius will not be courted successfully by those who woo her from such unworthy motives: and thus the Augustan age, and that of Louis XIV. have produced, for the most part, minds only of the second and third order; who will never hold the same rank with the greatest of other Ages and other countries. In this manner the Histories of Sallust seem to have been written as professed literary compositions; and the writer appears much more to have studied to make them eloquent and striking, that they might tend to his own glory, than to have regarded the sober instruction either of his own generation or of posterity. Hence the ambitious tone of the introductions to both his narratives, which, to say nothing of their inconsistency with his own personal character, are ill placed and empty; being written in that style of pretended Philosophy which runs into generalization, in order to escape the unwelcome labours of informing itself fully with particular facts. Yet, with all this, there is much in Sallust which deserves high praise. His impartiality is greater than we should expect, when we consider his own close connection with the faction of Cæsar; he speaks strongly but truly of the excessive profligacy and oppression of the Aristocracy; yet he does ample justice to the virtues of Metellus and Cato; and his sketch of the character of Sylla seems drawn with entire fairness. He has been accused of underrating the merits of Cicero in his account of the conspiracy of Catiline; but this charge must have originated from the habit into which men have fallen of estimating Cicero's conduct according to his own excessive panegyrics of it; compared with which the language of temperate and just praise must appear faint and niggardly. It is, on the contrary, highly honourable to Sallust, that he has never joined in the cry of several of his political associates, in condemning the execution of Lentulus

Biography. and his accomplices, as an action at once illegal and tyrannical. Such a view of the transaction might have been expected from a partisan of Cæsar, when we remember that Cæsar himself had protested at the time against the execution as contrary to law, and had advised the substitution of perpetual imprisonment in its room. The value of the work is increased also by its being a contemporary History; so that we have none of that ignorance of laws, customs, and various minute particulars, which occur so frequently in the compilers of a later age. Nor should the liveliness of the style be forgotten; a quality so excellent, that it more than makes amends for some occasional obscurities, and even for some affected words and expressions; inasmuch as it keeps up the reader's attention, and thus puts him in a state to study the work most profitably.

Cæsar. With far less literary pretension, yet with an object equally personal, and even more injurious to Historical excellence, the *Commentaries* of CAIUS JULIUS CÆSAR will next claim our attention. We have already expressed our astonishment that they should ever have gained the reputation of impartiality, or that they should be quoted as proofs of the modesty of the writer. From the first page to the last they are a studied apology for his crimes, and a representation of his talents and victories in the most favourable light. From his attack on the *Helvetii*, down to his rebellion against his own country, he describes himself as always just and moderate, ever ready to listen to proposals of peace from his enemies, and forced to conquer Gaul, and to overthrow the Constitution of Rome in mere self defence. With much more truth, certainly, yet still with evident exaggeration, he contrasts his own unwearied activity with the remissness of his antagonists; diminishes his own losses and aggravates theirs; imputes his disasters to accident or treason, while his successes are the natural result of his own superior plans, and the courage and discipline of his soldiers. To rely on the fairness of such a narrative would argue, therefore, but small discernment as to the criteria of Historical evidence; and to call Cæsar a good Historian would only show our ignorance of one of the main qualifications which History requires. Yet, wherever there is no apparent motive for disguising or corrupting the truth, the authority of the *Commentaries* is most excellent. Unlike the honest ignorance of some of the writers whom we shall presently notice, and who *would* tell the truth whenever they *could*, Cæsar on the other hand enjoyed such superior means of information, and was so active in availing himself of them, that it is evident he *could* tell the truth whenever he *would*. Hence arises the great value of the sketches which he has given us of the political state, natural productions, manners and customs of Gaul, Germany, and Britain. Owing also to the same cause, his geographical and topographical details are beautifully clear and accurate; and his descriptions of military movements, of the common usages of the service, of the operations of sieges, and the construction of bridges, and engines of war, are replete with information of the most unquestionable fullness and accuracy. In addition to these merits, his style is simple and animated, and formed with such rare ability, as to wear the semblance of unadorned soldierlike frankness and candour, when the narrative is indeed written with the most artful purposes of a consummate intriguer and adventurer.

History of Rome.

Resemblance between the *Commentaries* of Cæsar and the *Memoirs* of Napoleon Buonaparte.

A similar union of intentional misrepresentations, of deep and extensive information, and of language at once simple and forcible, may be observed in the *Memoirs* of the late Emperor Napoleon, and serves to heighten the resemblance which existed already in other points between him and Cæsar. Both were eminent for an unwearied activity of body and mind; both followed the same principle in their military operations, anticipating attack, relying on the ascendency of their name and the terror inspired by the daring rapidity of their movements, striking always at the vital points of their enemy's power, and never losing the fruit of past exertions by checking themselves too soon in their career of victory, and by stopping to satisfy themselves with what they had done already, while there yet remained any thing more to do. Both, though unsparing of their soldiers' lives, were yet completely masters of their affections; and knew how to awaken in the hearts of their immediate attendants an almost enthusiastic regard. Both also provoked their ruin by a vanity which found its gratification in insulting wantonly the feelings of mankind, and which coveted the ostentatious display of power as much as the real possession of it. In their literary characters, if the titles which remain to us of Cæsar's various works imply in him a greater proficiency in Science, in critical learning, and in Poetry; yet the *Memoirs* and Dissertations of Napoleon display a much deeper spirit of reflection on military and political subjects, and a much more extensive knowledge on all points of History, Geography, and Statistics, than we can find in the *Commentaries* of his rival. The narratives of both, notwithstanding the little strictness of principle which either possessed, are yet exceedingly valuable; because with all their unfairness, there is necessarily a great number of points on which nothing was to be gained by a departure from the truth, and on all which their great ability, and perfect information enable us to rely on their statements with implicit confidence. But it is necessary that the reader should be constantly on his guard, to observe where they can have any interest in misleading him; and on such occasions he should recollect, that their capability of telling the truth becomes absolutely a reason for suspecting their evidence, as it enables them to conceal it more artfully, and misrepresent it with greater plausibility.

Livy. We are now arrived at the Augustan age, and we must request the candid attention of our readers to the remarks which we are about to offer on the merits of Livy. We have already on more than one occasion spoken of this writer in terms which must have surprised and perhaps offended his admirers; and though we do not feel the slightest doubt of the justice of our censures, yet it is due to an opinion generally entertained to give our reasons for altogether dissenting from it. Of the family and personal fortunes of TITUS LIVIUS, little, we believe, is known. He was born at *Patavium*, or Padua, removed to Rome, where he enjoyed the protection and regard of Augustus, and died in his native city, in the fourth year of the reign of Tiberius. It is allowed that he was never actually engaged in military or political affairs, but that he was a mere man of letters; and it is clear from the very nature of his work, that for

Biography.

almost all the facts contained in it, he must have relied upon the writings of others. He appears to have been a man of very upright and amiable disposition, and of very good natural talents; but whether it was owing to the wretched education of the times, or to the want of a diffusion of knowledge, and a free intercourse with one another among men of different conditions and employments, scarcely any of the Historians of Rome are of much value, except those who were themselves, in some measure, practically acquainted with public business. What the Rhetoricians could teach him, Livy learned with readiness; and his natural abilities aided by their instructions enabled him to write with animation, with dignity, and with eloquence; while his natural good feeling, where no prejudice interfered with it, has given an honest and amiable character to most of the moral sentiments which he expresses. It is said, moreover, that in his account of the Civil wars, he spoke of the party opposed to Cæsar and to Augustus with fairness, and even with regard; not suffering his connection with the Emperor to lead him into any unworthy servility. In fact the last Books of his History, which embraced the events of his own times, and of those immediately preceding them, must have been incomparably more valuable than any part of his work which has been preserved to us. Living at Rome, and being often with Augustus himself, he must have heard a great number of authentic anecdotes, and have gathered various reports from the mouths of eye-witnesses, respecting the principal actions of the Civil wars. Besides this, every man must know something of the laws and Constitutional forms of his country in his own age; nor can he avoid being acquainted with the manners and habits of thinking which are prevalent around him. Many, therefore, may write a valuable contemporary History, who are quite incompetent to the task of exploring the condition and the actions of former times, and of describing faithfully a state of manners and of political circumstances, which can only be known by long and patient investigation. But of this part of his duty, Livy appears to have entertained a very imperfect notion. Like those Painters, who when choosing for their subject some event of the early history of Rome, destroy the truth of their pictures by giving to the buildings the style and splendour of the Augustan age, so has Livy drawn the Romans of every period in the costume of his own times; and the Senators and Plebeians of the first years of the Commonwealth, are mere copies of those whom he might have almost seen and heard himself, in the disorders immediately preceding the rebellion of Julius Cæsar. Doubtless the character of the Nobility and Commons of Rome underwent as great changes in the course of years, as those which have taken place in our own country. The Saxon Thanes and Franklins, the Barons and Knights of the XIVth century, the Cavaliers and Puritans of the XVIIth, the country gentlemen and monied men of a still later period, all these have their own characteristic features, which he who would really write a History of England, must labour to distinguish and to represent with spirit and fidelity; nor would it be more ridiculous to paint the Members of a Wittenagemot in the costume of our present House of Commons, than to ascribe to them our habits of thinking, or the views, sentiments, and language of a modern statesman.

Historians of Rome.

The fault of which we have just been speaking, together with most of the others with which Livy's History is chargeable, is to be ascribed to the great deficiencies of his knowledge. A History compiled mainly from the writings of others, and embracing a space of several centuries, was at the time at which he produced it, comparatively novel; and men were not yet aware of the prodigious labour required to execute such a task properly. Livy appears to have read no more than the principal Chronicles or other narratives which treated of the successive periods of the Roman story, and to have consulted them just as his immediate purpose required. This is the simplest explanation of his omitting all mention of the famous Treaty concluded between Rome and Carthage in the first year of the Commonwealth, preserved to us, as we have already noticed, by Polybius. Livy knew that the work of Polybius related to the VIth century of Rome, and therefore he never thought of reading it, while he was engaged with the events of the IIId century. In the same manner he was well acquainted with the *Origines* of Cato, and the History of L. Cincius; but he seems to have been perfectly ignorant of their various legal and antiquarian Treatises, in which their object was really to discover the truth, and not, as in their narratives, to write an engaging and popular story.

The same cause also will account for his total ignorance of the real issue of the war between Porsenna and the Romans. He followed, no doubt, his ordinary guides, the Chronicles of Fabius, Cato, Piso, &c.; without suspecting the existence of such a document as the actual Treaty between the two contending parties, which even a hundred and fifty years afterwards was accessible to Tacitus and the elder Pliny. With this extreme negligence, something of wilful blindness was probably mingled. He did not wish to scrutinize too narrowly a series of accounts, all of which tended to flatter the national pride of his countrymen; and thus even the notorious exaggerations of Valerius Antias,* although exposed by Livy himself in other parts of his work, are preferred to the authority of Polybius, in order to represent the victory of the Metaurus as a full compensation for the defeat of Cannæ, even in the actual numerical loss sustained by the vanquished in the field of battle. In other instances we are tempted to ascribe his seeming negligence to a physical impossibility of arriving at certainty; as on any other supposition it is almost too monstrous for belief. When he quotes two different versions of the *Libri lintei* from two different writers, without telling us which was the true one;† we must charitably believe that the *Libri lintei* were no longer in existence, rather than suppose Livy to have been so indolent as not to have taken the trouble

* We think we cannot be mistaken in fixing upon Valerius Antias as the writer whom Livy copied on this occasion. The exaggeration of "*fifty-six thousand men*" slain on the part of the Carthaginians, (Livy, lib. xxvii. c. 49,) instead of the "*ten thousand*," which is the number given by Polybius, lib. ii. c. 3, can surely come from no other than him whom *Livy* himself describes as "*avunium eorum immodicè numerum augenti*," lib. xxxiii. c. 10, and who in like manner raises the amount of the Macedonian loss at Cynocephalæ from 8000 to 40,000.

† Lib. iv. c. 23.

of walking from one part of Rome to another, in order to consult them with his own eyes. His intimacy with Augustus must have placed within his reach whatever monuments of ancient times were then remaining throughout Italy; but how few are the instances in which he ever refers to any such authority. Much less did he dream of acquiring any of the accessory knowledge which is so indispensable to an Historian. Of Geography; of the great general truths of political science, such as the ordinary progress of the state of society, and the various interests which successively arise to take part in the internal dissentions of a Commonwealth; of all the great questions of Political Economy, Livy was careless and ignorant. Born almost within sight of the Alps, his knowledge of their topography and scenery was utterly vague, and often utterly erroneous; and the marshes, through which Hannibal had to force his way at the commencement of his second campaign in Italy, are placed by Livy on the wrong side of the Apennines, and ascribed to the floods of the Arno. The whole history of the first four hundred years of Rome he has related in such a manner, as to give it the appearance of being a mere fiction; instead of throwing light upon his subject, he has darkened and confused it, so that it requires no small labour to extract the truth from the mass of inconsistencies, mistakes, and exaggerations, with which he has overlaid it. He describes Ser. Tullius as owing his Throne at first solely to the election of the Senate; and supposes his object in framing his famous *Census*, to have been to give a decided preponderance to the aristocratical interest in the *Comitia*; at the same time that he represents him as offending the Senate, by carrying into effect an Agrarian law; and when it is evident, that his unpopularity with the Patricians was the main cause which enabled his son-in-law to deprive him of his Throne and life. In his description of the *Census* itself, he shows that its tendency was to establish an Oligarchy, founded on property, not on birth; whereas the whole tenour of his subsequent narrative, manifests that the government was purely aristocratical, and exclusively in the hands of the Nobles, and not of the rich. Again, in the *Census* we have an account of a military system of arms and of tactics, totally different from those of the legion; yet in none of his descriptions of battles do we find any traces of the institutions enjoined by Ser. Tullius, but very frequent mention of the weapons and divisions in use amongst the Romans in Livy's own age. Now it is true that the system of Ser. Tullius was overthrown immediately after his death; and that thus the Government after the expulsion of Tarquin was not an Oligarchy, nor were the arms and tactics of the soldiers those of the phalanx; but neither, again, were they those of the legion, such as it was in later times; and the real story of the variations which they underwent, and of the constant connection between these changes and the political state of the Commonwealth, (although when we have once discovered it from other sources, we may trace it here and there in Livy's narrative,) was yet most certainly not understood by himself, nor does he seem to have formed any definite notions at all upon the subject.

With such an indistinctness in his views, and with so much ignorance, it was not possible that Livy should seize the clue of a multitude of crowded events; that seeing distinctly what was important and what was not, he should know where to condense his narrative, and where to be minute; and should place his readers in a situation from whence they might easily catch the general outline of the story, and find it relieved by the shadow into which the less interesting parts of the picture had been thrown. We will venture to say, that never was the history of a great war more uninstructively written than that of the second Punic war by Livy. Amidst the profusion of his details the reader is at once wearied and confused; he wanders about like a traveller lost in an immense forest of underwood; thicket succeeds to thicket, and each in itself is gay and beautiful with its flowers and its foliage; but the scenery has no striking features, and the wood has no certain paths, no elevated ground, the eminence of which might serve as a central point wherewith to connect and group the other parts of the landscape. Still more intolerable is the tediousness of the last fifteen remaining Books of his History; which, without conveying one particle of valuable information as to the internal state of Rome or of any other country, detail with the utmost minuteness every petty action of all the uninteresting wars in which the Romans were involved in Spain, Liguria, Greece, and Asia. The same character may be given of the ten first Books, which abound in the same minuteness of detail, and are equally barren of any clear or sensible views of what was important and what was worthless. In these earlier Books, indeed, Livy must often, in all probability, have written his descriptions from his own imagination, just as Dion Cassius copied some of his from the History of Thucydides. Nothing can be more impertinent than such pretended embellishments; and thus the famous description of the destruction of Alba, which has so often been praised for its elegance, might indeed have been justly admired in a novel, but like all other unauthorized statements, it is a sure proof of a shallow mind, when inserted in a work which aspires to the name of History.

The speeches introduced by Livy, which Quinctilian has so highly extolled, must not be passed unnoticed. It were unfair indeed to blame an individual author for adopting the general practice of his age; and it would have required a mind of a very different order from Livy's, to have discovered and renounced its absurdity, when it was sanctioned by custom, and was one of the readiest means of obtaining popularity. But it would argue no small want of judgment in ourselves, if we were now to consider such idle declamations with any feelings of similar admiration. None of them are at all characteristic of their pretended speakers, nor of the Age to which they are ascribed; but in all, the same author and the same style are presented to us, inventing arguments in the true method of the exercises of the Rhetoricians, and only anxious to dress them up in the most harmonious and striking language. We would only request those who may think our censure too severe, to read over the speech ascribed to Menenius Agrippa, in the second Book of Livy, in which he tells the old fable of the belly and the members to the dissatisfied Commons, and then compare it with the speech on the same subject, put into the mouth of the same speaker, by Shakspeare, in his Play of *Coriolanus*. If Livy

could have inspired his version of it with one half of the spirit and character which runs through every line of that of the English Poet, we might have almost forgiven him for inserting a speech written by himself, in a work that should contain nothing but what was genuine. But Shakspeare, though unacquainted with the particular history of Rome, well knew the sort of language which a popular Orator in rude times was likely to address to an exasperated populace; and this he has given with his own inimitable liveliness and power. Livy, with very little more knowledge, and infinitely less ability, has written that which cannot possibly be mistaken for the composition of any other person than himself.

Causes of the undue reputation which Livy has enjoyed.

If it be asked to what we must attribute the great reputation which Livy has so long enjoyed, the question, we think, is capable of receiving a very simple answer. History was regarded as a *literary composition* by the critics of the Augustan age, and that which followed it; and thus the style of a Historian was the point on which his character mainly depended. Quinctilian, when bringing forward Livy as a rival to Herodotus, extols him merely for the unaffected beauty of his narrative, and the inconceivable eloquence of his speeches,—with the same discernment of the real excellencies of a Historian as he has shown in another passage, where he selects the pithy conciseness of Thucydides, and the simple sweetness of Herodotus, as the merits which have entitled them to the highest place among writers of History. Yet the language of Quinctilian has been echoed by succeeding critics, who have dilated on the beauty of Livy's style, and the excellence of his descriptions, as if these qualities were sufficient to make him a good Historian. He was, moreover, a writer of the Augustan Age; and the greater purity of his Latin, as belonging to that golden period, has procured for him, in the judgment of Schools and Colleges, a preference over Tacitus, who was regarded as a writer of the silver age of Latinity. And when we consider how little the world at large has known of Greek and Roman literature, and that it has done little more than repeat the opinions of those who were called the learned, we shall not wonder that Livy has acquired a great name; since his panegyrists have been either those who have not studied him at all, or those who from the different nature of their pursuits, have been quite incapable of appreciating his deficiencies as a Historian, and have dwelt with a natural fondness upon the undeniable beauty of his style.

It is time, however, that these errors should be dispelled, and that Livy should be tried in a more just balance, and estimated after a truer standard. So long as he shall be considered a good Historian, it will be an ominous sign of the inattention of men in general to the nature of a Historian's duties, and of the qualifications which he ought to possess; it will forbid us to hope that History will be studied in a wiser spirit than heretofore, or that being more judiciously cultivated, it will be made to yield a more beneficial return. But this is a hope that we are loath to relinquish; and we would fain do all in *our* power to promote its accomplishment. This is our apology for the length to which we have now carried our criticism of Livy; we *know* that he is a bad Historian, and we would fain effect the same conviction in the minds of others. For this end nothing is necessary but to compare his work in one or two careful perusals with that of Thucydides. *There* would be seen the contrast between what an excellent Historian should be, and what Livy is: the contrast of perfect knowledge and unwearied diligence, with ignorance and carelessness; of a familiar and practical understanding of all points of war and policy, with an entire strangeness to them; of a severe freedom from every prejudice and partiality, with a ready acquiescence in any tale that flatters national vanity and pride. Nor would the comparison of the Speeches of the two Histories be less pointed and instructive. In the one we should find the genuine and characteristic sentiments of the times, the countries, and the parties, to which they are ascribed. The principles of morality and policy which were avowed or acted upon, and the sort of arguments which might be successfully used, are given on an authority known to be deserving of the fullest belief. In the other there is nothing genuine, and therefore nothing valuable; the sentiments and arguments are merely those of an unpractical man of a later age; they convey no information; they cannot be treated as developing the character of their pretended authors; they may be "inconceivably eloquent" in the eyes of a Rhetorican, but to him who estimates History rightly, it was a waste of time to write them, and except only so far as they are specimens of language, it is a waste of time to read them.

We would not have the above remarks, which we have felt it our duty to offer, mistaken or misinterpreted. It is *solely* to the want of merit in Livy in his province *as a Historian* that they are addressed. As an exemplar of purity of diction; as a consummate master of all the rhythmical cadences and harmonious combinations of language; and as a painter of the beautiful forms which the richness of his own imagination called up, he may be pronounced unrivalled in the whole course of literature.

Contrast between the early and later Grecian writers of History.

The chronological order of our criticism has now brought us to Diodorus Siculus, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus; and we shall proceed to notice the character of the later Greek Historians generally, amongst whom these two writers held a conspicuous place. Nothing, perhaps, is more striking than the contrast between the early and the later periods of Grecian literature; between the extraordinary excellence of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, and the extraordinary worthlessness of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Appian. We cannot doubt, indeed, but that writers of this latter class were sufficiently numerous even before the age of Alexander; and even Herodotus exposes many tales which were circulated by some of his contemporaries, and which breathe the very same spirit with those to be found so often in the pages of later Historians. But happily we have no monuments of early Grecian History, except such as are of the highest value; so that our impression of the period which produced them is naturally somewhat more favourable than the reality. Afterwards there appeared no revival of their excellencies; and as the circumstances of the times became more unfriendly to the formation of great minds, those who under better culture might have risen above mediocrity, now sank beneath it; and those who might have been awed into silence by the splendour of contemporary genius, were encouraged to essay their feeble voices amidst the universal weakness of all around them.

Biography.

The times, we have said, were unfavourable to the formation of great minds; not so much from any direct restraints imposed upon literature by the government, (for of this there seems to have been but little during the reign of Augustus,) but from the removal of those opportunities of practical discipline to the character, which in the free States of antiquity counterbalanced, in some measure, the want of education, and the difficulties of obtaining knowledge. The army was becoming a distinct profession; and every citizen was no longer obliged, as in the Commonwealths of Greece and Rome, to learn the duties and acquire the experience of a practical soldier. Those restless political intrigues, and those better and more honourable calls for action, which self defence, or the public good, held out so often to the citizens of the little Republics of an earlier Age, were now crushed and silenced; and the welfare of the great national society to which he belonged, was now to every man the object only of an occasional and impotent wish, instead of a daily principle of active exertion. Trade and navigation were uncongenial to the character of the Romans, and were thus depressed in public estimation; so that they held a distinct and subordinate place, and could not operate with much effect on the general mass of society. Doubtless the field of literature was open; and the patronage of the Augustan Age may be thought eminently favourable to its improvement. But the ancient notions of literature were very different from those of the present age. The original names bestowed on places of literary study, σχολὴ, γυμνάσιον, and *Ludus literarius*, names so improperly applied in the eyes of modern schoolboys, express very strikingly the feelings of the Greeks and Romans concerning them. Books were their relaxation from the severer business of life; and hence, as is well known, a taste for letters was regarded with jealousy, at an earlier period of the Roman History, as the mark of an indolent and trifling mind. But something of the original evil of looking to literature chiefly as to an amusement, has occasioned at once the omissions and the faults with which that of the ancients is chargeable. In the reign of Augustus there was a great demand for Poetry, for Oratorical compositions, for Criticism, and for entertaining narrative; but little or none for Political Economy, for legitimate History, for Experimental or Moral Philosophy. There was nothing then in the state of the public taste to encourage a writer to attempt works of laborious research, and of deep and extensive thought and knowledge. Fame and profit were to be gained at an easier rate by cultivating the more flowery paths of literature; and talents are so independent of wisdom, that where fame and profit invite them, they are generally sure to direct their efforts. Nor must we forget the scarcity of books amongst the causes which account for the badness of the greater part of ancient History. It was absolutely impossible for many authors to procure the knowledge which they needed; books could not be purchased, on account of the dearness of their price, and they could be consulted oftentimes only in the public libraries of large cities, at a considerable distance, perhaps, from the spot of the writer's residence. Nor even to those living at Rome itself, could a public library ever supply the place of a private one. Indolence would often tempt a writer to rest satisfied with an imperfect recollection of a passage, rather than make the exertion of going to another quarter of the city to ascertain its purport exactly; and, above all, he who reads in a public library, reads for a particular object, but does not and cannot indulge in that quiet and leisurely and extensive study which is only to be enjoyed at home, and which alone fills the mind with abundant and well digested knowledge. It was not, therefore, to be expected that a Greek coming to Rome in the hope of arriving at wealth and renown by his literary talents, should have been able or willing to make himself a really good Historian. Instead of the arduous task of storing himself with all sorts of knowledge, political, geographical, and military; instead of the slow and unostentatious labour of reading and digesting various authorities, sifting their value, and extracting from them what was most excellent; a simpler and easier path lay before him, which would lead him far more surely and speedily to the accomplishment of his objects. To cultivate his style with assiduity, so as to render his narrative agreeable; to exercise himself in the lessons taught him in the Schools of Rhetoric, so as to diversify his story with ingenious and eloquent Orations; to learn how to give a striking and novel appearance to the old common places of morality, which were to be interspersed from time to time; and to express on all occasions a fitting admiration and reverence for the glory and greatness of Rome: these were methods better adapted than any others to lead an author to popularity and patronage, and, therefore, independently of their own natural attractions, they were sure to be most generally practised.

Historians of Rome.

We must not be understood to mean that the operation of these causes was always uniform; or that there may not have been many exceptions to that which we still believe to have been the general rule. But with regard to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, we think that *his* deficiencies were of a nature which no change of circumstances could have removed. He appears not to have possessed any original capacity, which might have been improved by culture or experience, but a natural weakness of judgment and want of vigour, which must always have kept him far below mediocrity as a Historian. He is prolix, ignorant of political and military matters, flagrantly partial, and incompetent to apprehend the real state, manners, and character of the people of whom he wrote. The eloquence which is the redeeming charm of Livy's pages, is uniformly a stranger to those of Dionysius; the Speeches which, considered merely as rhetorical compositions, are in Livy so forcible and beautiful, are in Dionysius utterly vapid. He tells us in his Preface, that he spent two and twenty years in Rome, and that having learned the Latin language, and gained an acquaintance with the Roman writers, he employed the whole of this period in acquiring the knowledge necessary for his History. This he derived, as he tells us, partly from the personal communications of those eminent for their information, and partly from the approved Chronicles of M. Cato, Q. Fabius, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, Ælius Tubero, Gellius, Piso, and others. To say nothing of the judgment evinced in this classification of authorities, it is observable that he does not make any mention of the legal and antiquarian dissertations of Cato and Cincius, of which we have already spoken, but merely of their Chronicles: having, probably,

Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

like Livy, neglected their other works from which so much more of valuable information was to be drawn. The tenour of his narrative makes it probable that those learned Romans, who assisted his researches, were of that class who in simplicity believed, or from interested motives extolled, the private memoirs of the great families of Rome; and who sought to flatter the vanity of their patrons by the invention of fabulous pedigrees, such as those of Cluentius and Memmius, whose pretended ancestors were Cloanthus and Mnestheus, the companions of Æneas.

Diodorus Siculus.

The part of the History of DIODORUS SICULUS which remains to us enters but little upon the affairs of Rome. Yet his account of the first invasion of the Gauls is curious, inasmuch as he agrees with Polybius in representing the ransom demanded by the Gauls as actually paid; and places the pretended victory obtained over them by Camillus some months later than their evacuation of the Roman territory. It is also to a fragment of Diodorus, that we are indebted for the discovery of the manner in which the story about the death of Regulus originated, and for the fact that the cruelties said to have been committed upon him by the Carthaginians, were in reality practised by his own sons upon some Carthaginian prisoners, whom the Senate had put into their custody. Besides these passages, we find in Diodorus a clear and probable account of the revolt of the slaves in Sicily, in the early part of the VIIth century of Rome; and a remarkable narrative of an insurrection, excited by an insolent member of the Equestrian Order, T. Minucius. It is pleasing to find that he took great pains to acquire by travelling a correct knowledge of the different countries described in his work; and there is a general tone of honesty and fairness pervading his History, which shows that he was always inclined to speak the truth whenever he could discover it. His error lay in his design of writing an universal History; an undertaking, no doubt, exceedingly grand and attractive, but utterly incompatible with the limited length of human life, and our physical capabilities of acquiring knowledge. By thus attempting to do too much, he has done nothing as perfectly as he otherwise might have done it; nor is he one of those Historians on whose information we can rely with entire confidence, or who by the excellence of his work has introduced any striking improvements into History.

The two writers whom we have last mentioned both flourished during the reign of Augustus. Instead however of observing an exact chronological order, we shall next speak of the two other Greek Historians who have written most at large on Roman affairs, Appian and Dion Cassius. APPIANUS was a native of Alexandria, and lived during the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, and the elder Antoninus. He spent some time at Rome, where he followed the profession of an Advocate in the Imperial Courts, and was afterwards made Procurator of Egypt. In the plan of his History he has adopted a geographical division of his subject, and has attempted to trace the course of events by which the several Provinces successively became subject to Rome; after the completion of this part of his task he added the History of the Civil wars of Rome, from the first disturbances occasioned by Tib. Gracchus, to the battle of Actium and the establishment of the Imperial power; concluding the whole with a supplementary Book, in which he gave an account of the revenue derived from the several parts of the Empire, and of the military and naval force which was kept up in his own time. Unfortunately this last Book, which, from his official situation, was likely to contain much valuable matter, has entirely perished; together with large portions of the rest of his work; we still retain, however, besides some considerable fragments, one entire Book on the History of Spain, another on that of Syria, a third on that of Illyria, two on the Punic wars, one on the long contest with Mithridates, and five on the Civil wars of Rome, which carry down the story of them as far as the murder of Sex. Pompeius, A. C. 719. Thus the whole of Appian's existing History is necessarily a compilation from the writings of others, without any mixture of information gained from his own personal inquiries or experience. Such a work, when composed by a man of low understanding and scanty knowledge, is as worthless as any History can be, and this is the character which we are obliged to bestow on the History of Appian. It is true, that amidst the dearth of better information, even the writings of such an author as this, are to a certain degree valuable, as they contain some facts which are not to be found elsewhere. We are indebted to him for a translation of the proclamation issued by the Triumvirs to announce and to justify their dreadful proscription; and also for some curious anecdotes of the proscription itself.

Dion Cassius.

DION CASSIUS was a native of Nicæa in Bithynia,* and flourished during the latter part of the IId, and the first thirty or forty years of the IIId century of the Christian era. His father was a man of some consideration, who had been intrusted with the command of the Province of Dalmatia,† and had enjoyed the dignity of Consul in the last year but one of the reign of Commodus. Dion Cassius himself practised for some time as an Advocate at Rome; he was raised to the Prætorship by the Emperor Pertinax,‡ and appears to have been treated with kindness by the Emperor Septimius Severus. It was in the reign of this latter Prince, that he commenced the compilation of his History; and his own account of the motives which induced him to undertake it, is too curious to be omitted.§ He had written and published a small work on the subject of the dreams and prodigies, which had encouraged Severus to expect to obtain the Throne; and he sent a copy of it to Severus, who, after having read it, returned a very flattering written acknowledgment to the author. "It was towards evening," says Dion, "when I received this answer, and I soon retired to rest; during my sleep a divine power gave me a charge to compose a History; and accordingly I wrote that part, (namely, the Life of Commodus,) which the reader has just now completed. When I found that this was generally approved of, and that Severus himself expressed himself satisfied with it, I conceived the wish to compile an entire History of the affairs of Rome, and to embody in this larger work the portion which I had already written, that I might transmit to posterity, in one continuous

* Dion Cassius, lib. lxxv. p. 857. edit. Leunclav.
† Ibid. lib. xlix. p. 413. Cassiodorus, *Chronicon.*
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. lxxiii. p. 835. § Ibid. p. 828.

Biography. narrative, the whole History from the first beginning to as late a period as my lot would allow me to continue it." He then adds, that he employed ten years in collecting his materials, and twelve more in the composition of his work, residing for that purpose chiefly at Capua,* as a delightful situation in which he might enjoy uninterrupted leisure. But when Alexander Severus became Emperor, he was called forward into public life; was twice appointed Consul,† the second time as the colleague of the Emperor himself; and was successively intrusted with the governments of Africa, Dalmatia, and Pannonia. In this last situation he rendered himself so odious to the soldiers, by the strict discipline which he enforced among them, that in the mutiny in which Ulpian, the Prætorian Præfect, so well known for his fame as a lawyer, was murdered at Rome, the mutineers demanded of the Emperor that Dion Cassius should in like manner be surrendered to their vengeance. This request was steadily rejected; yet when Dion was afterwards chosen by Alexander Severus as his colleague in the Consulship, he was advised by his Sovereign to spend his term of office at a distance from Rome, lest his appearance in public in the capacity of a Magistrate, might dangerously irritate the minds of the soldiers. The latter years of his life were passed in his native country Bithynia, agreeably, he tells us, to an intimation of his destiny, which he once received in a dream, when a vision commanded him to inscribe on the last page of his History two lines from Homer, describing the removal of Hector from the battle by the care of Jupiter, and his escape "from the dust, and from the slaughter, and from the blood, and from the tumult."

In reviewing the History of Dion Cassius, recollecting at the same time his account of the manner in which he was led to write it, we cannot but regret, that he, like so many others, should have been ignorant, according to the expression of Hesiod, "how much the half is better than the whole." Had he been contented with what he at first accomplished, the History of the reign of Commodus; or had he only carried on the narrative from that period through the subsequent events of his own times, he would have deserved an honourable place amongst impartial and well-informed contemporary Historians. But the unfortunate desire of forming a complete work, and of giving to the world an entire body of Roman History, led him to go over ground of which he wanted an adequate knowledge, and to repeat, without improving, a story which had been often told before. He was too little acquainted with the laws and constitutions of the old Commonwealth to describe them accurately, or to trace with a clear and strong pencil the successive parties which arose, and the varying characters which they assumed at different periods. The defects of his knowledge he attempted to compensate by borrowing morsels of description from some ancient Historian, when he wished to draw a striking picture of any event; or by introducing long speeches of his own composition, such as those which he ascribes to M. Antonius at the funeral of Cæsar; to Cicero and Q. Fufius Calenus in the Senate; and to Mæcenas and Agrippa, when they are supposed to advise Augustus, the one to retain, and the other to resign, his absolute power. In short the early part of his History is as unsatisfactory as the latter Books are really valuable; so true is it, that a very ordinary man may be a useful Historian of the events of his own times; but that the story of a remote period can only be profitably told by one of indefatigable industry and most extensive knowledge, one whose powers of weighing evidence, of selecting what is most important amongst the facts presented to him, and of placing it in the clearest and most striking light, are commensurate with his diligence and learning. Historians of Rome.

In all the four writers whom we have last noticed, we may observe one prevailing fault besetting them, though not in an equal degree; namely, an extreme wordiness both in their narratives and their remarks. The same fault is a source of offence in the most eminent of the modern Italian Historians, such as Guicciardini and Davila; and in both cases it has arisen from the same cause. Both the Greek and Italian languages are so harmonious, and so naturally eloquent, that they conceal in some measure from the eyes of the writer the poverty of his thoughts, or the little substantial good which he is communicating, amidst the luxuriance of his beautiful sentences. Thus he is tempted to run on without restraint, and to be careless of the sterling value of his materials, when they are so easily susceptible of the most delicate polish, and can hardly fail to wear an ornamental appearance. Such languages are productive of serious evils to ordinary writers. They seem to derive from them a power far beyond their own nature, and thus they are exposed to the usual fate of those who are raised to an elevation which they are unfit to occupy; nor can it be doubted, we think, that this cause has greatly contributed to the extraordinary prolixity and emptiness of the second and third rate writers of Greece and modern Italy.

In resuming again the chronological order of our review, and proceeding to notice the Roman Historians subsequent to Livy, the historical sketch of Velleius Paterculus next claims our attention. His father had been employed in the army of Tiberius Cæsar in Germany, during the reign of Augustus; and he himself served under the same Commander in different capacities for the space of nine years; and on the accession of Tiberius to the Imperial Throne, he was one of the first persons nominated by him to be elected to the office of Prætor. Under these circumstances, and either enjoying, perhaps, or expecting, still greater marks of favour, it is natural that he should speak of Tiberius, and of his Minister, Sejanus, in language very unlike that in which more impartial Historians have described them. By the terms too, in which he expresses himself with regard to Brutus and Cassius, we are reminded of that increased courtliness which marked the writers of Imperial Rome; and we are led to recollect the story of Cremutius Cordus, who was tried for Treason, because in a History of the Civil wars he had mentioned the conspirators against Cæsar with admiration. But there is more, perhaps, in this of apparent than of real partiality; it was an undisturbed practice, to call Brutus and Cassius parricides; and such terms were a necessary passport to secure the unmolested circulation of a Historian's work. It does not seem to us, that Velleius Paterculus.

* Dion Cassius, lib. lxxvi. p. 860.
† Ibid. lib. lxxx. p. 917.

Biography. Paterculus is guilty of that unfairness which we have noted in the writings of Cæsar; who, seldom indulging in reproachful epithets against his antagonists, contrives by his representation of the facts, to produce a much stronger impression against them than he could have created in any other manner; and who, nevertheless, at the same time has gained credit for his pretended moderation and candour. Paterculus, on the contrary, does not misrepresent the facts; and if we rub off the exterior coating of false colouring, with which he has a little diguised their surface, we shall find them in substance mostly unchanged and uninjured. His work is so mere an outline that it hardly deserves the name of History; yet considered as a sketch, it is drawn with great force and judgment. His enumeration of the different Roman colonies, with the dates at which they were respectively founded, is conceived in a spirit far above most of the writers whom we have been reviewing; it is a piece of gratuitous information, which he must have collected himself, without finding it in the Books from which he formed his narrative; whereas Livy and Dionysius, and Dion Cassius and Appian, generally content themselves with copying from the Chronicles of their predecessors, and never dream of communicating any information which they do not find made ready for their hands. It is, however, a favourable circumstance for the fame of Paterculus, that the fate of his work has been exactly the reverse of that of Livy; the latter part, which treats of events nearer his own age, has been preserved; while the account of the early History of Rome from Romulus to the second Macedonian war has been entirely lost. Had this been preserved, we might have found him as indiscriminate a copyist of foolish and ignorant authorities as any of his contemporaries; but as it is, we cannot compare him with Livy, where Livy probably was most excellent; and his superiority over Appian and Dion Cassius is obtained with little difficulty, not only on account of his earlier date and his greater ability, but because as a Roman he had so much more familiar a knowledge of the names, customs, laws, and family history of his countrymen, and is free therefore from those mistakes, which the Greek writers of Roman History, with the exception of Polybius, are continually committing.

Tacitus. At length we have arrived at the greatest of the Roman Historians, and one of the most eminent among those of every age and nation, Caius Cornelius Tacitus.* He was born about the year of Rome 810, A. D. 57, about three and forty years after the death of Augustus. His father is supposed to have been the same Cornelius Tacitus, whom Pliny† describes as belonging to the Equestrian Order, and Procurator of the Belgian Gaul. At an early age he applied himself to the study of eloquence, with a view to obtain distinction as an Advocate, the sole capacity in which an Orator might then display his talents; and as he was of a rank to aspire to political honours, he served some campaigns in the army, as the necessary qualification required of every candidate for a Magistracy. When he was only one and twenty years old, he married the daughter of the famous Cn. Julius Agricola; he was one of the Prætors ten years afterwards,* and nine years later, U. C. 850, in the first year of the reign of Nerva, he was appointed to the dignity of Consul.† Once after this period his name is mentioned,‡ together with that of the Younger Pliny, as the joint and successful accuser of Marius Priscus, Proconsul of Africa, for multiplied acts of cruelty and corruption in his Province. But the later years of his life seem mostly to have been devoted to the composition of his Histories; a labour in which he was interrupted by a premature death, apparently before the close of the reign of Trajan. In point of external advantages therefore, no Roman had hitherto been so well fitted for the office of a Historian. Practically acquainted with civil and military affairs, gifted with a fair fortune, enjoying the highest public honours, with ample and undisturbed leisure, and writing in the reign of a Sovereign who had no desire to see the truth concealed or corrupted; he had all opportunities of acquiring information, without any temptation to forsake his duty as a Historian from motives of hope or fear; and it could only be a question, whether his own moral and intellectual qualities were such as worthily to correspond with the favours conferred on him by Fortune.

These qualities were undoubtedly of a very high order. He observes a fair and temperate tone in his censures even of the worst characters, and does not allow himself to be hurried away by the feelings of moral indignation, which could not but arise within him, when contemplating such a tissue of various crimes, as that which it was his business to record. His remarks are always striking, mostly just, and often profound; his narrative is clear, sensible, and animated; he communicates information on subjects, to which the thread of his story does not of necessity lead him, and on which a mere compiler, who collects at the moment his knowledge for the task which he has in hand, can never afford to venture. Of this nature is the valuable sketch of the distribution of the military force of the Empire, and of the state of the Government and of the people, which occurs at the beginning of the fourth Book of his *Annals*. Such also is the summary view of the progress of the Roman legislation in the third Book of the same work. His delineations of characters are lively and apparently just; his sentiments on political questions fair and judicious. His authority with regard to all points of Roman History is highly valuable, and for those times with which he is more immediately concerned, we could hardly desire a better guide. His faults are to be ascribed to such causes as we have already noticed as injurious to ancient literature. Not even Tacitus could overcome the habit of regarding History as a literary composition, intended to satisfy the expectations of professed critics, and to promote the literary fame of the writer. We see continually symptoms of the ἀγωνίσμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν; the composition written with effort, in the hope of gaining a prize. Hence the excessive ornament of the language; and hence also those idle specimens of Rhetoric, which are introduced as the

* We have borrowed [this sketch of the Biography of Tacitus from Brotier's Preface to that Historian, having merely verified his statements by referring ourselves to the authorities which he has quoted.

† *Histor. Natural.* lib. vii. c. 16.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xi. c. 11.

† Pliny, *Epist.* lib. ii. ep. 1. ‡ Ibid. ep. 11.

Biography. pretended speeches of different persons mentioned in the History. We remember that Whitaker in some one of his works, we believe in his *Review of Gibbon*, endeavours to discredit the authority of Tacitus as an Historian, because he puts a speech into the mouth of the Emperor Claudius on a solemn occasion, very different from that which he actually delivered. The pretended speech is to be found in the eleventh Book of the *Annals*, and is said to have been spoken in the Senate, when the inhabitants of Transalpine Gaul petitioned to be rendered eligible to the highest public offices at Rome. Now it so happens, that a copy of the real speech of Claudius, engraved on a large brazen plate, was discovered at Lyons in the year 1528; and we are thus enabled to ascertain exactly how much of the pretended version of it given by Tacitus is genuine. Whitaker argues, that a Historian who would so audaciously insert a fictitious speech of his own composition into his History, and at the same time represent it as having been actually spoken, can no longer be relied on with confidence in any part of his work, although we may not have the means of proving him to be in error. Brotier, on the other hand, the learned editor of Tacitus, defends his author in the true spirit of an ancient critic, by saying that the original speech is "old fashioned, weak, and little calculated to convince its hearers: so that it was the business of Tacitus to make something that should be more worthy of the occasion, the place, and the majesty of the Emperor."* It is tiresome to reflect how much of this kind of silliness has been written by classical editors, commentators, and critics; and how long it has obstructed the progress of sound ideas on the subject of ancient literature. But Whitaker is not to be listened to, when he infers that Tacitus is not to be trusted in his account of facts, because he has ascribed to Claudius a speech which was never spoken. The introduction of fictitious speeches was one of the regular ornaments of ancient History, on which much of the reputation of the author depended. It was never pretended that they were genuine, nor was any reader likely to be so simple as to mistake them for such; so that if the real speech of Claudius had been familiar to every person in Rome, Tacitus would never have been blamed for substituting in its place one of his own invention, but would rather perhaps have been censured for want of original talent, if he had merely inserted in his History a faithful copy of it. In the same manner when we read the speech of Galgacus in the *Life of Agricola*, no one would be so weak, as to suppose that any Roman had taken notes of the Celtic original, and had transmitted to Rome a translation of it; but at the same time it would be hard to infer, that Tacitus had allowed himself to describe from his own imagination the facts of the Caledonian war. Our objection to these fictitious speeches is simply that they are a waste of paper; that they are a mere impertinence, occupying a space in the History, and employing a portion of the writer's time and attention, which ought to have been devoted to something better. But the spirit which could tolerate or demand that such tawdry ornaments as these should be hung upon the plain magnificence of History, was too closely connected with another and a worse tendency,—that of shrinking from the full amount of labour which a conscientious Historian should undergo, and of reporting idle tales with respect to foreign nations, rather than consulting their own accounts of themselves. We now allude to that passage in Tacitus, which describes the origin and early history of the Jews; it certainly betrays much ignorance or much indolence, that he should have contented himself with retailing the vague and contradictory reports of foreigners, when he might so easily have learnt their true history, either from the work of Josephus, or from their original Historians themselves, whose writings translated into the Greek language were, as we know, very generally read throughout a considerable part of the Empire. It would not be fair to attach any particular blame to Tacitus for a fault of this nature, when it was one which the habits and feelings of his times so largely encouraged; but it shows the radical defects in the views of History entertained by the Romans, when a man of such rare accomplishments as Tacitus could not altogether emancipate himself from their influence. Historians of Rome.

The prevailing faults which marked the Historians of these times are to be observed also in the Biographers. Three writers of this class will demand a brief notice, Cornelius Nepos, Suetonius, and Plutarch. The Biographers.

Cornelius Nepos, who flourished in the Augustan age, and was familiarly acquainted with Cicero and Atticus, has left us a sketch of the life of the latter, which possesses great value; inasmuch as it is the account of an eminent and amiable man, written by a contemporary and a friend. We wish that we had many such memoirs of distinguished Romans, as no species of writing more effectually conveys a full and lively knowledge of the state of society and opinion at any given period. How much clearer and more instructive, for example, are the notions of the XVIIIth century, which we derive from Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, than from Smollett's *History of England*; and the instance is a strong one, as no one would place the talents of Boswell within many degrees of those of the author of *Roderic Random*, and *Humphry Clinker*. Cornelius Nepos.

But the praise which we have bestowed on the Biographer of Atticus, can by no means be extended to the other two writers whom we have classed with him. Plutarch, a native of Chæronea in Bœotia, was probably some few years older than Tacitus, but is mentioned as flourishing like him during the reign of Trajan. He was much respected by the Emperor, and received from him, according to Suidas, the rank of Consul, with an extraordinary authority over all other magistrates in Illyria. He is said to have died in his native city, during the reign of Antoninus Pius. With his *Moral works* we have at present no concern; and his *Lives* are so generally known by means of translations, even to those who are unacquainted with the original, that it may seem superfluous to offer any observations upon them. It is sufficient to remark that they are not contemporary biography; and must, therefore, have been compiled from books, and not written from personal knowledge. And as far as they touch upon the province of History, we may expect to find in them, in an aggravated degree, those same faults of imperfect information and carelessness, which we have noticed as characterising the Historians of the Plutarch.

* *Notæ et Emendat. ad* lib. xi. c. 24. *Annal.* C. Corn. Tacit.

Biography. same period. With regard to the more purely biographical part of them, Plutarch does not appear to have exercised a very nice discrimination in his selection of anecdotes; and many which he reports are improbable; occasionally, however, he has fallen in with authorities of a higher kind, and we are then indebted to him for preserving to us some very curious and important particulars. He has also the great merit of frequently mentioning the name of the writer from whom he is copying his narrative; and we are thus enabled to judge for ourselves of the degree of confidence which we should repose in him.

Historians of Rome.

Suetonius. The third Biographer whom we proposed to notice was C. SUETONIUS TRANQUILLUS. He also flourished in the reigns of Trajan and Adrian, and was familiarly acquainted with the Younger Pliny. He was the author of several works, none of which, however, have reached posterity, except the *Lives of the twelve Cæsars*, and two short books containing *Sketches of the Lives of the most eminent Philologists and Rhetoricians*. In his Biography of the Cæsars, his narrative of their actions is exceedingly summary, and the largest space is devoted to a number of miscellaneous particulars, illustrative of their characters and habits. Like Plutarch, he seems to have collected these from several very different authorities; but he had one great advantage over the Greek Biographer in the superior knowledge which he naturally possessed of the laws and usages of the Romans; so that on those subjects his testimony is much more trustworthy. We do not see any grounds for the charge of malignity which has been sometimes brought against him: on the contrary, he appears to us to have recorded the virtues and vices of the Cæsars with great impartiality; and certainly it is not the fault of Suetonius, if their vices appear to preponderate.

Little need be said of the few remaining Historians, if so they may be called, who have contributed something to our knowledge of the affairs of

lorus. Rome. L. ANNÆUS FLORUS, who lived in the reign of Trajan, has left us a series of detached sketches of the different wars and civil dissensions in which the Romans were engaged from the days of Romulus to those of Augustus. Such a work is a mere help to the memory rather than a history; and is scarcely a fitter subject for criticism than a chronological table of events.

stinus. JUSTINUS FRONTINUS, or MARCUS JUNIANUS JUSTINUS, who dedicates his work to the Emperor Antoninus, (if the passage be genuine) was merely the epitomizer of the larger History of TROGUS POMPEIUS, and the merits or faults of the narrative are not, therefore, to be attributed to him. It professes to be an universal History, commencing with the earliest times, and terminating at the period when the several nations of whom it treats fell under the power of Rome. Of Rome itself there is only given a sketch of its origin, according to the common accounts; and in some instances, as in the case of Parthia, the account of a nation is carried down to the reign of Augustus, if it had not been conquered at an earlier period. Trogus Pompeius seems to have been a very common-place compiler; and, therefore, the merit of his work is very unequal. A great part of it appears to be copied from writers of no great ability or accuracy; but sometimes, as in the sketch given of the Parthian Constitution, the materials must have been borrowed from a better source; and we thus occasionally glean some valuable information, which we could not easily find elsewhere.

Valerius Maximus. The anecdotes of VALERIUS MAXIMUS, who wrote in the time of Tiberius, afford us some curious particulars; but the accuracy of such collections is never to be much relied upon, as the authors think themselves at liberty to transfer any striking story into their pages which they may find any where recorded, without feeling bound to examine the evidence on which it rests, or to strip it of any exaggeration which it may have gathered since its first production.

Reflections on the duty of a Historian. Here then we shall terminate our review of the Historians of Rome. We may appear to have dealt out to them an unequal measure, in bestowing more of our attention on some and less upon others than they may be thought to have deserved. But our object has not been to enter into a minute criticism of individual writers, but chiefly to notice those defects in ancient History, which seem to have arisen from general causes, and to be referable to the peculiar circumstances and opinions of that period of antiquity with which we have been concerned. We have entered at some length into this part of our subject, not certainly from any wish to speak with severity of any individual writer, but because the faults which we have noticed, have exercised a most injurious influence on modern History; nor will the mischief be removed, till both the magnitude of the evil and its causes be fully and strongly stated. The influence of which we speak may be traced distinctly through the great Italian Historians, and those of the XVth or XVIth centuries, who composed their works in Latin, down to the French and English Historians of the XVIIth, and even of the XVIIIth centuries. It is to be observed in the habit, of regarding History as a *literary composition*, and as a source of literary fame to the author; in the consequent neglect of plain and useful, but laborious and unostentatious subjects of inquiry, and an excessive attention to all that was ornamental, whether in matter or style. It was a habit which encouraged the natural indolence of human nature, by attaching the highest fame to that which required least trouble, and undervaluing the labour which it neglected by representing it as unnecessary and undignified. From this alone could have sprung that preposterous ambition in any one individual to write an universal History, or in modern times to write the History of more than one single century. No one would have ever attempted such a work, if any just notions of the extent of a Historian's labour had been entertained either by writers or readers.

If eloquent narrative or ingenious disquisition may supply the place of deep and exact knowledge, then indeed we may profess without difficulty to write Histories as extensive as we please in their range of time and place. But if no man can describe any period as he ought to do, without obtaining as nearly as possible the knowledge of a contemporary; it is obvious that this knowledge can only be gained by a general study of all the existing memorials of that period; by a perusal, not only of its Annalists and Historians, but of its Divines, Philosophers, Poets, Novelists, and writers of a still more fugitive description, from whom the physical and moral state of society at any one time, can alone be adequately learned; and it is still more obvious,

Biography. that where those materials are as numerous as they are in modern times, it is physically impossible for one man to do more than acquaint himself with those which relate to one limited period. One sacrifice of selfishness is thus required in a Historian, that he should resign the detail of many brilliant eras, and satisfy himself with one alone, and that perhaps not the most attractive; another, and perhaps a greater, is also called for, that the quantity of his writing should not be in proportion to that of his reading; that he should be content to toil through many a page, without informing the world of the amount of his industry, and without deriving any more visible fruit from it, than the increased richness and soundness of knowledge which will transpire through every portion of his work. We shall be told, that this is to expect what never will come to pass; that he who has taken great pains will always wish to gain due credit for it; that he who has bestowed much time in ascertaining some unimportant fact, will think it entitled to the same share of the reader's attention, which it has demanded of his own. It may be, indeed, that we shall never see a perfect Historian; but the nearest approaches to perfection are ever gained by holding up to all aspirants an uncompromising standard, and by requiring them to strain every faculty to the utmost. He who writes for the instruction of others, has entered on no flowery path of selfish gratification; but has undertaken a sober and solemn duty; from which, as from every other, selfishness must be assiduously excluded. It is not fame, however brilliant, or any self-satisfaction in the display of intellectual excellence, which can lawfully be the objects of a Historian; but to do good after his measure, by the conscientious exercise of those faculties which God has given him,—while he bears continually in humbling remembrance, the end for which they were given, and the guilt either of abusing them or glorying in them. Historians of Rome.

DECLINE OF LATIN POETRY.

PERSIUS	DIED A. D.	63.	THE NERONIAN AGE.
LUCANUS	A. D.	65.	
PETRONIUS	A. D.	67.	
SILIUS ITALICUS, VALERIUS FLACCUS	FLOURISHED ABOUT A. D.	77.	THE FLAVIAN AGE.
JUVENALIS	A. D.	82.	
MARTIALIS	A. D.	84.	
STATIUS	DIED A. D.	96.	
NEMESIANUS	FLOURISHED ABOUT A. D.	288.	
AVIENUS	A. D.	370.	
AUSONIUS	A. D.	392.	
PRUDENTIUS, CLAUDIANUS	A. D.	398.	
SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS	A. D.	482.	

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Causes of the decline.

THE literary annals of every people present us with crises, to account for which has been the labour of the learned and the ingenious. Among these, none is more conspicuous than that which took place on the death of Augustus, and none has excited a greater zeal and diligence of inquiry into its cause and origin; and yet, perhaps, the whole history of Literature does not afford an instance of a revolution so naturally and easily explained. The learned and minute Tiraboschi has expended on this subject no inconsiderable portion of his erudition and philosophy; he rejects all the hypotheses of his predecessors, and, like the surgeon Antistius, who examined the corpse of Julius Cæsar, and pronounced but one wound mortal in twenty-three, allows but one of the causes assignable. This is the licentious character of the times; for the irruption of the barbarians, and the failure of the means of learning, circumstances which the Historian adduces among the causes which accelerated the fall of Roman Literature, had no influence in the reign of Tiberius.

Demoralization of the Romans

But what, it may be asked, produced this licentious character? and did it not prevail in a very great degree in the reign of Augustus himself? That national vice acts powerfully to the prejudice of excellence in the arts of imagination is an obvious truth; it is not, however, a sufficient solution of the present problem. The Civil troubles which, before the accession of Augustus, had desolated Italy, by depriving the people of the means and fruits of industry, had compelled them to subsist by rapine or military violence; while the conquests of Lucullus, by opening a readier communication with the East, had led to the introduction of the luxuries and vices of that corrupted portion of the globe.* It is true that Augustus gave considerable attention to the suppression of these evils; but judging from the writings of the most approved and popular authors of his time, his Court was very far from being moral; the effects of his legislation, indeed, however salutary as regards external conduct, could not have been sensible on the minds of his subjects to any material extent, before their operation was effectually paralysed by the accession of Tiberius; who, although himself a man of liberal education, and not a little self-complacent on that account, and even a Poet, (since we learn from Suetonius* that he composed a lyrical monody on the death of Lucius Cæsar, besides several Poems in Greek,) was as little a patron of true learning as he was of morals.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

It is not easy, however, to see why so much recondite learning and metaphysical speculation should be employed in the investigation of causes which seem incapable of escaping the ordinary student of History. No such person can be ignorant that the pursuits of science and literature have, in all countries, been cultivated with an ardour jointly proportional to their novelty, and to the encouragement given them by power. The labours of the early Poets, especially Ennius, had deeply imbued the Romans with a desire of inspecting the copious sources from which they were derived. The study of the Greek literature was, in consequence, pursued with the greatest enthusiasm: every Greek author was read, and almost every Greek author was imitated. It was exactly at this juncture, when the excellence of literature began to be more generally and more acutely felt than at any preceding period, that the policy of Augustus employed the popular sentiment in diverting from political speculations what little remained of the spirit of old Rome. Nothing therefore could be more natural, and we might say, more necessary, than the literary perfection which followed. Every department of Greek literature which the Romans were capable of appropriating, now attained the highest excellence which its transplanted state would allow. But as the Romans were a people of slender inventive faculties, the resources of Greece were no sooner exhausted, than the main stimulus to literary exertion ceased; and when, about the same period, the patronage which had given action to this stimulus was removed, it is nothing astonishing that we should meet with that languor which is the sure consequence of preternatural excitement, mental as well as bodily, political as well as individual.

Exhaustion of Greek literature.

* JAMPRIDEM *Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes,*
Et linguam, et mores, et cum tibicine chordas
Obliquas, necnon gentilia tympana secum
Vexit, et ad Circum jussas prostare puellas. Juv. *Sat.* 3.

* *Tib.* c. 70.

Biography. From A. D 63. to 482.

The effect of these circumstances is sufficiently conspicuous even in the later writings of Ovid. His genius and his habits would not admit of his using any other vehicle of his feelings than verse; but the brilliant and luxuriant invention which created the florid fabric of the *Metamorphoses*, and the elegant and elaborate texture of the *Heroic Epistles*, decayed when withdrawn from the sunshine of contemporary fame. Of this decay he was himself perfectly sensible:* and all the vaunting anticipations of immortality which he put forth in the peroration of his *Metamorphoses*, had no power to excite him to write for posterity while the countenance of Cæsar was adverse. And if such could be the effect which the mere absence of Court favour produced on the vein of a Poet of great genius, extensive reading, patient labour, and devotion to the opinion of posterity, we might, in the absence of additional facts, form a tolerably correct estimate of the state of Poetry under the most brutal and flagitious tyranny which the ancient world ever beheld. The only just subject for wonder is, how it comes to pass that we meet with any one Poet of eminence during the rule of the first Cæsars; nothing but the irresistible energy of genius, it might be supposed, could impel a man to place his sentiments on paper, when a look or a gesture might incur the suspicion of a capricious despot, or furnish lucrative employment to an alert and vigilant informer. Even those Poets who escaped the fearful results of Imperial caprice had little encouragement, at a time in which the highest authority in the State meditated the removal of the statues of Virgil from the public libraries, and the entire suppression of the works of Homer.†

Germanicus.

It is worthy of observation, that the earliest conspicuous victim of the new policy was a Poet. The pure faith, the chivalrous honour, the devoted patriotism of Drusus Germanicus, are themes which can scarcely be mentioned, without a desire to linger on their contemplation; yet it belongs to this department of our work to do no more than mention that he was, as his character would lead us to suppose, a Poet. His principal work was a translation of Aratus, an author on whom the Romans were fond of exercising their metaphrastic abilities.‡ The following elegant Epigram is ascribed to him:

Thrax puer, adstricto glacie dum ludit in Hebro,
Frigore concretas pondere rupit aquas:
Dumque imæ partes rapido traherentur ab amne,
Abscidit, heu! tenerum lubrica testa caput.
Orba quod inventum mater dum conderet urnâ,
"Hoc peperi flammis, cætera," dixit, "aquis."

To him, as a brother of the lyre, Ovid dedicated his *Fasti*; and in this character he is spoken of by the same Poet in his epistle to Suilius.* His death produced a Monody from the pen of C. Lutorius Priscus, a Roman Knight, which, however, proved fatal to its author. For, being by the Senate accused of having composed it during the illness of its subject, the unfortunate Poet was condemned to death. With Germanicus expired the last twilight glimmerings of the Augustan day. All that we have to record after him is night, illuminated indeed awhile by a few splendid constellations, but at length subsiding into the gross and starless darkness of barbarism.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

In our sketch of the earlier poetical literature of the Romans, we have already noticed the influence which the Epic and Didactic Muses exercised in Latium, from the time when Poetry first began to possess a sensible existence in the language. There were many reasons why this should be the case; their stern and masculine beauty, their regulated and decorous march, and their faultless and undistorted proportions, were calculated to give them, in the eyes of a Roman, attractions far superior to any producible by their less severe, but less *Roman* sisters. The success with which they had been courted by Nævius, excited the emulation of Ennius; and his example at once made his countrymen familiar with their beauties, and jealous of his honours. Virgil, at length, by increasing the difficulties of future aspirants to their favours, only increased the motives to emulation. But the main efficient cause which directed the energies of succeeding Poets in these channels, is perhaps to be sought in the condition of the period, which naturally suggested to those writers whose prudence bore any proportion to their genius, the necessity of adopting such arguments as had the least connection with existing circumstances.† Claudius, it is true, patronised literature, and even asserted literary pretensions; but he did not affect to be a Poet, nor could Poetry, by any possibility, have attracted his regard. He, therefore, caused no alteration in the poetical character of the time.

Didactic and Epic Poetry.

There have not been wanting modern Latin imitations of the *Georgics*; a circumstance which may, in some degree, qualify our suprise, when we find an ancient author attempting to *continue* them. Virgil, in his beautiful episode of the old Corycian agriculturist, appears, with consummate art, insensibly led into a digression on trees and flowers; and then, suddenly appearing to discover that he has wandered from the direct track, he exclaims:

"Verum hæc ipse equidem, spatiis exclusus iniquis,
Prætereo, atque ALIIS post me memoranda relinquo."

Columella.

Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella, of Cadiz in Spain, an author who is generally referred to the time of Claudius, took the hint, and yielded to the importunate entreaties of his friend Silvinus, that he would make the Xth Book of his work on Farming, which was to comprise the art of Gardening, a continuation of the *Georgics*. The work is still extant. It very much resembles the labours of modern Latin Poets; the style, the language, and the imagery of Virgil are closely copied; and whatever may be its merit, it has received from the Critics very high commendation. It cannot, how-

* *Da veniam fesso: studiis quoque fræna remisi:*
Ducitur et digitis littera rara meis.
Impetus ille sacer, qui vatum pectora nutrit,
Qui prius in nobis esse solebat, abest.
Vix venit ad partes; vix sumtæ Musa tabellæ
Imponit pigras penè coacta manus.
Pont. lib. iv. eleg. 2.

The whole of which is a valuable illustration of our present position.

† Suet. *Calig.* 34.

‡ This translation has also been ascribed to the Emperor Domitian, who, it is well known, affected the title of Germanicus. "*Sanè recordor,*" says Heinsius, "*vidisse me Lutetiæ pervetustum Arateorum codicem, qui Domitiano Cæsari poëma istud adserebat: ut veri omninò simile sit, pro Domitiano Germanicum ob invidiam nominis in plerisque exemplaribus esse repositum.*" *Notæ in* Valerium Flaccum, *ad init.*

* *Epist. Pont.* lib. v. ep. 8.

† "*Securus licet Æneæn, Rutulumque ferocem*
Committas: nulli gravis est percussus Achilles,
Aut multùm quæsitus Hylas, urnamque secutus."
Juv. *Sat.* 1. 162.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

ever, be denied that the Poem of Columella is rather a chaste and elegant study after a great master, than a bold and noble effort of original genius, kindling at the torch of a kindred spirit.

Columella expressed himself *content* to be the *rival* of Virgil; a sentiment which, however chargeable with self-complacency, is modest in comparison of those which were held by almost all contemporary and succeeding Epic writers, whose ridiculous ambition to surpass the most perfect and polished models, introduced into Latin Poetry a character of exaggeration and caricature, which conspired with the causes before noticed to accelerate the final ruin of Roman Literature. The author most deeply imbued with this pernicious vanity was Lucan, whose rank among Latin Poets requires us to give a slight sketch of his life, which will also be serviceable in illustrating the state of public feeling in regard to Literature, during the period in which he flourished.

Lucan.

Marcus Annæus Lucanus,* the son of Annæus Mella and Atilla, was born at Cordova in Spain, and instructed in philosophy and polite literature by Palæmon, Virginius, and Cornutus. His talents were conspicuous at an early age: Seneca, in his consolation to Helvia, calls him, "*Marcum, blandissimum puerum, ad cujus conspectum nulla potest durare tristitia.*" His first poetical effort was a panegyric on Nero at the quinquennial poetical contest, called the *Neronia*, from its founder, in which he is said to have vanquished the Emperor himself:† but it is well observed by Tiraboschi, that Lucan was dead before the second celebration of the *Neronia*; and Suetonius, Tacitus, and Dio, are all agreed on the fact that Nero was victor in the first.‡ Such, at least, is the order preserved by Suetonius; but Statius, in his *Genethliacon*, places first in order the Poem called *Iliaca*, or *Hectoris lytra*, (λύτρα.)§ His next composition was a Satire called *Incendium Urbis*, on the infamous conduct of Nero in the conflagration at Rome. Afterwards he produced a Poem called *Καταπλους*, and then his great work, the *Pharsalia*. He was then recalled from Athens, where he had been residing, according to the custom of the Roman youth, by Nero, who treated him with familiarity, and bestowed on him the office of *Quæstor*. Although affecting to admire the genius of Lucan, it is probable that the Prince was anxious to maintain a close observation over a young man whose talents awakened his envy, and whose high spirit and free sentiments aroused his fears. The subject of the *Pharsalia* was especially critical at that period; the history of the rise of that intolerable tyranny under which the nation was groaning, and the remembrance of times alike free and happy, could not be contemplated with safety to the Imperial despot. Lucan was not content with merely placing this exciting picture before the eyes of the fellow-citizens; but he openly advocated the character and policy of Pompey; he as openly execrated the motives and the conduct of the war into which he entered; and, after presenting his readers with a highly coloured description of the miseries and horrors which it originated, he crowned his period with a compliment to Nero, which, as the Emperor could not fail to perceive, was a tissue of the bitterest irony.* "Crimes and atrocities themselves," says the Poet, "are welcome as the price of Nero!"

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Such being, in all probability, the motives of Nero, and such being the undoubted character of Lucan, it was not to be expected that a reciprocity even of external courtesies could long subsist between them. The real sentiments of the latter were no secret to the Emperor, nor were pains taken to disguise them; the haughty spirit of the Poet could not brook the observation to which his conduct was exposed, and he was little anxious to manifest a regard to it. Envy, indignation, and policy, at length prompted the Emperor to suppress the writings of Lucan, and to require him never to write Poetry again. The proverbial irritability of the poetic race, combined with the impetuous temperament of the particular Poet, hurled back the mandate with defiance, in a bitter Satire on the Emperor and his adherents. At length, in the conspiracy of Piso, Lucan assumed a conspicuous part; and, principally through the total disregard of secrecy, which he, on this, as on all other occasions, evinced, that conspiracy was divulged. On his apprehension his former constancy failed him, and, being required to surrender his accomplices, he named his innocent mother. But his death was determined: his only privilege was the choice of the mode, which he exercised by having the veins of his arms opened. With the true ruling passion of a Poet, his last message to his father regarded the correction of some verses, and his last words were a quotation from the *Pharsalia*, which describes the death of a soldier under circumstances similar to his own.

Conspires against the Emperor.

Is executed

Independently of its intrinsic merits, on the subject of which Critics are little agreed, the *Pharsalia* is valuable, as presenting a faithful picture, both of the disposition of its author, and the literary character of the times. To the former of these must be attributed those historical misstatements and suppressions which favour the cause of Pompey, and which have afforded ample materials for ostentatious censure to modern Critics; while the whole character of the Poem, turgid, exaggerated, and laborious, and the commendations indiscriminately bestowed on it by succeeding Poets of high reputation,† sufficiently indicate the prevalent taste of the period included between the age of Augustus and the final extinction of the Roman literature and language. Quinctilian, indeed, with his usual superiority to the depraved sentiments of his

Character of the *Pharsalia*.

* Suet. *Vit. Luc.*

† "*Prima ingenii experimenta in Neronis laudibus dedit, quinquennali certamine.*" Suet. *Vit. Luc.* This poem is called *Orpheus*: it probably complimented the Emperor on his celebrity as a musician.

‡ Tiraboschi, *Storia della Lett. Ital.* tom. ii. lib. i. cap. x. sez. 4.

§ Stat. *Sylv.* lib. ii. 7.

* *Quod si non aliam venturo fata Neroni*
Invenere viam, magnoque æterna parantur
Regna deis, cœlumque suo servire Tonanti
Non nisi savorum potuit post bella gigantum:
Jam, nihil, ô superi, querimur / Scelera ipsa, nefasque
Hac mercede placent!" et seqq.
Luc. *Phars.* lib. i. v. 33.

† It will not be necessary to transcribe the various "*Testimonia de Lucano*," which may be found prefixed to almost any edition of this Poet. Statius has written 135 hendecasyllabics of the most extravagant eulogy on Lucan; but three will comprise their whole essence:

"*Attollat refluos in astra fontes*
Græio nobilior Melete Bætis!
Bætin, Mantua, provocare noli!"

Similarly Martial, (lib. vii. ep. 21.)

'*Hoc meruit quidquam te terris, Lucane, dedisset,*
Mixtus Castalio Bætis ut esset aquæ!"

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

age, considers Lucan more of an Orator than a Poet; yet his manner of delivering his opinion plainly discovers how little it was in unison with that of the public.* Modern Critics are seldom temperate in their views of this writer; while some regard him as equal, and even superior, to Virgil, others consider his Poem only as a mass of defects, scarcely relieved by an accidental excellence. His extravagances have been frequently commented on; and we think ourselves discharged from the obligation of retailing the unmerciful preface of Burmann, and the scarcely less intolerant observations of Spence.

Minor Poems of Lucan.

Besides the works above mentioned, Lucan is said to have written a Book of *Saturnalia*, ten Books of *Sylvæ*, a Tragedy called *Medea*, and fourteen *Salticæ Fabulæ*, or Dramatic Ballets. Some confound the Κατάκαυσμος with the *Urbis Incendium*, but we are justified in the distinction made above by the epitaph, or "*encomion*," written on Lucan by Pomponius Sabinus, who recognises two Poems of similar argument:

Hinc "Sylvæ," GEMINÆQUE "Faces," &c.

Polla Argentaria.

His wife Polla Argentaria also was a literary character, and is said, not without some colour of probability, to have assisted in the composition of the *Pharsalia*.

Seneca. His Tragedies. Whether genuine?

The uncle of Lucan was the celebrated LUCIUS ANNÆUS SENECA, the question regarding the genuineness of whose Tragedies is one of some obscurity. All the manuscripts uniformly present the title "L. Annæi Senecæ." This renders it difficult to suppose that the work is not genuine, unless we conceive that there existed some other Lucius Annæus Seneca, who might be its author. But Martial,† in speaking of the family, mentions only two as celebrated; Statius mentions none but the Philosopher;‡ and Quinctilian, also, who cites a verse from the *Medea* of Seneca,§ mentions the Philosopher only, concerning whom he observes in another place,‖ that he excelled in almost every department of learning, and that his speeches, *Poems*, epistles, and dialogues, were in the hands of the public.¶ Again he alludes to a discussion which took place between Pomponius Secundus and Seneca, relative to an expression of the Tragedian Attius; and as Pomponius was himself a Tragedian, and a Tragedian was the subject of the controversy, it is supposed that Seneca had a nearer interest in the subject than that of a mere *lover* of such literature. The testimony of Martial, it must be confessed, is urged also on the opposite side; in another place he calls the family of Seneca, "*docti Senecæ* ter numeranda domus;" but in reply to this, it is said, that these words are only equivalent to the "*duosque Senecas, unicumque Lucanum*" of the same author, which words allude to Lucius and Marcus. This is, after all, the best testimony that can be adduced against the genuineness of the Tragedies of Seneca. The next is that of Sidonius Apollinaris,** who very circumstantially distinguishes between the Philosopher and the Tragedian:

"*Non quod Corduba præpotens alumnis*
Facundum ciet, hic putes legendum:
Quorum UNUS *colit hispidum Platona,*
Incassumque suum monet Neronem:
Orchestram quatit ALTER *Euripidis,*
Pictum fœcibus Æschylum sequutus,
Aut plaustris solitum sonare Thespin."

* "Ut dicam quod sentio, *magis oratoribus quàm poëtis annumerandus.*" Quinct. lib. x. c. 1.
† Mart. lib. i. ep. 62.
‡ *Encom. Lucani.*
§ Quinct. lib. ix. c. 2.
‖ Ibid. lib. x. c. 1.
¶ Ibid. lib. viii. c. 3.
** *Carm. x. ad Magn. Fel.*

But the testimony of this author is, as we have before had occasion to notice, of very small value. That of Paulus Diaconus is absolutely of none. His words are, "*hujus (sc. Neronis) temporibus poëtæ pollebant Romæ, Lucanus, Juvenalis, et Persius,* Senecaque Tragicus;"* there is nothing in this sentence to show that the Philosopher was not meant; because the writer is speaking of him only in his poetical capacity. But even supposing a contradistinction intended, we cannot, in a question of this nature, place very implicit reliance on a writer who has referred Plutarch to the age of Nero!† On the whole, therefore, the evidence of antiquity appears favourable to the claims of the Philosopher. Be the Tragedies of Seneca, however, the production of whom they may, they are Poems of great beauty and high antiquity; and though our readers may not be disposed, with Scaliger,‡ to consider them equal to any Greek Tragedies, and superior in brilliancy and elegance to Euripides, they must allow that they contain a great deal of fine Poetry and sound Philosophy. That they are not the production of modern forgery is clear, since they have been quoted not only by Quinctilian, as cited above, but by Valerius Probus,§ Terentianus,‖ Luctatius,¶ (the Scholiast on Statius,) and Priscian.** However, we must admit that the *Octavia*, if written by the Philosopher, could never have been published during his life, as it is nothing less than a catalogue of the enormities of Nero, thrown into bold relief by strong poetical colouring.†† It might indeed be urged, that instances are not wanting of Poets who defied the Imperial displeasure; but this is little probable in the case of Seneca, as we shall see when we come to consider his conduct in regard to Claudius.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

State of the Drama.

With much intrinsic merit, the Tragedies of Seneca possess an additional claim to interest, as the only entire productions of the Latin Melpomene which have survived the injuries of time and barbarism. While they serve to confirm the assertion of Horace concerning the tragic spirit and happy daring of Roman bards, they exhibit throughout the strongest evidence that they were composed for the closet, and that, consequently, at this period, the legitimate Drama of Rome was nearly extinct.

Pomponius Secundus.

The correspondent of Seneca, POMPONIUS SECUNDUS, to whom we have before alluded, appears to have been the only person who applied himself earnestly to the reformation of the Roman Stage. Quinctilian considers him the first of Latin Tragedians;‡‡ and the elder Pliny, as we learn from his nephew,§§ had written a life of him in two Books. Besides these unexceptionable testimonies to his excellence, we have the no less valuable authority of Tacitus,‖‖ for pronouncing him "a man of elegant habits and splendid talents." What is most important in illustration of his

* Paul. Diac. *Misc. Hist.* lib. viii.
† *Ubi suprà.* Plutarch, it is true, lived under that Emperor, but must have been a minor when he died, whereas it is obvious that Paulus thought otherwise.
‡ Scal. *Poet.* lib. v. c. 6.
§ Val. Prob. *Gramm. Inst.* lib. i. *de syllab. met. pass.*
‖ Terent. Maur. *de met. Bucol. et de met. Hendecas.*
¶ Luct. lib. iv. *Theb.*
** Prisc. lib. vi.
†† We have confined ourselves, in giving a sketch of this question, to ancient testimony only. Those who wish to prosecute the subject may consult the works of Justus Lipsius, Heinsius, Erasmus, and Scaliger; and Brumoy's *Théâtre des Grecs.*
‡‡ Quinct. lib. x. c. 1.
§§ Plin. lib. iii. ep. 5.
‖‖ Tac. *Ann.* v. viii.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

opinions of dramatic excellence, is an anecdote of him related by Pliny, which proves that he was an enemy to the prevalent fashion of writing for the closet. Whenever his friends suggested an improvement, he always replied, "I appeal to the public." But this example was unsupported, and accordingly we find no traces of eminent dramatic success after his time, unless we are to except one VIRGINIUS, who wrote Comedies both on the old and new school, and Mimiambics, and who is celebrated by the younger Pliny* as a paragon of universal perfection. But Pliny's extravagant commendations, and his expression "*circà* ME *tantùm benignitate nimiâ excessit*," coupled with the gross egotism of the writer, and independent of all other support, justly render this evidence suspicious. MATERNUS, as we learn from Tacitus,† wrote three Tragedies, entitled, *Cato*, *Medea*, and *Thyestes*; and Martial has this Epigram on SCÆVA MEMOR, brother of Turnus the Satirist:

Virginius.

Maternus.

Memor.

> "*Clarus fronde Jovis*, Romani fama cothurni,
> *Spirat Apelleâ redditus arte Memor.*"‡

Varro.

VARRO, also, is thus mentioned by the same author:

> "*Varro*, Sophocleo non inficiande cothurno,
> *Nec minus in Calabrâ suspiciende lyrâ*," &c.§

Whether "*Calabra lyra*" alludes to Horace or Ennius, is a question which must remain undecided until the works of this Poet are found. It seems that he was also a Mimographer; and, apparently, composed a piece of this kind, in imitation of the *Phasma* of a certain Catullus mentioned by Juvenal, (*Sat.* 8.)

Seneca's Epigrams.

Of the Epigrams ascribed to Seneca, it is needless to say more than that they are so exquisitely frigid, that they become sometimes amusing,—as the extremes of heat and cold are said to produce similar sensations. It is scarcely possible to believe that the doggrel which they contain could ever fall from the pen of the Tragedian, and the undoubted author of a work to which we have before alluded, and which we now come more particularly to consider, the curious and celebrated Ἀποκολοκύντωσις. But here it will be convenient to premise a few words on the state of Satirical literature in the age of the first Emperors.

ıtire.

The circumstances most favourable to the production of Satire, are not always the most propitious to its publication. As the objects of Satire are vice and folly, wherever they predominate, the wise and virtuous of necessity become Satirists, and even where nature denies, indignation prompts the verse. But the misfortune is, that, under these circumstances, the Satirist can rarely disclose his opinions with safety; and this was eminently the case in the age of the early Emperors. Under those capricious tyrants all literary occupation was unsafe; but to name an individual was almost certain destruction.‖ Ælius Saturninus, for writing satirical verses on the Emperor Tiberius, was hurled from the Tarpeian rock;¶ Sextius Vestilius, Mamercus Scaurus, and Sextus Paconianus, all suffered death on conviction or suspicion of similar offences; and Caius Cominius, a Roman Knight, who had been equally guilty, was with difficulty saved through the intercession of his brother. Nor was it much less perilous to attack vice in the abstract; the guilty are always disposed to appropriate what they know to be merited; and if, on any occasion, the conscience of the Emperor acquitted a Poet, there were those around him whose internal admonitions were less readily pacified. It is therefore a remarkable phenomenon that this period produced any Satire at all; and it is little to be wondered at that the few whose virtuous indignation surpassed their worldly prudence, were careful, while they gave vent to the ebullition of revolting integrity, to adopt what they regarded a safe degree of obscurity. If this was necessary in the time of Juvenal, as that Poet intimates that it was,* it was incalculably more so in the period of which we are now treating. Various, therefore, were the methods resorted to by those who felt themselves unable to stem the exuberance of the satiric vein. Lucan concealed it beneath ironical adulation; Persius resorted to obscure and intricate metaphor and significant personification. During the life of Claudius, Seneca, although he had personal as well as public motives of dislike to that weak and unjust Prince, suppressed his real feelings with what may be thought something more, or perhaps less, than fortitude; for, in his letter to Polybius, the freedman of Claudius, written while he was smarting under the Emperor's displeasure, he calls him, "the truly gentle," "whose first virtue is clemency," "whose memory comprehends all the maxims of the sages;" and, at last, "the great and most illustrious DEITY!" But when the base object of his baser adulation was no longer accessible to its solicitations, he seems to have determined to make the most ample possible atonement for the expressions wrung from him by urgent misery and misplaced hope: and he who on earth was a present God, in the regions of disembodied spirits becomes the kindred associate of pumpkins! The contrast which the early part of the reign of Nero presented to that of his brutish predecessor, afforded a favourable opportunity for undisguised expression of opinion; and this facility seemed increased in the case of Seneca, in consequence of his relative situation with regard to the new Monarch. The Ἀποκολοκύντωσις, therefore, speaks a plain and unfettered language; it is evidently the production of a hand expatiating and exulting in the removal of its manacle,† and, as it is the only Satire of this description which these times have transmitted to us, it would be valuable, even had it no other merit than curiosity. It is also curious as a specimen of the Varronian Satire, the nature and origin of which we have elsewhere discussed.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Ἀποκολοκύντωσις.

But indeed the Ἀποκολοκύντωσις is a piece of great intrinsic merits, not the least of which is its originality, or at least, its original air; for whatever the compositions of Varro may have been, it bears not the slightest resemblance to any anterior extant Latin production. The title itself is extremely ingenious, being a kind of caricature of the ἀποθέωσις, or ἀπαθανάτωσις, by which it is intimated that, instead of being translated to the condition and society of the

---

* Plin. lib. vi. ep. 21. † *Dial. de Orat.* ii. 3.
‡ Mart. lib. xi. ep. 10. § Lib. v. ep. 31.
‖ "*Pone Tigellinum, tædâ lucebis in illâ,*
Quâ stantes ardent, qui fixo gutture fumant,
Et latum mediâ sulcum deducis arenâ."
Juv. *Sat.* 1. 155.
Whatever these corrupt and inexplicable lines may be supposed to intend literally, the general meaning is sufficiently clear.
¶ Dio. Cass. lib. lvii. *fin.*; Tac. *Ann.* vi. 9, 29, 39.

* Vide Juv. *Sat.* 1. *passim. præsertim sub fin.*
† "*Ego scio me liberum factum ex quo diem suum obiit ille qui verum proverbium fecerat*, aut regem aut fatuum nasci oportere." Senec. Ἀποκολοκύντ. *sub init.*

Biography. From A. D. 63 to 492.

Gods, Claudius was more appropriately conveyed to the paradise of gourds or pumpkins, things which in life he had most resembled in grossness and fatuity. The raillery on Geminius, who pretended to have seen Drusilla, the sister of Caligula, ascend to heaven; the council of the Gods, and speech of Augustus; the expulsion of Claudius from heaven; his funeral dirge; his descent to the shades, and the discussion which there takes place on the nature of the punishment suited to him; and, lastly, his condemnation to play for ever with a bottomless dice-box, are all strokes of a master. It is by no means improbable that this work determined Nero to remove Seneca at the first favourable opportunity; since it was obvious that, had the Satirist survived him, his own memory would have been treated as unceremoniously as that of his predecessor.

Although Seneca had not the fortitude to avail himself as largely as he might have done, of the genius and the materials which he possessed for Satire, others were less circumspect. One of the principal of these was Marcus Annæus Cornutus, if we regard consideration and learning: but his writings of this description must have been very scanty, inasmuch as it has been questioned whether any such ever existed. But Fulgentius Planciades, as quoted by Casaubon in his elaborate Treatise on this subject, expressly cites his Satire, "*Titivillitium: M. Cornutus in Satirâ ait: Titivillitii sat cedo tibi.*" As the preceptor of Persius, it is not improbable that he first kindled the spirit of Satire in the breast of that Poet; but this conclusion has been too precipitately deduced from some verses spoken in his person by Persius, to whom they are supposed to be addressed:

Cornutus.

> "*Verba togæ sequeris; junctura callidus acri,*
> *Ore teris modico, pallentes radere mores*
> Doctus *et ingenuo culpam defigere ludo:*"

for "*doctus*" may simply mean *skilful*, and, even though it should not do so, it will not hence follow that Persius caught the Satiric fire from any regular production of Cornutus. Indeed Suetonius expressly says of Persius, that it was not until he had completed his scholastic exercises, and read the Xth Book of Lucilius, that his taste for Satire became conspicuous; although it will still remain highly probable that his relish for this Poet was the result of habits of thinking engendered by his preceptor. But whether this author was as eminent in Satire as in other branches of literary excellence, must now be for ever uncertain. Unquestionable it is that he was a man of great talent and erudition. Suetonius* informs us that he was a Tragedian; but his greatest reputation was in Philosophy. Such, however, was the opinion of his universal taste and information, that Nero consulted him on the conduct of a Poem which he had just begun on the Roman History. His opinion, unfortunately, happened to disagree with that of the Emperor, who rewarded him with banishment, and (if we may believe Suidas†) with death. He enjoyed, however, the satisfaction of seeing his pupil Persius accomplish his honourable career. To this eminent Satirist the course of our observations will now conduct us.

Persius.

Aulus Persius Flaccus,‡ descended of an ancient, though plebeian family,§ was born at *Volaterræ*, now Volterra, in Etruria, u. c. 786. Such, at least, is the substance of ancient testimony.* But some moderns conclude that he was born at *Lunæ Portus*, in Liguria, from the following verses, which, in truth, relate to the place of his residence:

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 492.

> "*Mihi nunc Ligus ora*
> *Intepet, hybernatque* MEUM *mare, qua latus ingens*
> *Dant scopuli, et multâ littus se valle receptat.*
> "Lunai portum *est operæ cognoscere, cives.*"

He was, however, himself a Roman Knight, and connected with the first families in Rome. At the age of six years he lost his father; his mother contracted a second marriage, which was dissolved by the death of her husband not many years after. He studied till his twelfth year at the place of his nativity; afterwards he removed to Rome, where he prosecuted his studies under Remmius Palæmon and Virginius Flaccus. Palæmon. The former of these affected to be a Poet. He wrote to please the vulgar;† but so preposterous was his vanity, that he conceived that Virgil had been inspired to predict him in the emphatic hemistich,

> "*Venit ecce Palæmon.*"

By a low quibble on the name of Varro, (borrowed, as we must admit, from Cicero,) he called that most learned of all the Romans a swine; and affirmed that learning was born and would perish with himself. He was originally a slave; and his mind appears never to have been emancipated, as even Tiberius and Claudius pronounced him utterly unfit for a guardian of youth. At the age of sixteen Persius became acquainted with the celebrated Cornutus, whom we have just noticed, whose faithful disciple and friend he ever after continued. Here it was that he intimately cultivated the acquaintance of many Poets and literary men, especially of his fellow-pupil Lucan, whose admiration of his writings was so excessive, that, if we are to believe Suetonius, he with difficulty restrained himself from open commendation when Persius recited. His life, at least the information we possess respecting it, presents no prominent occurrence; he is described by his Biographer as handsome in person, gentle in manners, and even of maiden modesty; of temperate habits, and remarkably affectionate to his relations. At his death, which took place before he attained the age of thirty, he bequeathed his library and a handsome sum of money to his preceptor Cornutus; the Philosopher, however, retained the books only, and sent back the money to the sisters of his pupil.

That a Satirist of the Neronian period should be allowed to descend to his grave in peace, is an event not altogether unworthy of remark; but, in the case of Persius, Fate, perhaps, did no more than anticipate the tyrant; besides which consideration, the Satirist himself was remarkably cautious and guarded, and even did not always trust his own circumspection, but submitted his writings, before publication, to his faithful and judicious preceptor. That he did not spare the Emperor we know from the consent of all tradition respecting his IVth Satire, wherein Socrates is described as inveighing against the vices of Alcibiades. Nothing, however, can be more cautiously managed than this Satire; so incapable was it of self-appropriation, except by conscious guilt, that to have resented it would

---

* *In Vit. Persii.* † Suid. Κόφωνος

‡ Suet. *Vit. Persii.*

§ *Plebeiam* [*gentem Persii*] *fuisse fasti suadent, in quibus nemo, quod sciam, ejus nominis celebratur.* Casaub. *Comm. in Pers.*

* Euseb. *Chron.*; Cassiodor. *Fast.*

† *Scribat carmina circulis Palæmon:—*
Me raris juvat auribus placere.
Mart. lib. ii. ep. 86.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

have been to confess its truth and poignancy. On one occasion he showed to Cornutus his 1st Satire, in which he had ridiculed the literary taste of his times, and in which Nero was by no means spared, although perhaps not described in the following verse:

Auriculas asini Mida rex habet.

An expression apparently as little capable of appropriation as any in the IVth; his preceptor, however, thought otherwise, and altered the verse as it now stands,

Auriculas asini quis non habet?

From this anecdote Bayle,* in a note, which we will not injure by abridgement, concludes, as it appears to us, very justly, that the verses in the 1st Satire said to be quoted from the writings of Nero, could not have been the production of that Prince; inasmuch as such conduct on the part of the Poet would have been incalculably more imprudent than the very questionable passage which Cornutus compelled him to alter.

It is, doubtless, to this prudent abstinence from the very semblance of personality, that the Satires of Persius are partly indebted for that intense obscurity which presents so formidable a counterpoise to their sterling merit. Yet it is impossible always to acquit their author of partiality for the dark and difficult, even where he had no prudential considerations to cry "σκότισον," as Casaubon tells us his preceptor Cornutus was accustomed to do. His Biographer, no less circumstantial than concise, informs us that he wrote seldom and slowly; which latter circumstance proves that his obscurities cannot be the result of hasty and careless composition. We are inclined to believe the hypothesis of Tiraboschi to be no less true than ingenious, that a vain ambition of excelling Horace misled Persius, just as the desire of surpassing Virgil seduced his friend Lucan. In an elaborate endeavour to exceed the conciseness and terseness of his model, he encountered a danger which Horace himself had perceived and pointed out.† His difficulties, undoubtedly, have been augmented by time and transcription, as is evident from the high popularity which he enjoyed among his contemporaries‡ and immediate successors; and although conceits and metaphors which would have been openly exploded in the age of Horace, were studied and applauded in that of Quinctilian; yet that Critic, so greatly superior to the errors of his time, is to be heard with deference, when he tells us that Persius, in a single volume, has earned a considerable proportion of real glory.§

sius assus.

The Satires of Persius, as we now have them, were revised by Cornutus, and edited by Cæsius Bassus, the intimate friend of the author, to whom the VIth was addressed, and who has been confounded with Gavius Bassus, to whom Fulgentius ascribes a Satire, [*voc. Veruina.*] This Cæsius has received very high commendation from Quinctilian, (lib. x. c. 1.) After the well known declaration respecting Horace, that he was the only Latin Lyric worth perusal, the Critic proceeds: *Si quem adjicere velis, is erit Cæsius Bassus, quem nuper vidimus:* but the succeeding passage is still more curious: *sed eum longe præcedunt ingenia*

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

sicentium. For, as far as other testimony is concerned, we know of no Lyrist worthy of being named with Horace. The few that occur will be mentioned as we advance. Some unfinished verses at the end of the work of Persius, (which are supposed to have been the beginning of another Satire,) were cancelled. Besides this work, Persius had composed, when very young, a prætextate Play, a Book called Ὀδοιπορικά, and some verses on the unfortunate and heroic Arria; all which productions his mother, acting by the advice of Cornutus, caused to be destroyed.

Such are the most important authentic particulars respecting the state of Satire under the dominion of Nero; but it will be convenient slightly to transgress the limits of the period which we are now treating, in order to notice those Satirists, the analogy of whose subjects and genius appears to demand our present attention. We cannot advance to these more systematically, than by a review of the slender and obscure particulars which exist respecting the writings of Petronius. That this subject, however, has been involved in more difficulty than really belongs to it, we think we shall be enabled satisfactorily to show. In the year 1664, Marinus Statilius, a literary Dalmatian, published at Padua a fragment from a manuscript which he discovered at Traw, and which was afterwards purchased at Rome, for the library of the King of France, in the year 1703. The celebrated Mr. J. B. Gail, who is one of the Curators of this library, has politely allowed Mr. Guérard, a young gentleman of considerable learning, employed in the Manuscript department, to afford us the following circumstantial information respecting this valuable codex, which is classed in the library under the number 7989. "It is a small folio, two fingers thick, written on very substantial paper, and in a very legible hand. The titles are in vermilion; the beginnings of the chapters, &c. are also in vermilion or blue. It contains the Poems of Tibullus, Propertius, and Catullus, as we have them in the ordinary printed editions; then appears the date of the 20th of November, 1423. After these comes the letter of Sappho, and then the work of Petronius. The extracts are entitled '*Petronii Arbitri satyri fragmenta ex libro quinto decimo et sexto decimo,*' and begin thus, '*cum*' (and not '*num*' as in the printed copies) '*in alio genere furiarum declamatores inquietantur,*' &c. After these fragments, which occupy twenty-one pages of the manuscript, we have a piece without title or mention of its author, which is the supper of Trimalcio. It begins thus, '*Venerat jam tertius dies, id est, expectatio liberæ cœnæ,*' and ends with the following: '*nos occasionem opportunissimam nacti, Agamemnoni verba dedimus, raptimque tam planè quam ex incendio fugimus.*' This piece is complete by itself, and does not recur in the other extracts. Then follows the *Moretum*, attributed to Virgil, and afterwards the *Phœnix* of Claudian. The latter piece is in the character of the XVIIth century, while the rest of the manuscript is in that of the XVth." The publication of this manuscript excited a great sensation among the learned, to great numbers of whom the original was submitted; and by far the majority of the judges decided in favour of its antiquity. Strong as was this external evidence, the internal is yet more valuable; since it is scarcely possible to conceive a forgery of this length which would not, in some point or other, betray itself. Moreover forgeries are always most common of

Petronius.

---

* Bayle, *Dict. voc.* Perse.

† *Brevis esse laboro,*
Obscurus fio. *Art. Poet.* 25.

‡ "*Editum librum continuo mirari homines et deripere cœperunt.*" Suet. *in Vitâ.*

§ Quinct. lib. x. c. 1.

those authors, fragments of whose writings are to be found in others, which thus appear to countenance the fraud. But of the writings of Petronius, only a few disjointed words and expressions have been preserved by other authors, and even those have not been copied into the manuscript, as they most probably would have been, were it not a genuine monument of antiquity. The very obscurities which pervade the work are such as might be expected, when we reflect that it is, avowedly, a very small fragment, and that this is the only copy which has reached our hands. The difficulty of forging a work like the *Satyricon* will better appear, when it is considered that such an attempt was actually made by a Frenchman, named Nodot, who pretended that the entire work of Petronius had been found at Belgrade, in the siege of that town in 1688. The forged manuscript was published; but the contempt which it excited was no less universal than the consideration which was shown to the manuscript of Statilius.

Assuming therefore, what there seems good reason to assume, that this work is a genuine, though corrupted, monument of antiquity; the next subject for consideration, will be the determination of the author. It seems difficult to imagine how scholars could ever have adjudged this honour (if any it be) to any other than Petronius Arbiter, of whom Tacitus* gives the following singular account: "The days of Caius† Petronius were past in sleep; his nights in the business and relaxations of life. As others attain fame by exertion, so he acquired it by sloth; nor was he, like most spendthrifts, considered a profligate debauchee, but rather an elaborate voluptuary. The more negligent and free were his conduct and words, the more agreeable was his simplicity regarded. When he was Proconsul of Bithynia, and, afterwards Consul, he showed himself vigorous and equal to business; but, after this, returning to his vices, or his imitations of vice, he became one of the few intimates, and steward of the refinements‡ of Nero, who esteemed nothing elegant and polite, but what Petronius had previously approved. In this situation he incurred the jealousy of Tigellinus, who beheld in him a rival and a superior in the science of pleasure. Accordingly he bribed a slave to report Petronius as the friend of Scevinus: then committing all his household to prison, he effectually deprived him of a defence. It chanced that, at that time, the Emperor made an excursion into Campania, and advanced as far as Cumæ, where Petronius lay, who resolved no longer to endure the suspense of hope and fear. Nor did he have recourse to instantaneous death, but opening his veins, bound them again from time to time. During this process he discoursed with his friends, but not on serious subjects, nor with any view to a reputation for fortitude; and listened not to discussions on the immortality of the soul and the opinions of philosophers, but to light songs and careless verses. Some of his slaves he emancipated, others he punished; he walked abroad, and slept; that his death, although violent, might appear natural. Unlike the generality of the victims of Nero, he did not in his Will flatter the Prince or Tigellinus, or any of the men in power; but having described the Imperial debaucheries, with the names of those who shared them, and every new variety of impurity, he sealed the document, and sent it to Nero: taking care, however, to break the die, lest it should afterwards prove dangerous to the innocent."

There is little ancient testimony besides this concerning Petronius; he is seldom referred to or quoted; but it does not appear that more than one Petronius Arbiter was ever known to antiquity. Nor is it, indeed, probable, since the name was, most likely, strictly personal, as it denoted an office. If the work, therefore, now in our hands, be really the production of a Petronius Arbiter, there can be little difficulty in assigning his identity. The whole cast of the work is exactly what might be expected from a character like that described by Tacitus: extremely licentious, yet very elegant. The former part of this opinion will never be controverted: in the latter we are supported by the majority of Scholars and Critics; although there have not been wanting those who have drawn arguments against the authority of the work from its barbarisms and false Latinity. But when it is considered that this author has come down to us in a very mutilated state, and on the faith of a single copy, we have reason to conclude that many of the solecisms and obscurities which disfigure the *Satyricon* are owing to these circumstances. Certain it is that the criticisms of Petronius evince a writer well acquainted, both by taste and study, with the principles of composition; and for these he has obtained the distinguished honour of being placed in the shrine of Aristotle, Horace, and Longinus, by a Critic unexcelled by any:

> "Fancy and art in gay Petronius please:
> The scholar's learning, with the courtier's ease."*

His Poem, too, on the Civil wars, written for the purpose of elucidating his critical principles, will bear an advantageous comparison with Lucan, and proves him to have understood, as well as learned the maxims and uses of literary criticism. Thus the style and subjects of the *Satyricon* confirm, as well the belief of its genuineness, as the arguments which assign the identity of its author.

From what is recorded by Tacitus, it has been generally supposed that the document sent by Petronius to the Emperor, was no other than that of which we now possess a very small portion. But this opinion we cannot admit. For in the statement of Tacitus, Petronius exposed the Prince's minions by name; whereas all the names in the *Satyricon* are *significant*, and, by consequence, fictitious. And whatever may have been the indifference which marked the last days of Petronius, we cannot suppose that nature, under such circumstances, could have enabled him to compose a work in sixteen Books, to which extent, as the manu-

---

* Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 18.

† The prænomen of this man seems not to have been distinctly known; there is little doubt that he is intended by Pliny (lib. xxxvii. c. 2.) in the following passage: "*Titus Petronius, Consularis, moriturus, invidiâ Neronis principis, ut mensam ejus exhæredaret, trullam myrrhinam CCC. H.S. emptam fregit.*" Plutarch also, in his Treatise "πῶς ἂν τις διακρίνειε τὸν κόλακα τοῦ φίλου," names him Titus; "Ἢ τὸν ἀσώτου καὶ πολυτελοῦς εἰς μικρολογίαν καὶ βυπαρίαν ἀνειδίζωσιν, ὥσπερ Νέρωνα Τίτου Πετρώνιος." The Scholiast on Juvenal, however, terms him Publius. (Schol. in Juv. *Sat.* 6. v. 637.)

‡ "*Arbiter elegantiarum*," an expression easier to understand than translate, and which is no where in modern languages represented so well as by the French *Maître des menus plaisirs*. From this circumstance Petronius derived his name of *Arbiter*, which at once identifies him.

* Pope, *Essay on Crit.* v. 667.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

script informs us, the *Satyricon* actually reached. In the absence of data, we can assign to this work no object, nor can we very satisfactorily investigate its main subject, so brief and unconnected are the portions which remain. It is, apparently, a romance; but, whatever we are to consider it, perhaps there is no work of antiquity, the corruptions and imperfections of which are so little to be regretted.

That the work was entitled *Satyrica*, and not *Satyricon*, appears the most probable supposition. *Satyricón libri*, when the distinction of books was lost, easily became *Satyricon*. Fulgentius* mentions two works of Petronius, beside the *Satyricon*, called *Euscius* and *Albucia*. Concerning these we have no further information.

Balzac, in his *Entretiens Littéraires*, (ep. 4, ch. iv.) first presented the world with thirty lines of a Satire from an ancient manuscript, which were thence copied by Burmann into his *Anthologia*, and have been generally considered genuine. They are an animated and indignant survey of the Court and policy of Nero; and as they are not to be met with in many collections, and are eminently illustrative of the poetical character of the period, our readers may not be displeased to find them here.

Ergo fumem miseram, aut epulis infusa venena,
Et populum exhinguem, pinguesque in funus amicos,
Et molle imperii senium sub nomine pacis,
Et quodcunque illis nunc aurea dicitur ætas,
Marmoreæque canent lacrymosa incendia Romæ,
Ut formosum aliquid, nigræ et solatia noctis?
Ergo re bene gestâ, et leto matris ovantem,
Maternisque canent cupidum concurrere Diris,
Et Diras alias opponere, et anguibus angues,
Atque novos gladios pejusque ostendere letum?
Sæva canent? obscœna canent, fœdosque hymenæos
Uxoris pueri, veneris monumenta nefandæ?
Nil Musas cecinisse pudet, nec nominis olim
Virginei, famæque juvat meminisse prioris.
Ah! pudor extinctus! doctæque (infamia!) turbæ
Sub titulo prostant! et queis genus ab Jove summo,
Res hominum suprà evectæ et nullius egentes,
Ause merent vili, et sancto se corpore fœdant!
Scilicet aut Menæ faciles parere superbo,
Aut nutu Polycleti, et parcâ laude beatæ,
Usque adeo maculas ardent in fronte recentes,
Hesternique Getæ vincla et vestigia flagri.
Quinetiam, patrem oblitæ et cognata deorum
Numina, et antiquum castæ pietatis honorem,
Proh! furias et monstra colunt, impuraque turpis
Fata vocant Titii mandata, et quicquid Olympi est
Transcripsere Erebo! Jamque impia ponere templa,
Sacrilegasque audent aras, cœloque repulsos
Quondam Terrigenas superis imponere regnis
Qua licet: et stolido verbis illuditur orbi.

As these lines are anonymous, it is impossible to appropriate them with any certainty. It has been supposed that they are a portion of a Satire written by Antistius Sosianus, for which that unfortunate man, as we learn from Tacitus, was condemned to death, which was commuted into banishment.† It seems, however, extremely improbable that any writer, whatever his sentiments might be, should have avowed them so plainly, at a time when he must have been aware of the fatal tendency of his avowal. But although scarcely published under the dominion of Nero, there is a freshness about these verses which leads to a belief that they must have been the work of a contemporary. They are, moreover, evidently the production of satiric genius; and Wernsdorf, therefore, not altogether without probability, conjectures them to be the production of a celebrated Satirist named Turnus, who lived under Nero, and some following Emperors. This author, apparently, was born at *Aurunca*, the native place of the father of Roman Satire; since the expression "*magnus Auruncæ alumnus*," which, with good reason, is usually understood of Lucilius, is interpreted, by the Scholiast on Juvenal, of Turnus.* Like Horace, he was descended from a freedman; and like him also, he became powerful at Court, under Titus and Domitian. He is mentioned in high terms by Martial,† and classed with Juvenal by Rutilius Numatianus, an author whom we shall presently notice.‡ Aurunca appears to have enjoyed an extraordinary fecundity of Satirists; for the Scholiast on Juvenal, in the passage cited above, mentions two others of this place, Lenius and Silius; the former is, probably, the same with Lenæus, whom we have noticed before; and of the latter we only know, on the authority of the Scholiast, that he was a contemporary of Juvenal, of whom we shall now proceed to record some particulars.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Turnus.

Lenius and Silius.

The only authentic information which we possess respecting Decius Junius Juvenalis is to be derived from incidental passages in his own writings, and from a sketch, not to be dignified with the title of a "Life," from the pen of Suetonius or Probus. In the common editions of this slight memoir no mention occurs of the place of Juvenal's birth; but in the manuscript of Vossius, *Aquinum* was assigned; and this opinion derives probability from the Poet's own testimony.§ He was either the son or fosterchild of a rich freedman. Until he reached his middle age (*ad mediam ferè ætatem*) he amused himself with declaiming; less with a view to public objects than to the gratification of private taste.‖ The first occasion which exercised his satire is a disputed subject among Critics, whose opinions we shall not attempt to record, much less to examine, but prefer to consider what ancient testimony has left us. The following are the words of his Biographer: "*Paucorum versuum saturâ non absurdè compositâ in Paridem pantomimum, poëtamque Claudii Neronis, ejus semestribus militiolis tumentem, genus scripturæ industriosè excoluit. Et tamen diu ne modico quidem auditorio quidquam committere est ausus. Mox, magnâ frequentiâ, magnoque successu bis et ter auditus est, ut ea quoque, quæ prima fecerat, inferciret novis scriptis:*

Juvenal.

Quod non dant proceres, dabit histrio! tu Camerinos,
Et Bareas, tu nobilium magna atria curas?
Præfectos Pelopea facit, Philomela tribunos."

The Biographer then adds a few words, which comprise his whole history. "A Player was at that time in favour at Court, and many of his admirers were daily promoted: Juvenal, therefore, incurred suspicion as having covertly satirized the times; (*quasi tempora figuratè notâsset;*) and, although at the age of eighty years, was immediately removed from the city, under colour of an honourable promotion, and sent to command a cohort in the remotest districts of Egypt; such a mode of punishment being considered best

osianus.

* *De Cont. Virg. Item in Præf.* lib. i. *Mythologicôn.*
† Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 21.

* Schol. *in* Juv. *Sat.* i. 20.
† Mart. lib. vii. ep. 97, and lib. xi. ep. 11
‡ Rutil. Num. *Iter.* lib. i. v. 599. § *Sat.* iii. 319.
‖ Conf. *Sat.* i. 15.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

adapted to a light and jocular fault. In a very short time, however, he became a victim to weariness and melancholy."

To enter on a critical survey of the works of Juvenal, and to compare them with those of Horace and Persius, would be worse than unnecessary here. It has been often done by the profoundest Scholars and acutest Critics, and seldom, perhaps, with much influence on individual opinion. Whatever be the relative value of the Satires of Juvenal, there never was a doubt on their absolute excellence. His VIIth Satire, however, deserves our especial notice, as it professes to be a review of the state of Literature at Rome, in which Poetry naturally claims conspicuous regard.

VIIth Satire. State of Roman Literature.

There is no decisive external evidence on the chronology of this Poem; all that we know is, that it could not have been written *earlier* than the reign of Domitian, with the exception of the few lines quoted by the ancient Biographer; but it probably was not published till the time of Hadrian. That it was not altogether written under Domitian appears from an anecdote related in it of Statius, which took place in the reign of that Prince, and which is spoken of as evincing the ungenerous character of a policy exploded by a new and liberal Monarch. The ruinous consequences of this policy to Literature, especially to Poetry, are depicted with declamatory, but pathetic, eloquence. Poets of reputation and popularity are represented applying for the most menial offices, and the Muse herself in the condition of a mendicant. We will inquire how far this representation is countenanced by History, in reverting to the period from which we have digressed, and taking a survey of the state of Poetry during the turbulent reigns of Nero and his successors. With respect to the former, this has been in some measure already performed; we shall here complete our observations on the subject.

Nero.

The taste which NERO exhibited for Poetry was no less fatal to its interests at Rome than the barbarism and brutality of other Princes. Nero, affecting the art himself, regarded all its professors with more or less jealousy. The example of Cornutus sufficiently shows the opinion which he entertained of his own poetical merits, and the danger of provoking the most distant comparisons. The quinquennial poetical contest instituted by this Prince, and already noticed, might be supposed to have a beneficial tendency; but, as the Emperor himself entered the arena, the result was certain. Competition involved personal danger; and the only means of averting disastrous consequences were the meanest obsequiousness and the profanest adulation. Of the character of the Poetry produced by this institution, we may form a very tolerable notion from what is said in the verses ascribed to Turnus, which we have already given. They were impious as they are there represented, and dull as those formidable "*Gratulationes*" of awful bulk, which a royal birth or marriage formerly elicited from our own Universities. The policy of Nero, therefore, was not less hostile to Poetry in general than to political or personal Satire.

Neither is it probable that this Prince himself afforded to the Latin Muse those advantages which his jealousy forbade her to accept from others. She was, it is true, of a colder and severer temperament than her sisters in most nations, nor did she require from her votaries that ardent and impassioned devotion, without which it has been impossible for Poets in other countries to succeed; yet if she was too majestic and tranquil to be approached with unchastened warmth and irregular pathos, she was too pure for the worship of the fierce and cruel. As a Poet, Nero is called *doctus* by Martial; and as far as concerns the mechanism of the art, such he probably was: the pupil of Seneca could scarcely have been other. But it was the common opinion, and as such is recorded by Tacitus,* that he received great assistance from others, whom he employed to versify his own ideas, as nearly in his own words as possible, and who sometimes supplied whole verses. The Historian, who had seen his Poems, confirms the probability of this belief by their internal evidence; informing us that they were deficient in spirit and energy, as well as in singleness of style. Suetonius† admits that such a report prevailed, but denies the truth of it, and affirms that he has seen the autograph of some of Nero's Poems, which was so much blotted, dashed, and interlined, that it was, evidently, the result of meditation and labour. The common tradition, however, may still be true; he might, as Suetonius asserts he did, write verses with ease and fluency; (an assertion, by the way, a little at variance with what this author tells us about the elaborate aspect of the autograph,) but it will not hence follow that he never employed the assistance of others. Considering the circumstances of the times, and the critical testimony of Tacitus, there is every reason to suppose that he did so. Concerning the subjects of Nero's Poetry little can now be collected. He meditated a Poem on the Roman History in 400 Books; he completed one on the Trojan History; and from Pliny, we learn that, in one of his Poems, he had compared the tresses of his wife Poppæa to amber.‡ Suetonius§ mentions also a Satire by Nero called *Luscio*, against Clodius Pollio, who seems to have richly deserved the castigation of a purer pen. A similar production, directed against Afranius Quinctianus, a character equally infamous, is mentioned by Tacitus.‖ The circumstance has not escaped the acumen of Juvenal.¶

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

We may here mention, as Poets of this reign, Evodus, called by Suidas "ὁ θαυμαζόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ποίησιν," though not a line of his works existed in the time of the Lexicographer; Andromachus of Crete, a Physician, who wrote a Poem called *Theriaca*; and Petricus, of the same profession, who composed a piece *de Antidotis*.

The three succeeding Princes, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, had neither leisure nor disposition to advance the interests of Literature. The reigns of all together did not occupy two years, but their sanguinary and tumultuous characters were eminently pernicious to the arts and sentiments of peace. Vespasian endeavoured to counteract the evil consequences of the late commotions, and his policy was followed up by Titus, who was himself, as Suetonius informs us, a Poet, and occasionally extemporized. Pliny also mentions a Poem by him called *Acontia*, on a meteor which appeared in his time.** Some idea may be formed of the condition of Poets and Poetry at this period, from the declaration of Suetonius with

Poetry under the Vespasians.

* *Annal.* xiv. 16.
† Suet. *Nero*, lii.
‡ *Nat. Hist.* xxxvii. 3.
§ *Dom.* i.
‖ *Annal.* xv. 49.
¶ *Sat.* iv. 106.
** *Hist. Nat.* ii. 25.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

respect to the former Emperor: *præstantes poetas.... coemit!*" the reading has been disputed, but the variations are rather attributable to the extraordinary assertion implied in the word, which has confounded transcribers, than to want of authority. Those who allow the reading interpret it "hired;" but surely Suetonius would never have employed an expression unknown, perhaps, in this sense, to any other Latin author, when he had the natural and proper word "*conduxit*" at hand. The truth appears to be that such persons as had never devoted their attention to other than literary pursuits, were reduced by the exigency of the times to dispose of themselves as slaves. Nor will this appear improbable, when taken in connection with the testimony of Juvenal:*

> "*quùm jam* CELEBRES NOTIQUE POETÆ
> *Balneolum Gabiis, Romæ conducere furnos*
> *Tentarent; nec fœdum alii nec turpe putarent*
> *Præcones fieri.*"

Salejus Bassus.

To the liberality of Vespasian, SALEJUS BASSUS, a Poet who has received high commendation from Quinctilian and Tacitus,† and to whom the *Carmen ad Pisonem* is attributed by Wernsdorf, was indebted for the sum of 500 sestertia; and it was to this

Valerius Flaccus.

Prince that VALERIUS FLACCUS dedicated his *Argonautics*, a Poem which some Critics consider inferior only to the *Æneid*,‡ although it has reached us in a state of great corruption, and is recommended neither by originality, brilliancy of invention, nor melody of versification. Apollonius, Ovid, and Euripides, have all been laid under contribution to the production of the work, and the author cannot be denied the merit of having made them his own. The mythological machinery of Homer and Hesiod, which probably always had an esoteric sense, was borrowed, for the most part, in its literal acceptation, by the Roman Poets, who employed it either to aggrandize their patrons and families, or to gratify an appetite for the marvellous. Horace perceived this extravagant passion for supernatural agency, and prescribed a prudent rule for its limitation,§ which succeeding Poets little regarded, unless we may except Lucan, who preferred other methods of exciting surprise. To such an immoderate length is the interposition of Deities carried by Valerius, that perhaps not an instance can be selected from his whole Poem wherein an event occurs, or a design arises, unconnected with the operations or suggestions of the Court of Olympus. It is impossible to conceive a scene more ludicrous than that which Orpheus (of course, especially inspired by his mother,) recounts in the IVth Book, where Tisiphone pursues Io into Egypt, and Nile overwhelms her in his waves, while her whips, torches, and snakes, strew the unpitying flood, and the merciless Goddess is seen imploring mercy with her mouth half filled with water and sand. Jupiter, thundering above, completes the picture. The Poem is imperfect; the succession of Domitian probably interrupted a work begun under more favourable auspices. That the author did not survive the reign of this Prince is evident from the remark of Quinctilian:* "*multum in Valerio Flacco nuper amisimus;*" an opinion perhaps less grounded on proved than on promised excellence, as he died young. Of the Biography of this Poet little can now be collected. The place of his birth has been disputed; he is named in the manuscripts *Setinus*, which has been taken to mean a native of *Setia*, now Sezze, in Campania. But as he is called by Martial,† "*Antenorei spes et alumne Laris*," there is no doubt that he was at least educated at Padua, and *Setinus* was, probably, a family name. From the same writer we learn that Valerius did not find Poetry a very lucrative profession.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Domitian, and his times.

In the dedication of the *Argonautics*, DOMITIAN is mentioned as capable of celebrating in verse the conquest of Jerusalem. Whether such a work was ever undertaken, must now be matter of conjecture; certain it is, however, that during the mild sway of his brother, he consulted his popularity by affecting the patronage and cultivation of Poetry.‡ The character which History has bequeathed us of Domitian, will enable us to ascertain the value of his success far more correctly than all the preposterous adulation of his venal and cowardly contemporaries. It is melancholy to see the great Quinctilian, a spirit worthy "the most high and palmy state of Rome," attaching himself to this worse than despicable herd; addressing the tyrant as the greatest, sublimest, most learned, and perfect of Poets; humouring his childish vaunt, that he was the son of Minerva; and crowning the whole by representing his literary reputation only eclipsed by his resplendent virtues!§ We may lament over the terrible degradation which this infamous page of the great Critic displays, but its preservation dispenses with all prolix commentary on the condition of the times.

But the poetical taste which this Prince affected when a subject, and which proved a copious theme of contemporary adulation,‖ was discarded when its motives ceased to operate. His speeches, letters, and decrees, were committed to the composition of secretaries; and his sole study was the life and papers of Tiberius.¶ In persecution of the liberal arts he rivalled his predecessors, the Cæsars; but, as Poets were not eminently signalized on these occasions, we shall have less to observe on this part of his character. His expulsion of the Philosophers from Rome, however, gave occasion to a very spirited and elegant Satire, which is still extant, by a noble Roman lady, named SULPITIA. A distich of great point and truth is ascribed to the pen of the same lady also:

Sulpitia.

> *Flavia gens, quantum tibi tertius abstulit hæres!*
> *Pœnè fuit tanti non habuisse duos.*

She regarded with disgust and indignant purity the

---

* *Sat.* vii. 3, *seqq.*
† Quinct. x. 1. Tac. *Dial. de Orat.* 5, 9 and 10.
‡ Dominicus Marius, *ad Ov.* 1. *Amor.* xi. Casp. Barth. lvi. *Adv.* c xi.
§ "*Nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus*
Inciderit." *Art. Poet.* 191.

* Lib. x. c. i. † Lib. i. ep. 77.
‡ Suet. *Dom.* ii. Tacit. *Hist.* iv. 86.
§ Lib. x. c. i.
‖ *Quin et Romuleos superabit voce nepotes,*
Queis erit eloquio partum decus; huic sua Musæ
Sacra ferent, meliorque lyrâ, cui substitit Hebrus
Et venit Rhodope, Phœbo miranda loquetur.
Sil. Ital. *Pun.* iii. 618.
—— *Tu, quem longè primum stupet Itala virtus,*
Graiaque; cui geminæ florent, vatumque ducumque
Certatim laurus, &c. Stat. *Achill.* i. 14.
See also Martial, *passim.*
¶ Suet. *Dom.* xx.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

profligacy of the Court and people, and is celebrated as a pattern of conjugal fidelity and affection, in praise of which she composed verses, which are highly applauded by Martial. They seem, however, to have been, at least, of a mixed character;* and Ausonius openly calls them licentious.† By some Scholars she has been confounded with the Sulpitia, whose elegiac correspondence with Cerinthus is attached to the works of Tibullus; but the name of her husband was Calenus, and the learned are generally agreed in referring the former Sulpitia to the Augustan age.

Satire.

It does not appear that Sulpitia had any reason to repent her temerity; yet it is matter of little surprise that Satire was not greatly cultivated during this period. Juvenal, it is true, had written: but his works, perhaps, never passed the most confidential circles in the reign of Domitian, since Quinctilian takes no notice of them; and Turnus, possessed already of Court patronage, most probably reposed on his laurels. Manlius Vopiscus indeed, a Satirist of this period, was, if we are to believe his panegyrist Statius, a most versatile genius, and managed the lyres of Homer and Pindar with equal facility;‡ and Quinctilian, speaking of Satirists, observes, "*sunt clari hodieque, et qui olim nominabuntur.*"§

Vopiscus.

Suetonius has remarked that the government of Domitian was characterised by an eccentric mixture of virtues and vices;|| an observation illustrated no less in his conduct with regard to Literature than in other respects. His aversion to all liberal studies was sufficiently exemplified in his private habits, after his assumption of the purple rendered dissimulation unnecessary, and the tenour of his political conduct was perfectly consonant with his domestic manners. He, nevertheless, restored the libraries which had perished by fire in the Civil commotions, collected books from all quarters, and sent commissioners to Alexandria to transcribe the works preserved in that inestimable repository of learning. He instituted a quinquennial contest in honour of the Capitoline Jupiter, in which literary merit was disputed; and he founded at Alba a College dedicated to Minerva, the members of which were obliged to celebrate the *Quinquatria*, which included dramatic entertainments and poetical contests. As he did not, like Nero, interfere in these competitions, their influence on Poetry, though slight, was perceptible. But little could be expected so long as there was no individual patronage.

> *Contentus famâ jaceat Lucanus in hortis*
> *Marmoreis. At Serrano, tenuique Salejo,*
> *Gloria quantalibet quid erit, si gloria tantum est?*¶

The Statii.

The cases of the Statii and Martial, however, have been instanced as exceptions to the ordinary policy of Domitian. We will examine this assertion in sketching their Biography.

Statius the Elder.

Of the writings of P. Papinius Statius the Elder nothing is preserved, and our knowledge of their subjects and nature, as well as of their author's history, is derived to us from the monody of his son, which forms the IIId Poem of the Vth Book of the *Sylvæ*. From this we learn that he was of noble family, and that the honour of his nativity was contested by Naples and *Selle*; by which latter place we can scarcely understand the town so named in *Epirus*, since it is represented by the Poet as the scene of the death of Palinurus, which is placed by Virgil at *Velia*. The ambiguity is to be ascribed to a silly emulation of the fate of Homer, a resemblance which, probably, never occurred to any except to the Statii themselves. Wherever he might have been born, he established himself early at Naples, where he frequently engaged in the quinquennial contest, and, apparently, always with success;* nor was he less distinguished in the Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian Games. He opened a school at Naples, which he rapidly filled; but there is no evidence that he ever came to Rome, although we are told by his son that he educated the children of the first families in the Capital. He died at the age of sixty-five.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Concerning the subjects of the prize Poetry of Statius it would be fruitless to conjecture. He had written a Poem on the wars between the Vespasians and Vitellii, and *contemplated* another on the recent eruption of Vesuvius. His celebrity and excellence are certainly not to be estimated by the encomia of his panegyrist, who, independently of the influence of a sentiment more estimable than critical sagacity, was rarely a dispassionate judge of poetical merit.

Speaking of this Statius, Maturantius, who is followed by Gyraldus, observes,† "*summo honore apud Domitianum habitus est*, à quo etiam est auro donatus et coronâ, digno Principe erga PRÆCEPTOREM munere." If Statius had received proofs so conspicuous of the Imperial favour, doubtless his son would have no less conspicuously published them. And, had he been the tutor of Domitian, none acquainted with the author of the *Thebaïd* can doubt that such a circumstance would have been paraded with infinitely greater pomp than the less tangible favours of Apollo and all the Muses. Priests, Chiefs, and Statesmen, in all the splendour of Poetic ornament, are depicted swelling the peaceful triumphs of his ferule, but not a syllable of the Emperor. If by the "crown" and "gold" of Maturantius, be meant the prize which Statius gained at Naples, it was in no sense the Emperor's present; and if, by the phrases, "*Hinc tibi* VOTA PATRUM *credi*,"‡ and

> "*Mox et* ROMULEAM STIRPEM, *proceresque futuros*
> *Instruis*,"

Maturantius understood Domitian, it is certain that he made his statement on a very insufficient foundation. The education of this Prince seems to have been entirely neglected, and his early years were passed in the most abject and sordid poverty.§ We cannot, therefore, greatly rely on any story of Court patronage conferred on the elder Statius.

Statius the Younger.

Lucius Papinius Statius, son of the former, was born, as Dodwell conjectures, A. D. 61, at Naples. Before the death of his father, he had distinguished himself as victor in the Neapolitan poetical Games; his first essay, however, in the Capitoline contest proved unsuccessful. But he soon retrieved his honour by three victories in the Alban *Quinquatria*, and, at

* *Cujus carmina qui benè æstimârit*
Nullam dixerit esse NEQUIOREM.
Nullam dixerit esse SANCTIOREM.
Mart. lib. x. ep. 35.

† *In Epilog. ad Cent. Nuptialem.*
‡ *Sylv.* lib. i iii. 101. § *Inst. Orat.* lib. x.
|| *Dom.* iii.
¶ Juv. *Sat.* vii. 79. See also Martial, lib. viii. ep. 56.

* Stat. *Sylv.* 5. iii. 138.
† *In Achilleid. item* Gyrald. *de Poet. Hist.* dial. iv.
‡ Stat. *Sylv.* 5. iii. 146. § Suet. *Dom.* 1.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

length, by a conquest on the very theatre of his first reverse.* On one occasion he had the honour of being entertained at the Emperor's table, a distinction which he has not been backward to record. But the marks of Imperial favour which are said to have procured him the envy of Martial, and of almost all his contemporaries, were insufficient to protect him from the most deplorable indigence, since it appears that he was obliged to sell his Tragedy of *Agave* for bread.† Little, therefore, can be pleaded here in favour of Domitian's patronage of learned men. The faithful and affectionate wife of Statius, Claudia, whose love had given his successes a value not their own, was his best consolation in adversity. He appears to have retired with her to Naples, where, according to the computation of Dodwell, he died, A. D. 96, and at the early age of thirty-five. The story that he was killed by the Emperor with an iron stylus does not rest on any respectable authority.

It is remarkable that Statius, although possessing a considerably extensive literary acquaintance, is not mentioned by any contemporary author, except Juvenal; even Quinctilian is silent concerning him. His merit is a point on which modern criticism is sufficiently discordant; if, however, Juvenal speaks truly, his Poetry, whether deservedly or not, was decidedly popular in his day. In his *Thebaïd*, the work on which he has founded his reputation, he professes to follow, at a reverential distance, the footsteps of Virgil.‡ This is a rare acknowledgment for a postaugustan Poet; how far it is confirmed by the internal evidence belongs not to us to decide. Yet we may remark, that the confession is one of less than doubtful sincerity, since the Poet, addressing his friend Junius Maximus, has the following passage:

> *Quippe, te fido monitore, nostra*
> *Thebais, multâ cruciata limâ,*
> TENTAT AUDACI FIDE MANTUANÆ
> GAUDIA FAMÆ.§

The composition of this Poem occupied twelve years. It is supposed to have been modelled on the Poem of Antimachus, as that of Valerius Flaccus was on the *Argonautics* of Apollonius. His *Achilleid*, which, as he tells us, was designed as an exercise previous to a Poem on the exploits of Domitian,‖ never reached the end of a second Book. Some suppose that he drew Achilles after his friend Crispinus Bolanus, to whom he addressed the IId Poem in the Vth Book of the *Sylvæ*; but this seems founded on a mistaken interpretation.¶ His *Sylvæ* are a collection of fugitive pieces, in various styles, and on different subjects; and, so far from receiving the elaborate polish which their author bestowed on his *Thebaïd*, were, as we learn from their several dedications, for the most part composed in the greatest haste, and some almost extemporaneously.

tella

The Ist Book of these is dedicated to ARUNTIUS STELLA of Padua, a Poet of some celebrity, though none of his works have reached us. His principal reputation rests on a little piece called *Columba*, similar in style and subject to the *Passer* of Catullus, but superior, if we are to credit Martial,* to that beautiful little gem. He is said, however, to have written several other Poems on the Sarmatian victories of Domitian, and on amatory subjects.† He had an awkward custom of compelling his guests to write verses; to this we owe the Poem on his marriage with Violantilla by Statius, which, as the author tells us, was completed in two days, and which contains 277 hexameters. Although there is as much interest and originality in this as in most Epithalamia, it is not impossible that it has been glanced at by Martial in the following Epigram:

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

> *Lege nimis durâ convivam scribere versus*
> *Cogis, Stella; licet scribere nempè malos.*‡

Statius was, probably, the object of the same author's spleen under the name of Sabellus. Certain it is that wherever Martial has mentioned this name, it is with more than the allowed proportion of epigrammatic gall. The conjecture is derived from a comparison of the XXth Epigram of his IXth Book with the Poem by Statius on the baths of Etruscus. But it is time to say something on Martial himself.

Martial.

MARCUS VALERIUS MARTIALIS (and, as some more recent authors add, COQUUS,§) was born at *Bilbilis*, now Calatajud, in Spain, and educated at *Calagurris*, now Calahorra, in the same country. His father's name was Fronto, and his mother's Flaccilla. He married a lady named Claudia Marcella. At the age of twenty-one he came to Rome, where his epigrammatic talents procured him high reputation in the reigns of Titus and Domitian. The same motives which actuated the latter Prince in dissembling his aversion for liberal studies during the life of his brother, appear to have had some influence, wherever a comparison could occur advantageous to the memory of his regretted predecessor. Thus the honours which Martial enjoyed at the hands of Domitian, were, perhaps, really ascribable to the patronage of Titus. Certain it is that he possessed the "*jus trium liberorum*;" that he held the office of a Tribune and the dignity of a Knight; and that he had a country residence at *Nomentum*. But these advantages appear to have been more specious than substantial, as he existed in a state of great poverty.‖ After a residence of thirty-five years in the Capital, finding little encouragement at the Court of Trajan, he resolved to return to his own country, for which purpose he was assisted with money by Pliny the younger, to whose vanity he had judiciously appealed, and who took good care not to conceal the obligation.¶ Whatever favours he may have enjoyed from the Imperial hand, they were certainly not sufficient to prevent him from reproaching, when dead, the monster whom, living, his prostituted pen had exalted to the rank of the Gods. His opinion of the encouragement afforded to Learning at this time, may be clearly collected from several Epigrams written during the life of his patron. In addressing one Sextus, who, it seems, was anxious

---

* *Sylv.* 4. ii. 65, *seqq.* This is not quite clear from the original passage, but it is probable, and is adopted by Tiraboschi.

† Juvenal, *Sat.* vii. 87.

‡ Lib. xii. 810, *seqq.*

§ *Sylv.* 4. vii. Yet this Poet, who hoped to *rival Virgil, dared* not attempt the praises of *Lucan* in his own metre! Such is his own declaration: "*Ego non potui majorem tanti auctoris habere reverentiam, quam quod, laudes ejus dicturus, hexametros meos timui!*" (*Præf. in* lib. ii. *Sylvarum.*)

‖ *Achill.* i. 19. ¶ *Sylv.* 5. ii. 164.

* Lib. i. ep. 8.

† Stat. *Sylv.* 1. ii. 95, *et ibi comm.* With Wernsdorf, we are unable to find any sufficient ancient authority for the assertions of Vossius and others, respecting these poems on the Sarmatian victories.

‡ Lib. ix. ep. 91.

§ Lamprid. *Sever.* Joann. Sarisbriens. 6. iii.

‖ Mart. lib. xi. ep. 4, *et passim.* ¶ Plin. lib. iii. ep. *ult.*

to advance himself at Rome by Poetry, he is equally undisguised and discouraging:

"Insanis! omnes gelidis quicumque lacernis
Sunt tibi, Nasones Virgiliosque vides."[*]

And to the celebrated Valerius Flaccus he writes:

"Pierios differ cantusque chorosque sororum:
Æs dabit ex istis nulla puella tibi."[†]

The whole Epigram is well worth reading. It does not appear that he enjoyed at *Bilbilis* the repose which he anticipated; assailed by the stupidity and envy of his countrymen, he shortly after yielded to fate.

The works of Martial now extant are wholly epigrammatic; twelve Books consist of regular Epigrams on miscellaneous subjects; one Book is called *Spectacula*, and alludes to the exhibitions of Domitian; another has the title of *Xenia*, and, with a few introductory exceptions, consists entirely of distichs, each describing some article of ornament or luxury, which it was the custom of friends to send to each other on festal occasions. A third Book is entitled *Apophoreta*, also composed of distichs, celebrating the presents usually given to guests to be carried home at the *Saturnalia*. Whether we possess all his writings is uncertain.

No Poet was ever more extensively acquainted with his brethren of the lyre than Martial; and it is not a little remarkable, when the state of the period is considered, that this fraternity should have been as numerous as it was. We will mention the principal names of the Poets preserved in his Epigrams, annexing such illustrations as ancient notices afford us.

Canius. CANIUS RUFUS of Cadiz was, as is to be inferred from Martial, (lib. iii. ep. 20,) a very versatile Poet, who found himself at home in Epic, Elegiac, Comedy, and Tragedy. On the same authority, his wife THEOPHILA was in no respect inferior to Sappho.[‡] Decianus. DECIANUS Licianus. and LICIANUS were both natives of the Peninsula, and therefore not forgotten by Martial in his brief catalogue of illustrious authors, (lib. i. ep. 42;) the former being of *Merida* in Portugal, and the other a Parthenius. fellow townsman of the epigrammatist himself. PARTHENIUS, the Chamberlain of Domitian, is frequently Varus. mentioned with commendation.[§] VARUS, like the Cassius of Horace, wrote 200 lines every day.[‖] Such are the very scanty particulars which subsist concerning these Poets, which we have recorded rather with a view to method, than for the sake of any very conspicuous advantage derivable from the transcription of such names. The catalogue might easily be enlarged, especially if the names of those Poets who have been *censured*, as well as commended, by Martial, were to be allowed a niche in our Biography. But we willingly resign the task of constellating these luminaries to Fabricius and his editors, who have performed it with a patience as well as a diligence truly admirable. The learned, but incorrect, Gyraldus has made a similar assemblage.

Silius Italicus. Some names, however, there are, which must not be so lightly dismissed. The most conspicuous of these is SILIUS ITALICUS, author of the *Punica*. This Poet is by some referred to the age of Nero, in the last year of whose government he was Consul; but as his poem, so early as the IIId Book, mentions Domitian as Sovereign, he will most conveniently be noticed here. The place of his nativity has never been settled. He has been claimed by the Spaniards as a native of their town *Italica*, and by the Italians for a similar reason, as born at *Corfinium*, called *Italica* in the Marsian War. But it is probable that he derived his name from neither of these places, as, according to the unanswerable argument of Stephens, Vossius, and other eminent scholars, the analogy in this case would have given us *Italicensis* and not *Italicus*.* That he was not a Spaniard may very fairly be inferred from the omission of his name by Martial, wherever the poetical worthies of Spain are celebrated; although he is frequently mentioned by this Poet with high commendation.† Wherever he may have been born, his usual residence was at Naples, where he possessed an estate. In the time of Nero he had the reputation of an informer; but he afterwards retrieved his character, by his mild and prudent conduct in the friendship of Vitellius, his honourable demeanour in the Proconsulship of Asia, and his peaceable and dignified employment of the hours of leisure. When his age allowed him the privilege of a respite from Senatorial cares, he withdrew to his Campanian retirement, from which not even the accession of Trajan had power to excite him. An incurable disease of the eye induced him to terminate his life by starvation, at the age of seventy-five, about A. D. 100.

The character of Silius is that of a virtuoso, and is completely a counterpart of Pope's *Timon*. *Erat φιλόκαλος usque ad emacitatis reprehensionem.*[‡] He shifted from villa to villa, with a view of improving the elegance of his abode; he had a fine library, and a fine collection of statues. He purchased the estate of Cicero, to whose writings he was particularly partial, and paid honours to the memories of both him and Virgil, whose sepulchre at Naples he had purchased. In consequence, Martial equals him with the latter; at least, if one reading be correct, in the 51st Epigram of his XIth Book. He seems, however, to have inherited a very small portion of the spirit of either, and all his readers will acquiesce in the judgment of Pliny, *scribebat carmina majore curâ quam ingenio.*

Pliny Secundus. The Biographer of Silius (for so we may term CAIUS PLINIUS CÆCILIUS SECUNDUS, since it is by his pen that the most numerous and authentic particulars on this subject have been perpetuated) must not pass wholly unnoticed in this place, not only as a person whose addiction to literature has procured us information on the state of Poetry in his day, but as also a Poet himself. Of this talent, as indeed of all his other universal attainments, he frequently informs us.[§] When he was only fourteen years of age, he composed a Greek Tragedy. When detained in *Icaria* by unfavourable winds, this Island became the subject of his Muse, and forth came a volume of Latin Elegies. He then made trial of heroics; and last of all he produced his hendecasyllabics, of which he talks perpetually. It was not immediately that he discovered how so undignified a metre could be made to comport

* Lib. iii. ep. 38. † Lib. i. ep. 77.
‡ Mart. lib. vii. ep. 68.
§ Mart. lib. ii. ep. 1, lib. iv. ep. 45, lib. v. ep. 6, lib. viii. ep. 28.
‖ Lib. viii. ep. 20.

* See also Aul. Gell. xvi. 13, and Gruter, *Inscrip.* i. p. 385.
† Lib. iv. ep. 14, lib. vii. ep. 62. ‡ Plin. lib. iii. ep. 7.
§ Plin. lib. i. ep. 13, lib. iv. ep. 6, 14, lib. v. ep. 3, 10, 11, *et præsertim*, lib. vii. ep. 4.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

with that which the world, of course, expected from a Pliny. Fortunately, however, he stumbled on an epigram by Cicero, which put him on reflecting that many illustrious orators had amused themselves in a similar manner. No sooner did he ascertain such to have been the ordinary practice of eminent literary men, than he set to work in good earnest, and produced a volume of hendecasyllabics, some of which, so far as he leads us to conjecture, appear to have been somewhat coarsely seasoned, in order to procure comparison with Catullus. The occasion which led to the formation of this work, he has thought right to record in verse as well as prose. We shall not burden the reader with the whole passage, which, though short, is sufficiently tedious; part, however, may not be unacceptable as an efficient consolation for the ravages of time.

Quùm libros Galli legerem, quibus ille parenti
Ausus de Cicerone darè palmamque decusque,
Lascivum inveni lusum Ciceronis, et illo
Spectandum ingenio, quo seria condidit, et quo
Humanis salibus multò varioque lepore
Magnorum ostendit mentes gaudere virorum.

These verses, which their author evidently considered choice, sufficiently prove that he was ignorant of the technicalities of versification, and stand forth conspicuous on the exquisitely smooth and polished texture of his prose, like the island rocks from the surface of the still and limpid Ægean. The mind of Pliny was by no means cast in a poetical mould. He wrote verses because he conceived it necessary to his literary reputation; an idol to which he sacrificed every other passion and prejudice. What, however, must be our opinion of the *Poet* who could prefer the perusal of Livy to the spectacle of Vesuvius in eruption?* and, still more, who could hope by this avowal to conciliate the approbation of Tacitus?!

But although certainly not entitled to the highest honours of the Latin Parnassus, to Pliny we are indebted for information regarding several Poets, whose familiarity he possessed or courted: for such was his ambition of a literary immortality, that he made the acquaintance of every literary aspirant in Italy, and has taken especial pains to inform the world of the fact. His friends were not equally generous in return, and seemed, for the most part, insensible of the great honour and distinction which they were enjoying. The testimony of Pliny, however, as we have had previous occasion to observe, must always be taken with some qualification. He was a trader in praise, and his commendations were, in general, either speculations or payments; in the latter he was liberal, and in the former adventurous.

Voconius.

This remark premised, we will first proceed to notice Voconius Romanus, who occupies a conspicuous station among the friends and correspondents of Pliny; several biographical particulars of this writer are recorded in the XIIIth Epistle of his IId Book. The Emperor Hadrian, according to Apulejus, ordered this line to be engraven on his tomb:

Lascivus versu, mente pudicus erat.

If this account were correct, the modest Nine were not always so select in their expressions as might be hoped and expected from ladies of their station and character; for Pliny affirms that his language was like the Muses themselves composing in Latin. But if he were the same mentioned by Martial, (lib. vii. ep. 28,) under the name of Voconius Victor, as he is generally supposed to have been, he did not deserve even the sorry reservation of his Imperial apologist.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Passienus Paullus, a Roman Knight, is recommended to our notice and interest as the countryman and lineal descendent of Propertius, and his disciple in the school of Elegiac Poetry. He was afterwards an imitator of the lyrics of Horace. Pompeius Saturninus was a genius of that universal character which appertained, by Pliny's account, to many more of his friends; we are, however, here concerned with his verses alone, of which this writer gives us the following character: *Facit versus, quales Catullus meus aut Calvus.—Quantum illis leporis, dulcedinis, amaritudinis, amoris inserit! sanè datâ operâ molliusculos, leviusculosque, duriusculos quosdam: et hoc, quasi Catullus meus aut Calvus.** Another poetical prodigy, Octavius, is addressed in the Xth Epistle of the IId Book. Arrius Antoninus wrote Attic Greek *better than the Athenians themselves*,† but his Epigrams were but indifferently translated by Secundus.‡ That the praises of Sentius Augurinus should have filled an entire letter will seem nothing wonderful, when we read the following verses from his pen.

Paullus. Pompeius Saturninus. Octavius. Arrius. Secundus. Sentius Augurinus.

Canto carmina versibus minutis
His, olim quibus et meus Catullus,
Et Calvus, veteresque: sed quid ad me?
Unus Plinius *est mihi, priores*
Mavult versiculos, foro relicto,
Et quærit quod amet, putatque amari.
Ille Plinius, ille! *Quid* Catones?
I nunc, qui sapias, amare noli!

Titinius Capito celebrated the actions of eminent men.§ Apollinaris is also mentioned by Pliny and Martial in terms of respect, although, from the prevalence of the name, it is not quite certain that they allude to the same person. We scarcely know whether we are justified in enrolling on our list Lustricus Bruttianus, since he appears to have written in Greek only; but that his Epigrammatic powers were not trivial, we may fairly conclude from the prayer of Martial to Thalia, that she would allow him, provided Bruttianus condescended to epigrammatize in Latin, to occupy the second place. Martial, like his friend Pliny, was prodigal of his panegyrics; but none acquainted with his character can doubt his sincerity here. It was the fashion of that age, still more than that of the Augustan, to imitate the heroes of the brief, but pointed anecdote of Horace.

Capito. Apollinaris. Bruttianus.

Frater erat Romæ consulti rhetor, ut alter
Alterius sermone meros audiret honores;
Gracchus ut hic illi foret, huic ut Mucius ille.‖

Hence authors have appeared ridiculous in the eyes of posterity, who, probably, but for these extravagant eulogies, might have attained a respectable situation on the records of fame. It has been often observed that Pico Mirandola, whose vaunting epitaph extends his glory to the Antipodes, is scarcely known beyond the limits of Europe; and thus Lucius, who is termed by Martial "the glory of his time,"¶ and who is, without scruple, equalled with Horace, is only a

* Lib. vi. ep. 20.

* Lib. i. ep. 16.
† Lib. iv. ep. 3. *Non medius fidius ipsas Athenas tam Atticas dixerim.*
‡ Lib. v. ep. 10.
§ Lib. i. ep. 17.
‖ Hor. lib. ii. ep. 2.
¶ Mart. lib. iv. ep. 55.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

shadow and a name: and UNICUS, who yielded in the Poetic art to his brother only,* is now his rival in obscurity alone.

Review of the Flavian age.

The advocates of Domitian's liberality in the encouragement of learning, certainly possess an apparent advantage in the imposing array of Poetical names which the writers of that period supply; enough, however, appears to have been advanced to prove that, whatever may have been the cause, it cannot reasonably be sought in the spirit of the Imperial Government. Were any further argument on this subject necessary, we might appeal again to Pliny, who, while he informs us that in one year scarcely a day in the month of April passed without a Poetical recitation,† at the same time laments the scantiness of the auditory, and commends the Poets for their resolute contempt of an idle or disdainful public. The most satisfactory explication of the whole phænomenon is the impulse afforded to Poetical studies by the munificence of the Vespasians. The whole reign of Domitian extended only to fifteen years; a period insufficient to extinguish the hopes, and annul the ambition of those who had experienced or witnessed the effects of a patronage truly princely and worthy the Sovereigns of the world. We shall not find that the succession of a confessedly happier reign procured for the Muse those advantages which a more tyrannical system denied. The same hopes and the same objects were no longer extended, and genius passed from disappointment to decay.

Nerva.

The mild and benignant character of the Government of NERVA promised a favourable opportunity for the developement and prosecution of the arts and studies of peace; but the brevity of his reign, which little exceeded a twelvemonth, frustrated his benevolent designs. Nerva was himself a Poet; Pliny the Younger excuses his own light Poetry by his example;‡ a circumstance which acquaints us with the character of his writings. Nero, as appears from Martial,§ complimented Nerva with the title of "the Tibullus of his age;" and although the eulogies either of Martial or Nero are no very irrefragable proofs of real merit, this circumstance is not valueless, inasmuch as it affords us certainty that the works of Nerva were elegiac. Martial|| mentions his modesty and reluctance to publish, qualities which perfectly harmonize with all that we know of the character of Nerva.

Reign of Trajan.

If Juvenal, in his seventh Satire, speaks (as many, not without probability, suppose) of Trajan, we must regard that Prince not only as a liberal rewarder of Poetical merit, but as a diligent investigator of worthy objects for his patronage. We have, however, before observed that Hadrian is not improbably the "Cæsar" of this Poem. But little reliance can be placed on the historical fidelity of a Poet addressing a Prince on whom all his hopes and objects depended. Enough has been already said on the character of all similar testimony from the pen of Pliny the Younger. The following passage however is striking, especially as it displays the view which a contemporary took of the policy of Domitian in this respect, "*Quem honorem dicendi magistris, quam dignationem sapientiæ doctoribus habes! ut sub te spiritum et sanguinem, et patriam receperunt studia!* quæ priorum temporum immanitas exsiliis puniebat, quùm sibi vitiorum omnium conscius Princeps inimicas vitiis artes, non odio, magis, quam reverentiâ, relegaret. *At tu easdem artes in complexu, oculis, auribus habes; præstas enim quæcunque præcipiunt, tantumque eas diligis, quantum ab illis probaris.*"* "It is sincerely to be lamented," observes Gibbon, "that, whilst we are fatigued with the disgustful relation of Nero's crimes and follies, we are reduced to collect the actions of Trajan from the glimmerings of an abridgement, or the doubtful light of a Panegyric."† There can be little doubt that a disposition to value and advance the studies of civilisation accompanied the good sense and benevolence of Trajan; much, however, as has been said on the subject of his literary patronage, it will be vain to trace it in its effects. Most of the Poets (for it is with them that we are alone concerned) who adorned his reign of twenty years, had already published under his predecessors; Juvenal is the only conspicuous writer of this description who may be considered an exception; and even he had written before. Two causes will sufficiently explain this paradox; the example of the Prince, and the indolence of the rich. The patronage of Trajan was afforded to Literature in general, less from an abstract love of the object, than from a conviction of its political advantages, which, in the case of Poetry, are certainly inobtrusive, and by some Philosophers and Legislators have been regarded as doubtful. This Monarch, was no Poet himself, and the first incitement to poetical ambition was consequently wanting. Neither did the wealthy and influential portion of the citizens second, as far as it went, the good example of their head; and Poets, weary of protracted neglect, sank around in despondency and silence.‡ Juvenal and Martial, we know, experienced in this reign the bitterest discouragement: indeed it is impossible that the incessant projects of aggrandizement which occupied the mind of Trajan, could allow him, however inclined, to bestow any efficient culture on the arts and studies of peace and leisure. The Capitoline Poetical contest, it appears, was continued. We are indebted to an inscription still preserved in the town of Guasto, formerly *Histonium*, for a very interesting anecdote of a juvenile Poet, whose genius was excited and rewarded by this institution. From this it appears that LUCIUS VALERIUS PUDENS, a boy of that place, only thirteen years of age, was crowned victor in the Capitol, A. D. 106, by the unanimous suffrage of the judges. A statue of brass was erected to him by his countrymen in the time of Antoninus Pius. Without detracting in any degree from the honourable and meritorious distinction of the youthful adventurer, we may be permitted to observe that his success affords a presumption, either that the competitors were few or indifferent, or that the honour itself was slightly regarded.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Valerius Pudens.

---

* Mart. lib. xii. ep. 43.
† Lib. i. ep. 13.
‡ Plin. lib. v. ep. 3.
§ Lib. viii. ep. 70, lib. ix. ep. 27.
|| *Ubi suprà*

* Plin. *Paneg.* xlvii.
† *Rom. Emp.* ch. iii.
‡
Ingenium sacri miraris abesse Maronis,
Nec quenquam tantâ bella sonare tubâ.
Sint Mæcenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones,
Virgiliumque tibi vel tua rura dabunt.
Mart. lib. viii. ep. 66.

Quis tibi Mæcenas, quis nunc erit, aut Proculejus,
Aut Fabius? quis Cotta iterum? quis Lentulus alter?
Juv. *Sat.* vii. v. 94.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482. Hadrian.

The character of HADRIAN has been drawn so correctly, so forcibly, and at the same time so compendiously, by his biographer, Ælius Spartianus, that the words of this author will be the best possible comment we can supply on the effects of his accession. "*Idem severus, lætus; comis, gravis; lascivus, cunctator; tenax, liberalis; simulator, sævus, clemens; et semper in omnibus varius.*"* From the influence of a mind so perversely constituted no permanent nor substantial advantages could be expected to accrue to any department of literature. Yet was Hadrian a man of great accomplishments, and a Poet; his pieces were, for the most part amatory; and he wrote a Poem called *Catacriani*, which, as we learn from his Biographer, was extremely obscure,† and the title of which is now become no less mysterious than its contents. This work was an imitation of Antimachus, a Poet for whom he entertained a very high admiration, and whom he preferred to Homer, as he did Ennius to Virgil. He was liberal of rewards and honours to literary professors; but these afforded small encouragement to merit so long as he treated their owners with ridicule, contempt, and indignity, on the ground of his own superior attainments. Indeed literary pursuits and professions of all kinds were not more safe than honourable; for the Emperor, in order to pamper his own vanity, and mortify the self-complacency of authors, would often publish rival compositions, the superiority of which it would have been the most reckless impudence to deny. Thus Favorinus, being reprehended for the introduction of a word which he afterwards removed, replied to his friends, who reproached him for his obsequiousness, "You advise me ill, if you wish me to doubt the superior learning of one who has thirty legions at command."‡ A Poet named Florus, however, was less circumspect, and addressed to the Emperor the following lines:

"*Ego nolo Cæsar esse,*
Ambulare per Britannos,
Scythicas pati pruinas."

Hadrian chanced to read the verses in good humour, and took no other revenge than a prompt repayment, together with similar interest:

"*Ego nolo Florus esse,*
Ambulare per tabernas,
Latitare per popinas,
Culices pati rotundos."§

But the experiment was dangerous, and, probably, solitary, to say nothing of its bad taste and want of decent courtesy. The anecdote, if authentic, which there is no reason to doubt, furnishes a curious illustration of the literary relations of Prince and People at the time.

There is still extant an Epitaph by Hadrian on his horse Borysthenes, which has been edited as follows, by Salmasius after Casaubon,‖ and which is illustrative of his style and versification.

"*Borysthenes Alanus*
Cæsareus veredus,
Per æquor et paludes
Et tumulos Etruscos
Volare qui solebat,
Pannonios nec ullus
Apros eum insequentem,
Dente aper albicanti
Ausus fuit nocere,
Vel extimam salivâ
Sparsit ab ore caudam,
Ut solet eventre:
Sed, integer juventâ,
Inviolatus artus,
Die suâ peremtus
Hic situs est in agro."

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

A more celebrated piece is his address to his departing soul, the popularity of which is not easily accounted for:

"*Animula, vagula, blandula,*
Hospes comesque corporis,
Quæ nunc abibis in loca,
Pallidula, rigida, nudula,
Nec ut soles, dabis jocos."

Ælius Verus.

The adopted successor of Hadrian, L. Cejonius Commodus, called by him ÆLIUS VERUS CÆSAR, was a great admirer of Poetry, and a Poet. The character of his Poetry may best be collected from his favourite authors. Ovid and Appius were the companions of his pillow, and Martial he styled his Virgil.* His son, the Emperor Verus, was also a Poet, although far from eminent.† Verus Antonius.

Age of the Antonines.

It might be supposed that beneath the tranquil and beneficent sway of the Antonines, the Latin Muse, though already feeble and expiring, might have rallied her exhausted energies, and stood forth again to the world in the perfect beauty and chaste proportion of her Augustan maturity. "The love of letters, almost inseparable from peace and refinement, was fashionable among the subjects of Hadrian and the Antonines, who were themselves men of learning and curiosity. It was diffused over the whole extent of their Empire; the most northern tribes of Britons had acquired a taste for Rhetoric; Homer, as well as Virgil, was transcribed and studied on the banks of the Rhine and Danube; and the most liberal rewards sought out the faintest glimmerings of literary merit."‡ Yet, in the words of the great historian to whom we are indebted for the above picturesque glance at the literary condition of this period, "the name Poet was almost forgotten;" "while a cloud of critics, of compilers, of commentators, darkened the face of learning, and the decline of genius was soon followed by the corruption of taste."§ This consummation, however, is easily accounted for. The protracted realities of neglect and penury had at length dispelled the visions and chilled the aspirations of genius; which, like youth, may struggle awhile with unkindness and sorrow, but which is equally endangered by their premature influence, and equally irrevocable by subsequent attentions. Had Augustus himself occupied the throne of the Antonines, no eminent superiority could have been expected; but neither was the kind of encouragement afforded to literature by these Princes calculated to foster imaginative excellence. Poetry, indeed, was utterly neglected; and the philosophers and orators who were the objects of Imperial patronage were those who best retained the maxims of their predecessors, not those who reasoned most freely on their knowledge, or studied to become critics in the subject for themselves. But, without entering

* C. 14. † Ibid. 16.
‡ Ibid. 15. § *Ubi suprà.*
‖ *Vide utriusque notas ad* Æl. Spart. *Hadr.*

* Æl. Spart. *Vit. Æl.* v.
† *Melior quidem Orator fuisse dicitur quam Poëta: imò (ut verius dicam) pejor Poëta quam Rhetor.* Julii Capit. *Verus. Imp.* ii.
‡ Gibbon, *Rom. Emp.* ch. ii. § Ibid.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

into a discussion of the metaphysical causes of the rapid decay of Poetical merit, in and after the period of the Antonines, which, however seducing to a writer on this subject, is not expected in a brief summary of facts, the effect is indisputable; and the names which we shall now have to record will only be detailed in their chronological order, without attempting to classify where there is no connection.

The state of Poetical literature during the sway of the Antonines may be conveniently gleaned from the following fact: Aulus Gellius, who appears to have been intimate with all the eminent literati of his time, speaks with the most extravagant commendation of the Poet JULIUS PAULLUS, calling him the most learned man whom he could remember.* To the same testimony we are indebted for a notice of ANNIANUS,† who, as we learn from Ausonius,‡ composed Fescennine Carols.

Paullus.

Annianus.

The lethargy which succeeded the decease of Marcus Aurelius cannot excite any surprise. The Emperors were not unfrequently unskilled in the national tongue; rarely patronized literature at all; and most rarely of all, Poetry.§ Commodus, in one sense, was a patron of the Muses, as his conduct gave rise to many lampoons.‖ Pertinax, indeed, gave the sanction of his presence to Poetical recitations.¶ Geta affected a high zeal for literary pursuits, and his favourite author was Q. SERENUS SAMMONICUS, who wrote a Poem on medicine, still extant.** But the style of this Prince's acquirements may best be estimated from the questions which he put to Grammarians concerning the noises of animals, and the strictly *literary* dinners which he gave, wherein only dishes beginning with one letter were allowed.†† CLODIUS ALBINUS wrote Georgics, and *Fabulæ Milesiæ*. But encouragement and example appeared equally fruitless until the reign of Alexander, who attempted a more vigorous patronage with somewhat more of the appearance of success. The language however had undergone important corruptions, and Alexander was not best qualified to remove them. By an inversion of the fate of Telephus, the speech and literature of Rome were rapidly decaying beneath the influence of the same causes which had brought them to the high perfection they had once enjoyed. The Greek language was now indeed triumphant. That Lucretius and Cicero, expounding for the first time the doctrines of the Greek Philosophy in a language which possessed no equivalent expressions, should borrow from the rich and various stores of Greece, was only to be expected. But what originated in necessity was continued through affectation; and a spirit similar to that which is now perhaps working the ruin of our own language prevailed. This spirit was rather sanctioned than checked by Augustus, who considered the naturalization of a Greek word or phrase an acquisition to the language, with more taste indeed, but not less error, than the Gallicizing writers of our own times. A perusal of the letters of Pliny, (whose character, certainly, was favourable to the diffusion of a corruption originated and propagated by vanity,) sufficiently testifies the progress which this destructive propensity had made in the course of half a century. Alexander, unhappily, was so addicted to Greek literature that he almost despised that of Rome;* so that his policy, as might be expected, in no manner improved the purity of the language. His favourite Latin authors were, however, the Poets,† and these might certainly have enjoyed his patronage if willing to claim it, as we know from the case of Q. Serenus Sammonicus, son of the Poet of that name just noticed, and whose abilities recommended him to the notice of the Court.

Serenus Sammonicus.

Clodius Albinus.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Sammonicus the younger.

The name of Serenus has greatly perplexed literary historians. Crinitus and Henry Stephens make A. Serenus and Q. Septimius distinct Poets, and Gyraldus adds another Serenus. But Marius Victorinus‡ and Sidonius Apollinaris‖ speak of Septimius Serenus as one person; and some verses are quoted as the work of Septimius and Serenus, by the contemporary poetical grammarian, MAURUS TERENTIANUS. But the age of Terentian himself is not accurately determined, although generally referred to the period which we are now treating. Vossius and Fabricius conjecture that he was no other than the Præfect of Syene, addressed by Martial in the eighty-seventh Epigram of the first Book; and on this supposition Wernsdorf, after Gronovius, and others, ventures to identify this Septimius with Septimius Severus, the correspondent of Statius, and proposes there to read Serenus for Severus. The extant works of Septimius are some fragments on rustic subjects, from several little pieces called *Opuscula Ruralia;* and to him is attributed, by Wernsdorf, the celebrated *Moretum*, more commonly ascribed to Virgil. The *Falisca*, mentioned by the grammarians, were probably no other than the *Opuscula Ruralia*. They gave their name to the Faliscan measure, which consists of a dactylic trimeter followed by an iambus. Sammonicus also enjoyed the favour of the two first Gordians, father and son, to the latter of whom he was tutor, and who were themselves Poets; the elder having composed, when yet a boy, an Epic in thirty Books, called the *Antoniniad*, on the life and exploits of the Antonines, Poems called *Halcyonæ*, *Uxorius*, *and Nilus*, and a translation of Aratus and Demetrius,§ being a kind of *rifacciamento* of the Poetry of Cicero, as Pope remodelled the works of Donne; while the younger amused himself with lighter productions.¶ Their successor, BALBINUS, colleague of Maximus or Pupienus, is called by his Biographer, Julius Capitolinus, eminent among the Poets of his time;** but the praise is of small absolute value. GALLIENUS also was celebrated for his poetical talents, and gained the palm from one hundred competitors for an *Epithalamium*, part of which has been preserved in his life by Trebellius Pollio. None of the Emperors of this period actually persecuted the

Septimius.

Incidental notice of Terentian.

The Gordians.

Balbinus.

Gallienus.

---

* *Noct. Att.* I, xxii. 5, iv. 19, vii. † Ibid. 7, vii.

‡ *Præf. in Cent. Nupt.*

§ We give the following specimen of Imperial poetry from the pen of Macrinus, in answer to an epigram written on the occasion of his refusal of the name of Pius, and his acceptance of that of Felix:

> *"Si talem Graium retulissent fata poëtam,*
> *Qualis Lătinus Gabalus iste fuit,*
> *Nil populus nŏsset, nil nŏsset curia,* MAGNO
> *Nullus scripsisset carmina tetra* MIHI!!!"
>
> (Jul. Capit. *Macr.* xi.)

‖ Lamprid. *Vit. Comm.* xiii. ¶ Jul. Capit. *Pert.* xi.

** Jul. Capit. *Gord. Jun.* ii. †† Jul. Capit. *Get.* v.

* Lamprid. *Alex.* ii. *et* xxviii. † Ibid. xxxiv.

‡ *Gramm.* lib. iii. p. 2578, edit. Putschii. ‖ *Epist. ad Polem.*

§ "*Cuncta illa quæ Cicero ex Demetrio et Arato,*" &c. Jul. Capit. *Gord. Maj.* iii.; but some for *Ex Demetrio*, read *de Mario*.

¶ Julius Capitolinus passes the following criticism on his writings: "*Non magna, non minima, sed media, et quæ appareant esse hominis ingeniosi, sed luxuriantis et suum deserentis ingenium.*" *Gord. Jun.* iv.

** Jul. Capit. *Max. et Balb.* vii.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Muses except Philip the Arab, whose savage law is still extant in the Justinian code:* "*Poëtæ nullâ immunitatis prærogativâ juvantur.*" No important consequences, however, resulted from this temporary improvement in the general character of the Imperial government. The climate, indeed, was mild and genial, but the soil was poor and stubborn. This assertion is best exemplified by considering the age of Carus and his sons, Carinus and Numerianus, by whose time the action of this improved artificial temperature had forced into light a few sickly productions which we are required to notice.

The two former of these Princes were little addicted to intellectual pleasure; yet their education was liberal, and they were not insensible to the excellence of literary pursuits and the value of a Poet's praise. The mild

Numerian.

and amiable NUMERIANUS was a Poet by choice and feeling; according to his biographer, Vopiscus,† he surpassed all the Poets of his time. This may either allude to his abstract reputation, or to his successes in the poetical contests, which had now been revived, and in which he bore a conspicuous part. History is seldom identified with just criticism in the matter of literary sovereigns; still less can a dependent vassal be expected to pronounce an impartial decision on the merits of his absolute master. In the present instance, however, there is no violence in the supposition that the historian or the judges recorded an unprejudiced opinion. The Poetry of some of this Prince's contemporaries has been spared by the caprice of Time, and renders the possibility of his superiority perfectly consistent with the usual standard of Imperial mediocrity. We have not

Aurelius Apollinaris.

the good fortune to possess the iambics of AURELIUS APOLLINARIS, who celebrated the exploits of Carus, and whom, according to the flourish of Vopiscus,‡ Numerian, with a similar Poem, "flashed into obscurity as if with a sunbeam;" but the works of M. AURELIUS

Nemesian.

OLYMPIUS NEMESIANUS, of Carthage, author of *Halieutica*, *Cynegeticon*, and *Nautica*, whom he fairly vanquished, are partly extant, and certainly, in this case, dispense with all the difficulties of the hypothesis, that a Poetical monarch may be tried by impartial contemporary judges.

Of the *Cynegeticon* of Nemesian, only 325 lines have reached us: whatever judgment may be formed on their merits by modern Critics, it is certain that the Emperor's triumph was by no means lightly esteemed by his contemporaries. Nemesian, indeed, received far greater honours than ever had been enjoyed by Horace, Virgil, or Ovid; whatever we are to understand by the corrupt passage in which his distinctions are recorded, they were evidently extensive and remarkable.§ To this Poet is ascribed, by Wernsdorf, the fragment on the labours of Hercules, usually printed with the works of Claudian. The property of this trifle is in no respect important; but those who think the subject worth further prosecution may read the arguments of the learned Critic in the second Volume of his *Poetæ Minores*. The same scholar, on the most solid and convincing grounds, has restored the four

Calpurnius.

Eclogues commonly assigned to this author to T. CALPURNIUS SICULUS, a Poet of the same period, and if we may trust universal tradition, an object of the patronage of Nemesian. Wernsdorf, who seems to have exhausted on the illustration of both these Poets all the ample stores of his learning, and all his excursive powers of conjecture, stoutly denies the identity of Melibœus with the author of the *Cynegeticon*; his argument, which is defended at some length, may be entirely comprised in the fact, that the Melibœus of Calpurnius is everywhere represented as a person of great power and influence at Court, which Nemesian is not known to have been. Little, however, is known of the biography of Nemesian; and the few particulars which can be collected, rather favour than oppose the opinion that he was a person of rank and influence. Ulitius even conjectures that he was related to the Imperial family.* Under such circumstances there scarcely appears to be sufficient reason for disturbing an ancient and consistent tradition. But if the claims of Nemesian be unfounded, where is Melibœus to be sought? Wernsdorf is not a little perplexed in discovering a character of this period equally conspicuous for illustrious rank and poetical preeminence, and at last fixes on C. JUNIUS TIBERIANUS,

Incidental notice of Tiberian.

of whose literary qualifications and patronage Vopiscus speaks highly, in his introduction to the life of the Emperor Aurelian. "But Melibœus was himself a Poet." So also was Tiberian; for Fulgentius Planciades quotes a verse from an author of this name,† and even cites his Tragedy of *Prometheus*;‡ but there is no evidence whatever to prove that the Biographer and Grammarian alluded to the same person.

The *Eclogues* of Calpurnius are (if we may be allowed the paradoxical expression) more Virgilian than those of Virgil. Not only are they a Cento of the phrases and sentiments of that Poet, but his misapprehension of Theocritus has been implicitly adopted and even advanced. The injudicious mode of allegorizing has been throughout observed; and this enables us to glean from them a few unconnected particulars respecting their author. From a needy adventurer he appears to have become, by the interest of his patron Melibœus, a person of consideration at the Imperial Court, principally in consequence of his Poetical merits. It is not improbable that he was the same with Junius Calpurnius, styled by Vopiscus, the Imperial Remembrancer; the variation of the *prænomen* being by no means an insuperable objection, as we have seen in the instance of Petronius. Whether he is to be identified with the Poet whose comedy, *Phronesis*, is cited by Fulgentius,§ is not so clear.

The style of Calpurnius, even more than that of Nemesian, indicates a new era in the Poetical history of the Latin language. The resources of Greece being now exhausted, no object of imitation remained but the Latin authors themselves; a situation which necessarily placed an uninventive people in a state of rapid deterioration. The language also had materially degenerated; and writers ambitious of reputation were compelled to embrace the expression of a happier age, a necessity which produced an appearance of art and labour, without effectually escaping the infection of colloquial corruption. Poetry, however, had again become fashionable; and the continuance of a virtuous and pacific Government might have cheered with a few forced flowers the bleak winter of the Roman Poetical

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

* Lib. x. tit. lii. 3. † Vopisc. *Numer.* i.
‡ "*Velut radio solis obtexit.*" Ibid.
§ "*Omnibus* coloniis *illustratus emicuit.*" Vopisc. *Numer.* i. Casaubon corrects *coronis*, and it is the most probable reading which has been offered.

* *Comm. ad tit. Cyneg.* Nemesiani.
† *De Serm. Antiq. voc.* Sudus. ‡ *Myth.* lib. iii.
§ *Voc.* Nasiterna.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

history; but the murder of Numerian, and a reign of military excitement and tumultuous glory, banished the Latin Muses for ever from the echoes of Albunea and the haunts of Tibur. Their reappearance on the shores of the Propontis deserves a more particular consideration.

Effects of Christianity on Poetry.

The effects of Christianity on the Poetical spirit have been discussed under a great variety of forms. It has never been denied that the knowledge of Truth is frequently unfavourable to the action of a warm and enthusiastic imagination, the reveries of which it reprobates and dispels. The Poet, to succeed, and his reader, to be pleased, must lend themselves for a season to the influence of illusions, which the studious contemplation of abstract Truth will render it difficult to create or experience. If Lucretius felt unable to treat his subject poetically, without invoking the aid of one of those powers whose agency it was the object of his work to deny, and if Tasso was sensible that his page required other embellishments than the sober colours of fact, there must, it should seem, exist a strong incompatibility between the qualities of Truth and Invention. But of all others, religious truth must, apparently, be the most adverse to the spirit of Poetry The Christian Poet must discard all the beautiful creations of Mythology; or, should he retain them, as in the impious and absurd combinations of Camoens, he will excite no feeling corresponding to that scarcely disbelieving awe with which even the most philosophical of heathen readers must have perused the inspired pages of Homer. To combine consistent fiction with Religious truth must be the work of a Milton or a Tasso; a genius that can "breathe empyreal air:" nor would it be difficult to show that even Milton and Tasso have been sometimes mastered by the mightiness of their subject.

Such are the arguments most frequently adduced to prove the deteriorating influence of Christianity on the Poetical character. Whatever truth may be contained in the observations themselves, we are now about to consider a portion of Poetical history which will clearly show that tendencies of an opposite nature have been quite sufficient to counterbalance all the disadvantages resulting from the opposition of Evangelical fact to Poetical fiction. The conversion of the Empire to Christianity is not more remarkable as a Political than as a Poetical era; the corrupt state of the language, and the turbulent condition in which the newly established Religion found the people, being, apparently, the only obstacles to a complete renovation of Latin Poetry. The stupendous miracles of the sacred history, the whole administration of the great plan of human redemption, the sufferings and triumphs of the church exercised and elevated the original genius of Prudentius; while the refinement of taste and intellect, which is always consequent on the influence of Christianity, astonishes us in a most corrupt period of the language with the pure and truly classical Poetry of Claudian.

A consummation of this nature neither was, nor could be immediate. Most of the Christian writers, however, from the first establishment of the Religion, had been Poets, if the composition of psalms and hymns entitle their authors to that name. We have still some

Cyprian.

verses by CYPRIANUS, *De sanctæ crucis ligno;* and there also exist five hexameter books against Marcion, a Poem on the last judgment, pieces called *Genesis* and *Sodoma*, and a remonstrance with an apostate Senator,

Tertullian.

which are all ascribed to the Muse of TERTULLIANUS. The first Christian Emperor, indeed, although a patron of learning, was no Poet;* his son Constantius attempted versification, but Ammianus Marcellinus speaks very contemptuously of his productions in this way.† Yet the influences of a more humanized policy were conspicuous in the number of Poets who endeavoured to adorn their respective ages. Of these we shall attempt to give some account.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D 63. to 482.

The eminent LUCIUS CÆLIUS LACTANTIUS FIRMIANUS, to whom religion and literature are greatly indebted, will naturally claim the first notice, although his Poetical works are, at most, few, and the genuineness of all the Poems ascribed to him has been questioned. The *Phœnix* appears, on all grounds, to be justly ascribable to this author. The consent of MSS., and the improbability that this Poem should otherwise have been found in company with the writings of Lactantius, seem reasons sufficient to establish his claim, in the absence of opposite evidence. Many scholars, however, have hesitated to confirm this apparently unexceptionable testimony,‡ principally on account of the silence of the Poet on the subject of Christianity, and his allusions to the Gentile fables of Deucalion and Phaëthon. It is not, however, a necessary consequence, that a Poetical believer in the Greek Mythology cannot be a Christian; although it is nothing impossible that the *Phœnix* may have been written before the conversion of its author. Certain it is, that the opening description of the country of the *Phœnix* has been compiled at least from indirect Jewish tradition; and the word *magnities*, for *magnitudo*, which is the reading of all the MSS., appears to assign this Poem to some African writer, this termination being then common with the Latin writers of that country, and adopted elsewhere by Lactantius himself, in the word *minuties*.§ The *Carmen de Paschâ* and the *Passio Domini* are now generally allowed to be the productions of a much later writer, Venantius Honorius Fortunatus, in whose works they are found. Jerom‖ ascribes to Lactantius a work called *Symposium*, and an hexameter Poem intituled *Ὁδοιπορικὸν*. The latter is lost. The former is still supposed to be extant, and is published in his works. It consists entirely of a collection of enigmas in dactylic hexameter tristichs. There is however an important variation in the reading of the first line. Many copies have

Lactantius.

"*Hæc quoque* Symposius *de carmine lusit inepto:*"

which, if correct, does not intitule the Poem *Symposium*, but directly ascribes it to the pen of some Symposius. Fabricius expressly asserts that all the MSS. prefix the name of Symposius as the author;¶ and Sigebertus Gemblacensis speaks of Symposius the Epigrammatist.** Wernsdorf therefore attributes this collection to CÆLIUS

* We have no account of any poetical compositions of Constantine. Porphyry, the Poet, indeed speaks in his panegyric thus: "*Inter belli pacisque virtutes, inter triumphos et laureas, inter legum sanctiones et jura, etiam Musis tibi familiaribus adeò vacas ut inter tot Divinæ Majestatis insigna, quibus invictus semper in primis es, hujus etiam studii in te micet splendor egregius.*" But the speaker is a panegyrist and a Poet.

† "*Quùm à rhetoricâ per ingenium devereretur obtusum, ad versificandum transgressus, nihil operæ pretium fecit.*" Ammian. Marcell. xxi. 16.

‡ Ittig. *Biblioth. Patr.* ad Clem. *Ep* i. *ad Corinth.* Buchner, *ad Hymn. de Resurrect.* Sirmondus, *notæ in Theodulfum.*

§ *Institt.* iv. 12. ‖ *Cat. Scriptt. Eccles.* Firmianus.

¶ *Bibl. Lat.* iv. 1. sec. 7. ** *De Scriptt. Eccles.* cap. 132.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Firmianus Symposius, a contemporary of Lactantius, to whose pen we are indebted for two little pieces on Fortune and Envy respectively. Pentadius, to whom Lactantius dedicated his *Institutiones*, is supposed to be the author of several Elegies and Epigrams ascribed by the MSS. to a writer of that name. The only peculiarity about the former is, that the last hemistich of the pentameter verse is always the same with the first of the hexameter. It would be injustice, however, to this Poet not to mention that the following fragment is attributed to him, although the internal evidence by no means favours his claim.

Pentadius.

> *"Non est, falleris, hæc beata, non est*
> *Quod vos creditis esse, vita non est:*
> *Fulgentes manibus videre gemmas,*
> *Aut testudineo jacere lecto,*
> *Aut plumâ latus abdidisse molli,*
> *Aut auro bibere, aut cubare cocco,*
> *Regales dapibus gravare mensas,*
> *Et quidquid Libyco secatur arvo,*
> *Non undâ positum tenere cellâ:*
> *Sed, nullo trepidum timere casu,*
> *Nec vano populi furore tangi,*
> *Et stricto nihil æstuare ferro:*
> *Hoc quisquis poterit, licebit illi*
> *Fortunam moveat loco superbus."*

Flavius.

Contemporary with Lactantius was Flavius the Grammarian, whose name has been strangely converted by modern Critics into Q. Rhemnius Fannius Palæmon, and thus by some confounded with the same Palæmon whom we have already noticed, and to whom the Poems of Priscian have been attributed. According to Jerom,* he accompanied Lactantius to Nicomedia, at the request of the Emperor Diocletian, and was celebrated for a metrical treatise on medicine.

Porphyry the less.

A notorious, although by no means gifted Poet of the age of Constantine was Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius. The compositions of this author, and the character of his life, do not make a very laborious search into the chronology of his time expedient; there is, however, a little confusion on the subject of dates, which we shall endeavour to rectify without reference to any of the various hypotheses invented for the solution of this difficulty. He appears then, in the year of the Christian era 326, to have addressed to the Emperor a gratulatory Poem on the occasion of the twentieth celebration of his accession. Before this time, however, he seems to have dedicated another Poem to the Emperor; for whose reception of which Porphyrius thanked him in a letter still extant. After these transactions he was banished, but was subsequently recalled in the year 328,† in consideration of a panegyric on his Imperial master. He appears to have been a person of some consideration, since he is styled in the Emperor's letter *frater carissimus*, and is thought to have exercised the office of '*Præfectus urbis*.'

The works of Porphyry are conceived with infinite labour. They are all subjected to some arbitrary law, being either acrostichs, or representing by metrical interlineations the form of a ship, a shepherd's reed, the monogram , or some fanciful device. They have, therefore, as may naturally be supposed, no other merit than that of ingenuity. He was probably an Epigrammatist, as some Epigrams by an author of this name are cited by Fulgentius.‡

* *De Scriptt. Eccles.* 30. *item in* Jovinian, lib. ii.
† Hier. *Chron. eo anno.* ‡ *De Cont. Virgil. et Myth.* ii. 4.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Under Constantine and his sons flourished C. Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus, a Spanish Priest, whose *Historia Evangelica*, in four Books of heroic metre, is still extant, remarkable for its minute fidelity and general purity, but written, like the Poem of Silius, "*majore curâ quàm ingenio.*" We scarcely know whether we are to class among the Poets an author of these times, Commodianus, who wrote in *accentual* hexameters a book of instructions for Gentiles, Jews, and Christians, still extant, and of course more remarkable for piety than elegance. An entire sense is included in short sentences, the initial letters of which, being joined in their order, give the titles of the stanzas or divisions. In the age of Constantius flourished Marius Victorinus, a native of Africa, who taught rhetoric at Rome, where he became a convert to Christianity. He wrote a Poem on the martyrdom of the Maccabees, some hymns, and some poetical commentaries. Hymns also are ascribed by Jerom to the celebrated Hilarius, and some of those which are still used in the Church of Rome bear his name; but, as Dupin conjectures, without sufficient foundation.* Damasus, Bishop of Rome, also claims notice as the author of several poetical pieces on the martyrs, and the Psalms; some of these are still supposed to be extant. The Poems commonly attributed to Damasus are mostly of an epigrammatic form. The life of Julian the Emperor was also written in verse by Callistus.† If we are to receive the critical as well as historical testimony of Jerom, we must suppose Matronianus equal to any of the ancients; but we have not the means of criticizing for ourselves. In the reign of Valentinian, Attilius, or Cæcilius Severus, wrote a book called 'Οδοιπορικὸν, which appears to have been a kind of Varronian Satire. The celebrated Ambrosius, Bishop of Milan, was the author of several hymns still used in the Church of Rome; and part of the controversy between his namesake of Alexandria and Apollinaris was conducted in verse.

Commodian. Victorinus. Hilary. Damasus. Callistus. Matronianus. Severus. The Ambrosii.

But the first eminent Poet who flourished after the reign of Constantine was Rufus Festus Avienus. The age and country of this writer have been disputed. Tradition or conjecture has assigned to Spain the honour of his birth; but this opinion is unsupported by written testimony, and even contradicted, if the inscription found in the Cæsarian villa refer to this Poet, which there seems small reason to doubt. From this we learn that he was the son of Musonius Avienus,‡ or the son of Avienus and descendent of Musonius, accordingly as we punctuate the first line; that he was born at Vulsinium, in Etruria; that he resided at Rome; that he was twice Proconsul; that he was the author of many Poetical pieces; that his wife's name was Placida; and that he had a large family. The same Epigram contradicts the notion, too precipitately grounded on some vague expressions in his writings, that he was a Christian; for it is nothing else than a religious address to the Goddess Nortia, the Fortune of the Etrurians. This conclusion is also deducible from a short metrical account which Avienus gives of his pursuits in the country, wherein he informs us that he employed a portion of every day in prayer to the Gods,§

Avienus.

* Dupin, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv. *tit.* Hilaire.
† Socrates, iii. 21.
‡ *Festus Musonî soboles prolesque Avieni.*
§ "*Luce Deos oro,*" is the reading of the best MSS. But some have "*manè Deum exoro,*" &c.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

as well as in Poetical pursuits; and his son Placidus, evidently, was not educated in the Christian religion, nor can it be supposed that he would have composed the following epitaph on a Christian father:

"SANCTO PATRI FILIVS PLACIDVS.

"Ibis in optatas sedes, nam JUPITER *æthram*
Pandit, Feste, tibi, candidus ut venias.
Jamque venis! tendit dextras CHORUS *inde* DEORUM
Et toto tibi jam plauditur ecce polo."

Jerom speaks of Avienus as of a recent writer;* we can scarcely therefore, with Crinitus, place him in the reign of Diocletian. The death of Jerom happened in 420, in his ninety-first year: on the supposition, therefore, that Avienus flourished about the middle of that father's protracted life, we have referred him in our chronology to A. D. 370, or the period of Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian.

His writings.

The extant and acknowledged works of this Poet are versions of the Φαινόμενα of Aratus and the Περιήγησις of Dionysius; and a portion of a Poem *De ora maritimâ*, which includes (with some digressions) the coast between Cadiz and Marseilles. The forty-two fables rendered from Æsop into elegiac verse, and sometimes ascribed to this author, are, by some Critics, assigned to FLAVIUS AVIANUS, a contemporary writer. The other Poems generally believed to be the work of Avienus are an Epistle to Flavianus Myrmecius, an Elegiac piece *De cantu Sirenum*, and some verses addressed to the author's friends from the country. A Poem, *De urbibus Hispaniæ Mediterraneis*, is cited by some Spanish writers as the work of Avienus;† but it is generally supposed to be the forgery of a Jesuit of Toledo. Serviust ascribes to Avienus iambic versions of the narrative of Virgil and the history of Livy; which observation of the Grammarian, together with a consideration of the genius and habits of this Poet, renders it not altogether improbable that he is the author of a very curious and spirited Latin epitome of the *Iliad* which has reached us, and which throws some light on the Poetical history of the time.

Incidental notice of Avianus.

Epitome of the *Iliad*.

State of the Poetical mind.

The revival (if so it may be called) of Poetical studies under the Byzantine Emperors and their western colleagues found the public mind in a very unfortunate condition. The spirit of slavish imitation (at no time foreign to the Roman character) had made active progress between the ages of the Antonines and Carus, and appears to have reached its crisis under Theodosius. The preposterous ambition of surpassing Virgil and Horace, which had long kept possession of the Roman Parnassus, was exchanged for an equally preposterous veneration of the great names both of Greek and Roman antiquity; and a blind consecration of the errors of distinguished writers depreciated the homage, as it multiplied the faults of their servile successors. Every literary character was a Poet, if the mere composition of verses can confer that sacred title; while every Poet was a literary character,—ambitious rather of showing his familiarity with the ancient classics, and his profound and indiscriminate admiration of all their pages, than of securing his own fame by the productions of a cultivated imagination. The *Periegesis* of Avienus, which most Critics call a liberal translation, might, perhaps, more properly be termed a servile original. Like his versions of Livy and Virgil, it was less a translation than a metaphrase; the timid performance of a writer who dreaded to explore an untrodden path, without the slightest intention of relinquishing those pretensions to originality, which, in the then corrupt state of Poetical taste, were as easily allowed as asserted.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

The prevalent passion for metaphrastic writing received encouragement from the circumstances of the times. When Homer and Virgil were less felt than revered, and more read than understood, it was natural that readers should desire a less laborious introduction to the destined objects of their admiration than an actual perusal of the authors. The whole substance of the *Iliad* in little more than a thousand very readable lines, could not, under such circumstances, fail to be acceptable. Hence the epitome of the *Iliad*, judicious in its selections, pertinent in its additions, and not inelegant in its language, attained to high reputation in the middle ages, was frequently quoted for Homer, and indeed remained, until the revival of learning, the only Homer generally known in the western world.

Valentinian.

Meanwhile the example, no less than the conduct of the Court, was employed in the encouragement of Poetical pursuits; although not without a tincture of that degenerate taste which prefers the amusements of ingenuity to the excursions of fancy. The composition of a nuptial cento was not regarded an unworthy employment by the Emperor VALENTINIANUS. So partial indeed was that Prince to these ingenious trifles, that we are still indebted to his authority for the similar combination of ingenuity and indecency perpetrated by Ausonius. GRATIANUS was also a Poet,* and received his education from this celebrated writer, who is supposed by the ablest Critics to have panegyrized his imperial pupil in the following lines:

Gratian.

"Bellandi fandique potens Augustus, honorem
Bis meret; ut geminet titulos, qui prælia Musis
Temperat, et Geticum moderatur Apolline Martem.
Arma inter, Chunnosque truces, furtoque nocentes
Sauromatas, quantum cessat de tempore belli
Indulget Clariis tantum inter castra Camænis.
Vix posuit volucres stridentia tela sagittas;
Musarum ad calamos fertur manus, otia nescit,
Et commutatâ meditatur arundine carmen."†

From the conclusion of this poem Achilles appears to have been the imperial theme:

"Sed carmen non molle modis: bella horrida Martis
Odrysii, Thressæque viraginis arma retractat.
Exsulta, Æacide! celebraris vate superbo
Rursum! ROMANUSQUE TIBI CONTINGIT HOMERUS."

But we owe a few words to the panegyrist himself.

Ausonius.

The most authentic particulars respecting DECIUS MAGNUS AUSONIUS are to be found in his own writings, and more especially in the second of his *præfatiunculæ*, wherein he treats the subject professedly. His father was a Physician, a Roman Senator, and Member of the Municipal Council of Bourdeaux, at which place the Poet was born. Had his education been solely confided to paternal attentions it is probable that no record of him in this place would have been necessary, as the senior Ausonius, although well read in Greek literature, was but indifferently acquainted with Latin; but, by the exertions of his maternal uncle, ÆMILIUS MAGNUS ARBORIUS, himself a Poet, and the reputed author of an Elegy still extant, *ad nympham nimis*

Incidental notice of Arborius.

* *In Epist. ad Titum*, v. 12.
† See Nicolaus Antonius, *Bibl. Vet. Hisp.* ii. 9.
‡ *Ad Virg. Æn.* x. 272 and 388.

* Aurel. Vict. xlvii. † *Epigr.* ii.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

cultam, and those of the Grammarians Minervius, Nepotian, and Staphylus, the disadvantages of our Poet's circumstances were abundantly removed. From these eminent men he acquired the principles of Grammar and Rhetoric; his success in the latter of these arts induced him to make trial of the bar; but the former was his choice, and in 367 he was appointed by the Emperor Valentinian, as we have already observed, tutor to the young prince Gratian, whom he accompanied into Germany the following year. He became successively Count of the Empire, Quæstor, Governor of Gaul, Libya, and Latium, and first Consul. He married Attusia Lucana Sabina, daughter of an eminent citizen of Bourdeaux, by whom he had two sons and one daughter. That he was a professed Christian can admit of no doubt; and some of his Christian pieces are so pious and beautiful, that he might have gained, the reputation of somewhat more, had he not disgraced his pages with language and sentiments unbecoming a Pagan of decency.

Writings of Ausonius.

The extant Poetical works of Ausonius are, 1. A book of Epigrams. 2. *Ephemeris*, or the transactions of a day. 3. *Parentalia*, tributes to the memory of deceased friends. 4. *Professores*, short metrical memoirs of the Professors of Bourdeaux. 5. *Epitaphia Heroum*, epitaphs of the heroes who fell in the Trojan war, and some others. 6. Tetrastichs on the characters of the Cæsars as far as Heliogabalus. 7. *Ordo Nobilium Urbium*. 8. A kind of drama on the seven wise men of Greece. 9. *Idyls*; Poems of the most multifarious kind. 10. Eclogues; principally astrological. 11. Epistles.

The poetry of Ausonius, like that of Avienus, is alike distinguished by poverty of argument, profusion of mechanical ingenuity, and imitation, or rather compilation, of the ancients. It is valuable, however, to the literary historian: its variety alone affords us a considerable insight into the state of Poetry in that age; and the station and pursuits of the author allowed him that familiarity with contemporary Poets which has imparted to his works the character of Poetical memoirs. Of this advantage we shall now avail ourselves.

Paullinus.

The most remarkable, on all accounts, among the poetical intimates of Ausonius was PONTIUS PAULLINUS, the celebrated Bishop of Nola, for such we shall consider him, until we know on what authority Gyraldus and Crinitus have grounded their distinction.* This pious and learned person was born in or near Bourdeaux, about A. D. 353, and was educated by Ausonius, who led him, as he himself informs us, to the mysteries of the Muses. On account of the paternal tenderness which Ausonius everywhere expresses towards his pupil, and the filial respect exhibited in turn by the grateful Paullinus, which sometimes induces them to use the words *pater*, *filius*, &c. it has been supposed that Paullinus was the grandson of Ausonius; but this opinion is improbable, and destitute of further foundation. He was certainly Consul, and that previously to his tutor; but as his name does not appear in the Consular Tables, it is probable that he was substituted in the room of some other. He afterwards was baptized by Delphinus, Bishop of Bourdeaux; and, having distributed his estate among the poor, settled at Barcelona, where he was ordained Priest on Christmas day, A. D. 393. From this retreat his tutor in vain endeavoured to recal him, and wrote, occasionally, in a strain of disappointed affection at his silence. These metrical letters received similar answers, abounding in terms of the most grateful respect and Christian affection. Paullinus afterwards accepted the See of Nola, and there remained till that city was sacked by the Goths, A. D. 410. It was probably at this time, and not on the invasion of the Vandals, which did not take place until forty-four years after, that the circumstance occurred which Gregory relates, that the Bishop, having expended his whole estate in ransoming prisoners, at length disposed of his person in exchange for the son of a poor widow, and was sent into Africa, where, his rank being disclosed, he was immediately restored. Paullinus married a lady named Therasia, of whom he speaks in terms of the highest affection. He enjoyed the friendship of Augustine, Ambrose, Martin, and many of the distinguished churchmen of that period. It is probable that he was the uncle of another Paullinus, author of a Poem still extant, called *Eucharisticon*.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

His writings.

The extant Poetical works of Paullinus are, 1. Epistles; 2. an Elegy to Celsus, and other lyrics; 3. a Sapphic Ode on Nicetas the Dacian; 4. an Epic sketch on the life of John the Baptist; 5. metrical version of some Psalms; 6. an Epithalamium; 7. some birth-day pieces. His hexameter history out of Suetonius has perished. Ausonius might have been sincere, when, speaking of the verses of Paullinus, he observed,

> *"Cedimus ingenio, quantum præcedimus ævo:*
> *Assurget Musæ nostra Camœna tuæ:"*

since in sentiment, and even in elegance, few will compare his stiff and puerile compositions with the natural, simple, and unambitious effusions of his pupil.

Delphidius.

A conspicuous acquaintance of Ausonius was ATTICUS TYRO DELPHIDIUS, whose history he has briefly sketched among the Professors of Bourdeaux. This Poet, at an early age, was a successful competitor in the Capitoline contest, and afterwards a candidate for the Epic laurel. Not content, however, with the tranquil retreats of the Muses, he embraced, apparently, the cause of Procopius, who rebelled against the Emperor Valens in 365; and, but for the intreaties of his father, Attius Patera, a celebrated Rhetorician, would certainly have lost his life. He afterwards taught Rhetoric, but with great carelessness; and died in the prime of life, without the affliction of beholding his wife and daughter adopt the heresy of Priscillian, for which the former was beheaded. Ausonius speaks also with great warmth of admiration of Proculus,* who refused to publish his verses; and of Alcimus Alethius,† a Poet, and writer of the life of Julian, but whether in verse does not appear. The Satires of Tetradius he prefers to those of Lucilius;‡ and Crispus he ranks with Horace and Virgil;§ but these eulogies are well understood. Theon, whom some represent as the intimate friend of Ausonius, and on that account charge the latter with gross familiarity in his epistles, seems really to have been only the butt of the Poet, who attacked his plagiarisms, his bad verses, his vitiated elocution, and even his personal defects, with an irony which, however transparent, not improbably prevailed on the imbecility of his victim to confide himself to the friendship of his correspondent, whose bad faith could only be equalled by his bad taste.

Proculus. Alcimus Alethius. Tetradius. Crispus. Theon.

By these gradations, under the cherishing influence

* See Gyral. *de Poet. dial.* v. Crinitus, *in vitâ*.

* *Epig.* xxxiv. ‡ *Proff.* ii. ‡ *Epist.* xv. § *Proff.* xxi.

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482.

of Christian sentiments and Imperial protection, the spark of Poetry, which long had mouldered unperceived amidst the wrecks of barbarism and contest, had awakened into a flame, which neither the rude breath of war, nor the chilling influences of ignorance, could utterly extinguish. Since the fatal day of Allia, never had the Empire suffered such reverses, as when the Augustan Muse revisited the light at the potent call of

Claudian.

CLAUDIUS CLAUDIANUS. This highly-gifted person was born at Alexandria in Egypt.* Few other particulars of his life have been preserved; but it is much to the honour of Honorius and Arcadius, the Emperors under whom he lived, that a statue of brass was erected to him. The following inscription, discovered at Rome, is supposed to have been the dedication on the pedestal:

CL. CLAVDIANI. V. C.

CL. CLAVDIANO. V. C. TRI
BVNO. ET. NOTARIO. INTER. CETERAS.
VIGENTES. ARTES. PRAEGLORIOSISSIMO.
POETARVM LICET. AD. MEMORIAM. SEM
PITERNAM. CARMINA. AB. EODEM
SCRIPTA. SVFFICIANT. ADTAMEN
TESTIMONII GRATIA OB IVDICII SVI
FIDEM DD NN ARCADIVS ET HONORIVS
FELICISSIMI AC DOCTISSIMI
IMPERATORES SENATV PETENTE
STATVAM IN FORO DIVI TRAIANI
ERIGI COLLOCARIQ IVSSERVNT.

ΕΙΝ ΕΝΙ ΒΙΡΓΙΛΙΟΙΟ ΝΟΟΝ
ΚΑΙ ΜΟΥΣΑΝ ΟΜΗΡΟΥ
ΚΛΑΥΔΙΑΝΟΝ ΡΩΜΗ ΚΑΙ
ΒΑΣΙΛΗΣ ΕΘΕΣΑΝ.

The Poems of Claudian, for the most part, consist of what might be called Epic sketches, did not their elaborate polish forbid us to use the name; but their brevity will scarcely admit them to the dignity of the Epopœia. These are, 1. the Consulship of Olybrius and Probinus. 2. The war with Rufinus. 3. The third, fourth, and sixth Consulships of Honorius. 4. Epithalamia. 5. The war with Gildo. 6. The Consulship of Theodorus. 7. The war with Eutropius. 8. The Consulship of Stilico. 9. The Gothic war. 10. A panegyric on Serena. 11. The rape of Proserpine. 12. The war with the Giants. Besides these, there is preserved a collection of Idyls, Epistles, and Epigrams, some of which can scarcely be genuine, as they are most strictly Christian; while not only Augustine and Paulus Orosius† assert that Claudian was a Pagan, but one of his own Epigrams, *in Jacobum, magistrum equitum*, sufficiently attests his contempt of the Christian religion. It is probable that these Poems are the work of

Mamercus.

MAMERCUS of Vienne, of whom Sidonius Apollinaris speaks in terms of the highest commendation.

Prudentius.

Contemporary with Claudian, (and scarcely, perhaps, a less illustrious name,) was QUINTUS AURELIUS PRUDENTIUS CLEMENS. This Poet has furnished us with sufficient particulars for supplying a tolerably connected view of his biography. According to Dupin's conjecture,‡ which has all the evidence of internal truth, he was born A. D. 398, at Zaragoza in Spain. Having a liberal education, he applied himself to the forensic profession, in which he so far distinguished himself as to be intrusted with the chief magistracy of two eminent cities, although which these were he nowhere informs us. By Honorius he was made a member of the Imperial guard. At the age of fifty-seven he devoted himself to the composition of sacred Poetry; and we are still in possession of the following productions of his pen:—1. *Psychomachia*, or the Combat of the Soul against Vices and Temptations, an hexameter Poem. 2. *Cathemerinon*, Hymns for each day. 3. *Peristephanon*, Lyrics in celebration of eminent martyrs. 4. *Apotheosis*, polemical, against various heresies 5. *Hamartigenia*, a treatise on the origin of sin. 6. A treatise against Symmachus. 7. *Enchiridion*. The history of the Bible abridged in tetrastichs. The last is, probably, the abridgement of a larger work, called *Dittochæon*, mentioned by Gennadius. The merits of Prudentius are very fastidiously overlooked. His style will certainly bear no comparison with that of Claudian, and scarcely with that of any of his contemporaries, who all felt themselves obliged to attempt the language of a happier period. Prudentius evidently wrote more for pleasure and for duty than for fame; and his Latin may be considered a fair sample of the real state of the language at the time of the Gothic invasion. But this defect is abundantly compensated by a vein of the most fertile poetical enthusiasm, and his Lyrics alone entitle him to honourable mention among Latin Poets.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482.

Rutilius.

A conspicuous poetical writer of this age was CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS NUMATIANUS, a native of Gaul, although of what place cannot be with certainty determined. His father was a man of rank, and Proconsul of Etruria. In the MSS. the letters V. C. are added to his name; by which is generally understood *Viri Consularis*; but as his name nowhere appears on the *Fasti*, and the passages adduced from his work point rather to the office of *Præfectus urbis*, Wernsdorf supposes this abbreviation to signify *Viri Clarissimi*. It is more probable that the passages alluded to led the transcriber into the belief that Rutilius had been Consul. Certain it is that the Poet enjoyed the office of *Præfectus*. The rest of his life is involved in considerable obscurity. His Poem called *Itinerarium*, descriptive of his journey to Gaul, was written in 417. He probably never returned. There can be no doubt that he was a Pagan when he composed this work; his manner of speaking of the Monks might indeed be used by a Christian; but a Christian of that time would have been careful to separate their fanaticism from his religion. His reflections on the Jews and their sabbath are equally convincing. Nevertheless, Wernsdorf entertains the strange supposition, that the *Christian poetry* of Rutilius came into the hands of Theodulf of Orleans, who mentioned him among other Poets of the church, in the following lines:

"*Sedulius*, Rutilius, *Paulinus*, *Arator*, *Avitus*,
Et Fortunatus, *tuque*, *Juvence tonans*."—iv. i. 13.

But assuredly Theodulf knew more of his metre than to

* Spain and Florence have claimed the honour of Claudian's nativity. But if his own testimony is of any value, he was certainly born in Egypt; and Suidas calls him Ἀλεξανδρεύς.

† Aug. *de Civ. Dei*, v. 26. Paul. Oros. vii. 34.

‡ This is one of the happiest in the records of philological criticism. The MSS. of Prudentius, in the preface to the *Cathemerinon*, read—

"*Irrepsit subito canities seni*
Oblitum veteris Messalinæ Consulis arguens,
Sub quo prima dies mihi."

Messalia has puzzled the commentators. The omission of a letter makes the sense clear,—*Me Salia*. Salia was Consul in 398

Biography. From A. D. 63. to 482. Poetry of the Vth century.

place Rutilius in such a situation. The name is certainly corrupt, and should be, most probably, Rutilus.

But the excitement which temporary patronage had afforded to genius was withdrawn, and the inundations of barbarism swept from the Roman world the fast-expiring ashes of the Poetic flame. The beginning of the Vth century witnessed the second decline of Roman Poetry, and the end of the same period its utter dissolution. Not, indeed, that there were wanting writers of Latin verses; but the language had been almost everywhere extinguished as a *native* dialect, and its purity so materially impaired, that the few who aspired to literary excellence wrote the language of a departed age. Few words will sum the Poetical history of this era, which is rather a barren catalogue than an historical narrative. To it belong MARCIANUS CAPELLA, author of the *Epithalamium of Philology and Hermes*, and some Epigrams; PROSPER TYRO, whose beautiful little address to his wife is still extant; SEDULIUS, who wrote a poem called *Paschale*, or *de Mirabilibus*, and some Hymns, still used in the Church of Rome; VICTORINUS of Marseilles, who composed the history of Genesis; HILARIUS of Arles, and DRACONTIUS, who wrote on the same subject, besides other Poems, now lost; PROBA FALCONIA, who compiled sacred Centos from Virgil; and ALCIMUS AVITUS, who wrote, toward the close of this century, Poems on original sin, the Creation, the word of God, the Deluge, the passage of the Red Sea, celibacy, &c. The latter Poet is one who deserves to be distinguished from this crowd, as does C. SOLLIUS. SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, author of three panegyrics, and a variety of other Poems; but their lives belong rather to Ecclesiastical than to Poetical biography. From this period we may date the extinction of all classical Latin Poetry. A Boëtius, Corippus,* or a Venantius, occasionally borrowed light from the contrasting darkness around him; but the reign of ignorance and barbarism was complete, until Petrarch and Dante called into existence from the ashes of the Roman Melpomene the less majestic, but not less beautiful, Erato of Tuscany.

Decline of Latin Poetry. From A. D. 63. to 482. Sidonius Apollinaris.

* A Poem by this author, called *Johannis*, has been recently discovered at Milan by M. Mazzuchelli. It is extremely valuable, as it affords information respecting a period wherein all other history fails. As a Poem it is not undeserving attention.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXVII.

RISE OF CHRISTIANITY.

History

HISTORY being the portraiture of Mankind (a subject which admits of two very different aspects,) itself obtains a corresponding difference in its design and character. It may represent Men merely as inhabitants of this world—considered in their relation to one another, as members of Families, Cities, and Empires. Or, again, it may represent them in their relation to an invisible state of things, and to the supreme invisible Being. Whichever of these views we contemplate in this great picture of Time, the most striking feature, doubtless, is the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ upon earth. For, considered merely in its results on the temporal condition of Mankind, neither Conquest, Legislation, nor Philosophy, has at any period affected Society so intimately, so extensively, and so permanently, as Christianity; while all that concerns our Heavenly connections seems important chiefly in proportion as it has been subservient to, or otherwise connected with, this institution. As the former view of the subject belongs to the province of general History, it is to the latter that our attention will be exclusively directed here.

In order to estimate the nature and extent of that change, which the Saviour's coming wrought on the Religious condition of Mankind, as well as the fitness of the means employed for effecting it, it will be necessary to take a brief survey of the state in which he found Religion. It is well known that, for many centuries preceding the Advent, all the world, except the Jews, a small and otherwise inconsiderable people, were not only in the grossest error on the subject, but without any authentic source to supply them with more correct information. An account therefore of the Religion of the Gentiles (as all other nations were termed in distinction from the one favoured people of God) will be rather an account of their *ignorance* than of their *knowledge*. But however widely removed from Truth are the opinions and practices which such an account must contain, it will serve the twofold purpose of instructing us in the sources of that ignorance, and of discovering the propriety of the Christian scheme, wherein Truth was so dispensed as to apply specially to the more important varieties of existing error.

Division into the Jewish and Gentile world.

Proceeding from the Religion of the Gentiles to that of the Jews, the need of the Gospel dispensation will appear not less in the state of their knowledge than in that of the Heathen ignorance. It was knowledge insufficient, not only in quantity but in kind; partial, not because confined to a few truths, but because the truths which it embraced were each designedly incomplete, and requiring some afterpiece of Revelation to render it intelligible and effective.

Rise of Christianity

Besides the Religion of the Gentiles and of the Jews, that of the Samaritans (narrow as was its extent and influence) will deserve some slight separate notice, owing to certain peculiarities in its origin and character, which distinguish it from the Jewish on the one hand, and still more from all the Heathen creeds and modes of worship on the other.

I. *Religion of the Gentiles.*

All Religions from one common origin

Were History silent, the concurrent traditions and fables of all nations concerning a chaos, a deluge, and a repeopling of the earth from a single family, would suggest the inference, that out of one origin proceeded the Religions of all the Gentile world. But this conclusion is more directly deduced from the Bible. At the dispersion of mankind after the attempt to build Babel,*

* The building of Babel forms the first great era in the history of idolatry. The work is described in the Bible, literally, as "a tower whose top was to the heavens," and the confusion as a confusion of "lip." Herodotus mentions the existence of such a building at Babylon in his time, and states that it was dedicated to the Assyrian Jupiter. Diodorus Siculus gives nearly the same account of it. Now, comparing these statements—the heathen with the sacred authority—we are perhaps warranted in interpreting the latter as denoting a tower whose top was dedicated to heaven as to an object of idolatrous worship, Jupiter being well understood by all to be the air or the heavens.

It is more agreeable to this view of it to understand the latter expression likewise in a different sense from the received interpretation; namely, as a disagreement in worship rather than in speech. The miraculous confusion of tongues is certainly not what we should suppose likely, from the strong marks which the several ancient languages retain of a common original, and of their difference being the gradual result of the dispersion. But a confusion of worship would be naturally enough considered as the means employed by

History.

the wanderers we know possessed a certain portion of Revelation, which they must have carried with them into their respective settlements; nor is it reasonable to suppose that this knowledge, however it might be neglected, would be soon altogether effaced. Limited as the compass of Sacred History becomes from that period, still it affords instances amongst the Heathen of Priests and worshippers of Jehovah. Such was Job, such was Melchisedech, such, possibly, we may add, was Potiphera the Egyptian, whose daughter Joseph married, as well as Jethro the father-in-law of Moses. In Balaam we recognise not only a believer, but one divinely inspired.

Without denying, then, the tendency, or the capacity of mankind to create a system of Religion for themselves, it may be fairly assumed that no period has yet occurred which has afforded an opportunity for the experiment. Certainly the ancient Heathen creeds could not have been originally the mere invention of Fancy, or the independent deductions of Reason, but rather the corruption of Revealed Religion—extending, it may be, in most instances so far, that in process of time the foundation should be concealed and buried under the superstructure. Nevertheless, any attempt to trace the origin and progress of false Religion, or any estimate of its character, which should have no reference to its connection with the true, would be as unreasonable as an inquiry into the formation of Language, which should neglect all consideration of a portion of it being co-existent with the gift of speech.

Reasoning from the Scriptural account of the several lapses of the Israelites into Heathenish worship, it would seem that Polytheism did not originally imply a disbelief in the unity of God; neither were the objects of false worship originally substituted for, or associated with, Jehovah. In short, they were not regarded as possessing a similar nature with his. Thus, when the people, despairing of the return of Moses from Mount Sinai, persuaded Aaron to make them Gods, both the occasion and the motive assigned, plainly indicate that the object represented by the Golden Calf was not intended as a substitute for the Lord, but for Moses; not a God, in the same meaning of the term as when it was applied to Jehovah, but one of his ministering creatures, of a different order indeed, but in this respect supposed to be such as by Divine appointment "the man Moses" had been unto them. "Up," (said they to Aaron,) "make us Gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him." And accordingly when the image was made, and the altar was built before it, still the proclamation was, "To-morrow there is a feast unto the Lord,"—meaning Jehovah.*

Original character of Polytheism.

That the Israelites then did not consider Polytheism as implying a disbelief in the unity of God will hardly be denied. That the Heathen originally adopted it under the same impression is also highly probable. But what, it may be asked, could have suggested to the early world, possessing as they did the knowledge and belief that God is one, a system so strange, and apparently incongruous, as Polytheism? Was it the mere wantonness of Fancy? or was there any doctrine of Revelation known to all, and thus liable to become perverted by all? Such a doctrine there is.—A belief in Angels and ministering Spirits appears in the earliest records of God's dispensations; nor can there be any difficulty in fixing on this article of belief as the point from which Religion first began to diverge into error, and superstition, and impiety. Men, for instance, attributing whatever blessings they received from God to the intermediate agency of his good Angels, would (if neglectful of the appointed preservatives against error) fall into an undue regard and reverence for these ministers of good. A kindly season, the rains which caused their corn to grow, the sun which ripened it, would become associated in their effects with some invisible superintendent, the agent and the creature of God. Hence the worship of the Heavenly bodies, of animals,* and of the various parts of Nature. In like manner, whatever great public benefactors arose, these would be supposed to be under the guidance of guardian Angels, either appropriated to the individuals, or to the society for whose welfare they laboured. The reverence and gratitude felt towards the men would lead to a veneration and worship of their supposed invisible guides. In time, the two would be confounded together, and the Human being and the guiding Angel would be handed down in History and Fable as one and the same person. By a similar abuse of Revelation, the doctrine of Evil Spirits would lead to a new class of Gods, such as the Persian Ahriman and the Grecian Furies, whose malicious disposition would require sacrifice and worship, in order to avert their spleen. The robbers, tyrants, and mighty "hunters" of the earth would be blended in traditionary lore with these, in like manner as the benefactors of mankind were with good Angels.

Rise of Christianity.

The doctrine of Angels and other ministering beings, the point from which true Religion diverged into false:

These associated with the heavenly bodies, and other striking features of nature:

Also with public benefactors:

And with persons eminently mischievous to society.

Idolatry would be the necessary and early result of these indistinct notions. An image, originally that of a man, (for to sensible objects only would images be originally applied,) would, in process of time, be transferred to the tutelary Spirit whose character was blended with his; and to the Deity, so represented, rites would be instituted, consisting partly of the sepulchral honours paid to the man, and partly of such as were appropriated to the tutelary Spirit. In the former we may see the origin of the impurities and immorality of Heathen worship; in the latter its impiety. Rites, commemorative of human benefactors, naturally contained some reference to those habits of life to which, when living, they had been most addicted. Hence, even in the memorials of the wise and brave, the warrior's grave would be stained with the blood of human victims, whilst the frailties and infirmities of the sage and legislator would be preserved in Bacchanalian revels, or in the filthy and disgusting emblems of the Phallics.

Transition to idolatry or image worship.

Idolatry the source of immorality as well as of impiety:

Nor was this motley adoration addressed to men alone. Whatever was admirable or useful in the whole compass of Nature, (it being once assumed that its effects on mankind depended on the exercise of a power delegated to one of the host of Heaven,) became invested with similar associations, and was adopted as

Not confined to human figures.

Providence to prevent the contemplated establishment of one great idolatrous Church and Empire in that early period.

It was, doubtless, in reference to the Heavens being the first and chief object of idolatry among the ancients that the Holy Scriptures open with the declaration, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;" thus claiming for Jehovah, what none of the heathen ever ascribed to their Deities, the creation of the world, and including in the work of creation all that men called Gods.

* *Exodus*, ch. i. v. 32.

* Unless, indeed, this was a later corruption arising out of the Mystical Philosophy, the instincts of animals being regarded as emanations of the Deity.

History.

Egypt notorious for brute worship: occasioned by their use of hieroglyphics.

symbolical of these unseen stewards of Providence. This was most remarkably the case in Egypt, where beasts, birds, reptiles, and plants became instruments of idolatry, and the works of Nature were made to answer the purpose of graven images and other artificial symbols. With the Egyptians, too, the use of hieroglyphic characters cooperated to produce the same effect. The ox, for instance, was an obvious symbol of husbandry; and an ox, distinguished by colour or by any other arbitrary sign, of him who was their first or chief instructor in agriculture. When ceremonies and sacrifices were appropriated to this public benefactor, and his human character had been lost or blended with that of a tutelary Spirit, the hieroglyphic figure under which he had been recorded in this monumental history would suggest in the living animal a still more appropriate and vivid emblem. Thus the ox would become to the Egyptian idolater what the work of Phidias or Praxiteles was to the Greek. Then a further process of association would produce further results. The Deity would in time be believed to be mysteriously combined with the animal; and thus the same principle which led at Athens to the banishment of him who was hardy enough to assert that the statue of Minerva was but a block of dull marble, made it sacrilege in Egypt to slay a cat or a stork.

Illustration and confirmation of the foregoing statement from the means used by Divine Providence to preserve the Israelites from false worship.

To advert once more to the case of the Israelites. The methods adopted by Divine Wisdom in the Mosaic dispensation, to preserve them from false worship, are highly illustrative of this view of its origin and early nature. That they might have the less temptation and pretext for worshipping any of the host of Heaven, Jehovah condescended to become to them God in both senses of the term, not only as the one, distinct, supreme, uncreated being, but also as the tutelary power presiding over their nation. "I am the Lord, *thy God*, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt," is a declaration which, considered together with the errors into which they so soon fell after their departure from Egypt, may be fairly interpreted as indicating, that in his dispensation to them he employed no ministering Spirit; with the same view, it would seem, that the remonstrance was made against their desire to have a King,* inasmuch as without a King they were likely to look more *immediately* to Jehovah as their governor, and guide, and judge. In several other peculiarities of their polity as directed by God, we may trace the same merciful† intent to remove from them a temptation which proved so fatal to all the nations of the world: in none more, than in the exclusion from their view of a state of future rewards and punishments, whereby their attention was fixed and limited to that portion of his dispensation, which with a more comprehensive revelation they might have rashly deemed the less worthy of him, and likely to be delegated to Angels or to men. Nor was it until the original character of idolatry, as practised by the nations around them, was changed and lost, that their Prophets were commissioned to point to a better country than Canaan, and a worse bondage than that of Egypt or Assyria.

Religion once corrupted soon became utterly depraved.

To this state of change and utter depravation the Gentile Religion rapidly advanced. The worship of God being once transferred to his creatures, henceforth Religion became liable to all the accidents and modifications of a mere human institution. Its claim to a holier name and a higher authority was admitted as a matter of courtesy, but proofs and title-deeds were lost. To the inquiring mind all was foolishness and fable, to the vulgar it was only custom. And thus it was handed down from one generation to another, sometimes the toy of fancy, sometimes the engine of State policy. Or, if the serious regard of any were arrested by it, as by an ancient monument of unearthly record, the characters on it were so worn, through time, neglect, and outrage, that all attempt to decypher them was fruitless, and all reasoning on their import conjectural.

Rise of Christianity.

It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the progress of false Religion through its various shapes was not the same among the several Gentile nations. It has been questioned, for instance, whether the Persians ever proceeded to image-worship, and it has been also asserted that the Scythians never did so. Among the Celtic nations, undoubtedly, (and they were probably of the same faith originally, as they were of the same stock with these latter,) idolatrous figures were first introduced by their Roman invaders. Egypt, on the other hand, luxuriated in all the refinement and subtlety of idolatry, so as even to excite the disgust and contempt of other nations.

Stages of corruption different in different countries.

> *Quis nescit Volusi Bythinice, qualia demens*
> *Ægyptus portenta colat? Crocodilon adorat*
> *Pars hæc; illa pavet saturam serpentibus Ibim.*
> *Effigies sacri nitet aurea Cercopitheci,*
> *Dimidio magicæ resonant ubi Memnone chordæ*
> *Atque vetus Thebe centum jacet obruta portis.*
> *Illic cæruleos, hic piscem fluminis, illic*
> *Oppida tota canem venerantur, nemo Dianam.*
> *Porrum et cæpe nefas violare et frangere morsu.*
> *O sanctas gentes, quibus hæc nascuntur in hortis*
> *Numina!**

Difference occasioned by certain national peculiarities.

And besides this difference of form and outward cast, which is observable in the different branches of the Gentile Religion, there are other characteristics belonging to each, more strongly marked, and more essentially distinct. Thus the Persian kindling his devotion in the blaze of an Eastern sun; the German and the Briton seeking it beside the blood-stained altar in the chilling gloom of a forest; the Egyptian carrying it about him like a disease, which rendered him morbidly sensitive to the supposed influence of the herb beneath his feet, and the reptile which crossed his path; the Roman combining it with war, triumph, or luxury; and the Greek with the Arts, with Poetry, and with Philosophy,—are worshippers differing not so much in the nature of the objects adored, as in the frame of their devotion, in the ties which bound them to their faith, and in whatever may be supposed to result from a combination of national peculiarities, imparting each something to Religion, and operating all to force it into that shape which might best accord with the whole national character.

Effect of Sculpture.

Among these sources of difference, none deserve a specific notice more than the Fine Arts, especially Sculpture and Poetry.

Brief mention has already been made of the probable rise and progress of image worship. Its result on the popular conceptions of the Divine nature is curious and instructive. Sculpture, of all the imitative arts, addresses itself most palpably and unequivocally to the

* 1 Samuel, ch. viii.

† i. e. merciful to mankind at large; for it should be borne in mind that God's favour to his chosen people was shown with a view to preserve Religion, not for them exclusively, but for all the world.

* Juvenal, *Sat.* 15.

History.

bodily perceptions. Let it represent what it may, its subject forthwith becomes material, its form must be defined, its substance measured, and to all incorporeal associations it yields unkindly and reluctantly. What wonder, then, that the great mass of a people, habituated from childhood to contemplate their deities so represented, should, in defiance of Reason itself, entertain no higher notions of the divine than of the human nature? One can hardly say how far such early impressions may retain their hold even on more enlightened and speculative minds; nor, with the existence of such a phenomenon, can we wonder at the doctrine which some attributed to the Stoics, that the Supreme Being was corporeal.

What has been here suggested will derive some support from contrasting the Greek and Roman superstitions with those of the Northern and Oriental nations. In the former a divine vision was somewhat familiar to mortal eyes, at best "the Gods came down to men in the shape of men;" but the Persian found no description immaterial and extra-human enough for his Genii and Peris; and in the still darker imagination of the northern enthusiast,

> "The mountain mist took form and limb
> "Of noontide hag, or goblin grim."

It is true that, with the highly-gifted idolaters of ancient Greece, Sculpture became not merely an *imitative* but an imaginative art. In their hands it went as far into the province of fancy and pure intellect as its nature possibly allows it to go. With them, therefore, its use for Religious purposes had not exactly the same tendency as with nations among whom it was more rude and uncouth. The brutal thirst for blood, for instance, instilled into the heart of the warrior who bowed before a monster like Bel, or Dagon, could hardly consist with the image of Mars, arrayed in all the beauty of art, and conveying the stern inspiration of war, softened and humanized by the medium through which it passed. It was like the fair hand buckling on the spur, or presenting the banner in the days of chivalry. Still all this was no corrective of that peculiar bias which the mind received from the habitual contemplation of sculptured deity; and in none more conspicuously than in the most refined nations has the wisdom of that restriction been justified, which forbade the Israelites, not the worship alone, but the most harmless use of images.

ffect of etry.

Still greater was the effect of Poetry. What Herodotus has asserted of Hesiod and Homer,* that from them the Greeks learnt their Theology, is nearly true of the earlier Poets of all nations. The ancient Heroes of each country form the first and natural theme of its bards; and these either had passed into the rank of Gods, or were intimately connected with others who had attained that eminence.

Embracing, then, as his subject Gods and departed Heroes, the Poet encountered a twofold difficulty. In his account of the Gods it required no slight exercise of genius or fancy to create a definite image of a divine nature, active, and employed in an appropriate sphere of activity, without exposing it to so exact a scrutiny as might betray the materials of which it was composed, and destroy the illusion. The task was doubtless easier where it was aided by the same efforts to the sculptor, but in all nations the method adopted was the same. They took as their basis a human being, and by amplifying its several qualities, and extending the sphere of their exercise, undertook to produce a God—a being not merely superior, but of a different nature from man. All their taste and ingenuity were put to the test in keeping out of view those qualities which might betray the real character of this pretended Divinity.

Rise of Christianity.

But a more trying task awaited the Poet, in his representation of man as existing in a future state. The popular creed admitted no idea of bodily existence in a future state, but only of the existence of the soul. How, then, were men to be brought on the scene divested of all which rendered them objects of perception? The same materials were again resorted to, and human nature was again moulded by the fancy into an immaterial essence. In the former instance it was a system of *amplification*, in this it was one of *diminution*. The disembodied man was described, by sometimes concealing one of his corporeal qualities, sometimes another, and so shifting the point of view as never to expose more at once than was barely enough to render the figure perceptible. For an illustration of this we may refer to almost any passage in the sixth book of the *Æneid*, or the twelfth book of the *Odyssey*. Thus when Virgil brings his hero into the presence of the Dardan ghosts:*

> *Ut* videre *virum fulgentiaque arma per umbras,*
> *Ingenti* trepidare *metu; pars* vertere terga
> *Ceu quondam petiere rates.*

He had made them see, move, and turn their backs. This was carrying the image almost too near; he therefore makes his escape at the close:

> *pars tollere vocem*
> *Exiguam, inceptus clamor* frustratur *hiantes.*

Homer, who was a more plain-spoken and inartificial Poet, by a whimsical contrivance allowed himself more latitude in his phantasmagoria; but, as if apologising for his boldness, he occasionally puts in an avowal, that what he has so dressed up as to seem flesh and blood has no more substance than a dream:

> ἀὐτη δ' ἶλιη ἐστὶ βροτῶν ὅτις κέν τι δόκησιν·
> Οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἶφι ἔχουσιν,
> Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τε πυρὸς κρατερὸν μένος αἰθομένοιο
> Δαμνᾷ, ἐπεί κε πρῶτα λίπῃ λιὺν' ἐσθλὰ θυμός
> Ψυχὴ δ' ἠΰτ' ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται.†

Now, these fictions being interwoven with the most vivid, if not the most serious notions of Religion, to the Divine nature was attributed all that was found in the human character—passions, prejudices, infirmities; and the stories which adhered to each God out of his true and original history as a man were perpetuated, and contributed still further to degrade the character of the Deities. Add to this, that so palpable were the fabulous ingredients which were mixed up with what was taught as serious truth, that the least reflection on the subject was productive of scepticism and disbelief. Hence the censure passed by Pythagoras on Hesiod and Homer, and hence the banishment of the latter from the imaginary Republic of the most poetical of Philosophers.

Poetry as a vehicle of Religious story fatal to its credit.

Similar to this was the effect produced on the belief of a future state. The efforts of the Poets, to make positive images of what only admitted of a negative

* Herod. lib. ii. c. 53.

* *Æneid.* lib. vi. v. 490. † *Odyss.* lib. xii. v. 217.

History.

description, reduced the notion of future existence to nothing. The rewards of the good were only shadows dealt out to shadows, and the punishments of the wicked the same. No wonder that the chequered scene of real life should be boldly maintained to be preferable to the fair but unsubstantial glories of Elysium, or even of the heavenly mansions.

Βυλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἰὼν θητευέμεν ἄλλῳ
Ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ, ᾧ μὴ βίοτος πολὺς εἴη,
ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.*

was a sentiment thought not unworthy of the high-minded Achilles by the Poet from whose works so many were content to derive their creed.

Credit of Religion maintained through the Mysteries.

From this view of the subject, it would appear that the Religion of the Gentiles must have lost ground from its connection with the Fine Arts and Poetry. In another point of view, however, (which will be briefly adverted to by and by) they made ample amends to it for the injury. It is time now to consider what provision had been made by the policy of legislators against these and other casual sources of irreligion.

This consisted in the establishment of those remarkable institutions, the Mysteries. Their origin has generally been attributed to Egypt, and their progress from that country to the rest of the Gentile world has been traced through the legislators or founders of States which Egypt either sent forth or instructed. Ac-

Conjectures respecting their origin.

cording to the conjectures of some, they were the invention of a crafty priesthood, employed in maintaining their influence by investing Religion with imposing and solemn circumstances. The author of the *Divine Legation of Moses* has, by the application of an immense body of learning to the subject, set them in the light of political devices, originating with the legislators, and designed to support civil society by inculcating the doctrine of a future state.

Probably the Priests devised these, or the institutions out of which they were formed, solely with a view to the support of Religion; and statesmen and legislators, observing the success of the stratagem, contrived to have them moulded so as to suit their political views. Cooperating with the Priest in the furtherance of his general object, they might both combine to give prominence to the great political doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment. In many instances, doubtless, the Priest would himself be the chief man of the nation, as was the case of old with Melchisedech, and of Anius, whom Virgil describes as

rex idem hominum, Phœbique sacerdos.†

One conjecture further may be proposed. If in these singular institutions was preserved, as there is much reason to suppose was the case, the only authoritative instruction of the Gentile world in the unity and distinct nature of God, might they not have owed their origin to the righteous remnant who, in the gradual encroachments of idolatry and false Religion, kept their faith, and would be likely enough to band together, and to form establishments of this kind? We read in Scripture that, at the period alluded to, "men first began to call upon the name of the Lord;" and if by this any secession and union of the faithful few be intended, the result of such associations would naturally be some form of symbolical or histrionic record, such as might give the groundwork of the Mysteries. Histrionic representation being the first rude mode by which men would express themselves, to records so preserved may be assigned an earlier date than to hieroglyphic symbols, or even to monuments.

Rise of Christianity.

Their general adoption by States and people widely different in their other customs plainly shows their importance to Religion, whether supported on its own account, or for the sake of good government. Everywhere the celebration of the rites was a secret, and the most awful penalties were affixed to the divulging of it. Everywhere also the secret was twofold, one for the great body of those who applied for admission, and another contained in a second initiation, reserved for a select few. In both some preparatory discipline was requisite, but in this latter it was rendered so inconvenient and even terrible, as to repress the curiosity or ambition of all, except those who from their rank in society, or from a higher tone of mind, sought it as a mark of distinction from the vulgar.

The secret twofold:

In this was displayed the policy of the institution. The Exoteric doctrine, contained in the first initiation, was essential to the support of the popular Religion, and of its great political feature, the dread of punishment after death. In this, therefore, was asserted the real existence of the Gods, the duty of public sacrifice and of obedience to the laws, as constituting a character meet for future reward.

The reason of this.

Those who were admitted to the second initiation, and instructed in the Esoteric doctrine, were intrusted, it appears, with a secret, which at first view might seem inconsistent with the alleged application and intent of the Mysteries; for it exposed the true nature of the Gods, and made a future state a dream. But it might have been deemed necessary or useful that the nature of the error should be partially known, so that there might be always a supply of persons the better qualified to preserve and tend it, from their very knowledge of its weakness. It might also have been deemed more prudent to confess the truth to bold and inquiring minds, than to allow men to discover it for themselves, and to make use of it as their own acquisition and property. On this principle we may perceive why Socrates declined initiation, and why this refusal was imputed to him as somewhat suspicious in his character. In this, then, the tales of Tartarus and Elysium were explained away into fable and allegory, and the soul was represented as a portion of the Divine essence in a state of temporary separation from its source, and destined to return to its original condition either immediately upon death, or after passing through certain migrations, the object and necessity of which was to purify it from all that was extraneous to it.

Whether the Gentiles derived any clearer views from the dispersed Jews.

Over all this scene of darkness, superstition, and fraud, the general dispersion of the Jews might be expected to have scattered some rays of truth. To this source has been traced the general expectation which preceded the birth of the Messiah. National vanity, and the approaching crisis of long-cherished hopes, might have prompted the Jews to disclose this part of the Scriptures, however reserved they might be on other topics of Religion. In their zeal for making proselytes, they might likewise have occasionally taught purer views of the Divine nature; but if so, their instruction was conveyed in such a manner as to create no higher notion concerning Jehovah than as of the tutelary Deity of their nation. Their boasted claim to his

* *Odyss.* lib. xii. v. 488.

† *Æneid.* lib. iii.

History.

peculiar care might have tended to encourage this misconstruction.

Unlikely from their belief in the supremacy of Fate.

One doctrine there was vaguely but universally handed to the Gentile world, which was inconsistent with more correct views of God than those above attributed to it. It was their belief in Fate, Necessity, or by whatever other name was expressed that mysterious principle, by which all that was divine or human was supposed to be controlled. Its supreme dominion was a main article in the popular creeds of all nations. It was supposed to circumscribe the free agency of the Gods themselves, and even to assign a term to their existence. Jupiter's high office, according to his poetical chronicler,* consisted in being chief dispenser of the decrees of Fate; and Prometheus is represented by Æschylus as solacing his spirit, galled under the tyranny of this Lord of Gods and men, by the reflection, that even this deity himself could not escape the sentence which Fate had pronounced on him. And that sentence was annihilation.†

The effect of this belief even on the creed of the learned was considerable. It was professedly maintained by the Stoics, and occasionally and perhaps unconsciously biassed the speculations of all Sects, even of those who discarded it from their systems, or refused to recognise its existence as an independent principle.

The notion of Fate considered further.

The term Fate, in its original import, is something uttered, a decree, a law, or expression of authority of some kind. To admit the existence of such a law involves the admission of two further truths,—that there is a being who framed it, and a subject to which it is applicable. Now if in its subject be embraced human affairs, (as was the Gentile doctrine,) and the law be not derived from God, nor controllable by Him, the being from whom it proceeds must at least hold divided empire with him; and the notion of one distinct and supreme nature is destroyed. Nevertheless, in this doctrine of Fate, however corrupted and abused,—in this universal impression of a supreme word which could not be reversed or gainsaid, we may possibly discover the last imperfect remnant of the true Religion, as it existed at the era when men first began to corrupt it.

Superstitious arts which seem to have been out of it.

With the Gentiles, however, it rather served to perplex their view of a Supreme Being, and gave rise to the most mischievous and artful contrivances of their Religion. Under a pretence of discovering the application of these eternal decrees to any given case, the wily, or enthusiastic, took on them the characters of soothsayers, augurs, and magicians. The abodes of those most famous for their skill became the seats of Oracles, and their art was transferred to their successors, and at length associated with the places.

Agreeably to this notion, few Oracles appear to have existed in the earliest ages of which there is any record, and the business of the Oracle was performed by the Soothsayer.

These arts differing according to the general character of Religion in several parts of the world.

These arts and fraudulent practices of course took a tinge from the general character of Religion as it existed in different parts of the world. Thus in Egypt, where the doctrine of the Metempsychosis was most prevalent, they were connected with magical rites, and the consulting of departed souls. In the East, where the heavenly bodies were worshipped and were supposed to represent demons and spirits, the wise men pretended to apply to these sources for their sublime information. So arose the practice and the name of Astrology. The flight of birds, and the character of the entrails in victims, (the materials of Augury,) betray in like manner the notion of the soul, the divine principle, migrating through the bodies of these animals; a doctrine not unknown to the ancient Etrurians, to whom is attributed the invention of this art.

Rise of Christianity.

Of all these, the influence of Oracles, originally the greatest, was the earliest overturned. Their extinction at the period of the Advent has been attributed to the miraculous expulsion of the spirits which presided over them on the appearance of Christ in the world. But there are natural causes to which it should be rather referred. The machinery employed in them was more complicated and clumsy, and less easily disguised than that used in the other similar arts, except perhaps that of magic. Besides which, all the arts of prescience had at some period or other enjoyed the patronage of the great Empires and States of the world. Such was the case with Oracles in Greece, with Magic in Egypt, Astrology in Chaldæa and the East, with Augury at Rome. But at the period concerning which we are now treating, Rome was all, and sole powerful. Augury being the national art was patronised by the Government; Astrology and Magic (although contrary to law) received a still more powerful support from the secret practice of individuals of rank, even of the Emperors themselves. Oracles alone having lost all accidental support fell into disrepute and disuse. Something like an allusion to this capricious transfer of credulity may be observed in those lines of Juvenal:

Cause of the cessation of Oracles.

> ——— *Quicquid*
> *Dixerit Astrologus credent a fonte relatum*
> *Ammonis, quoniam Delphis oracula cessant*
> *Et genus humanum damnat caligo futuri.**

Whether the errors of the Heathen received any correction from Philosophy before the rise of the Grecian Sects.

As long as the learning of the Gentile world was confined to the Priest, the Statesman, and the Lawgiver, it was uniformly employed in these and whatever other superstitious practices tended to maintain the popular Religion, and, through that, order and decorum. The Brachmans and the Magi might have despised the vulgar errors of their countrymen, but their more enlightened views were kept to themselves, or else cautiously communicated through the interior doctrine of the mysteries. But, in truth, as far as there is any ground for conjecture, the wise men of old, comprehending the Magi, the Brachmans, the Astrologers, the Druids, and even the far-famed Sages of ancient Greece, exercised their reasoning powers but little in investigating the truths of Religion. They were occupied in perpetuating and expounding immemorial traditions, rather than in pursuing independent inquiries by the light of Nature. They were Priests and Politicians, not Philosophers.

To this latter character none have any claim before the rise of those celebrated Schools of Greek Philosophy, which divided the learned world at the period of the Advent.

How far these were influenced in the publication of their opinions by ancient custom.

Yet even with these so strongly did the old custom operate, that in their teaching and writing they preserved a distinction similar to that which obtained in the Mysteries, and always framed an exoteric, as well as an esoteric system. Their genuine opinions on Religion

* Hesiod. † Æschyli *Prom.* v. 527.

* *Sat.* vi. v. 553.

History.

were intrusted as secrets to a few, whilst publicly they maintained the grossest doctrines of the popular creed. Nay, to such an extent did they carry this sense of duty as good citizens, that when Euemerus made the alarming discovery of the secret of the Mysteries, the Philosophers were the most active in replacing the veil which had been drawn aside; and much of that allegorical interpretation of the more absurd parts of the popular Theology was applied to this purpose, which has since exercised the ingenuity of one greater than the ancient Sages.*

The double doctrine of the Philosophers.

Owing to this double doctrine, the Religious views of the Philosophers exhibit an endless tissue of inconsistency, which renders it (even with this key) not always easy to discover what was their opinion as Philosophers, what their doctrine as good citizens; and to the age for which they wrote, it doubtless answered the purpose of keeping their light under a bushel.

Their speculations on the divine and human nature not always of a Religious character.

Besides, although they speculated much on the nature of God and of Man, yet these speculations were not always applicable to Religion. All Religious inquiry, strictly speaking, is directed to the nature of God *as connected with Man*, or again to the nature and condition of Man *as connected with God*. Metaphysical discussions on the Divine nature, similar to those in which an attempt is made to analyze or arrange the principles of the human mind, are sometimes indeed confounded with Religious views, but these are evidently compatible with the most complete denial of all Religion. Religious obligation arises not from the absolute nature of God, but from its relation to us. Accordingly Epicurus and his followers were content to admit the existence of a Divine Being, provided it was granted that he had no connection with the world. Velleius is introduced by Cicero as tracing the evils of a belief in Religion, not to the doctrine that there is a God, but to the doctrine that he is the Creator and Lord of the universe. *Dum Deum rerum auctorem facitis, imposuistis in cervicibus nostris sempiternum dominum, quem dies et noctes timeremus, quis enim non timeat omnia providentem et cogitantem, et animadvertentem, et* omnia ad se pertinere putantem, *curiosum, et plenum negotii Deum.* (*De Nat. Deorum*, lib. i.)

Now much of the speculation of the Philosophers was directed to this object, that is, to the absolute nature of God. It was indeed the chief, because it seemed the more scientific inquiry, and the other was only incidental.

Prevailing Sects at the period of the Advent.

The world, at the period in which Christianity was published to it, was divided among the opinions of the Epicureans, the Stoics, the Academics, and the Oriental Philosophy, which had risen out of an alliance between the School of Plato and the Eastern creed. To these may be added the Alexandrian School, although it was not until the close of the IId century that this last assumed its peculiar character and importance, in attempting to combine in one Eclectic system, as it was termed, the Christian doctrines, the tenets of the Greek Philosophy, and the fanciful theories of Egypt and of the East.

Epicureans.

Of these, the Epicureans denying the existence, or, what amounts to the same, the authority and providence of God, contributed nothing to the general stock of Religious knowledge. The remaining Sects, however at issue in other respects, agreed thus far, that the relation between the Divine and human nature was that of a whole to its parts; a doctrine which may be considered under two heads. First, as to the Divine essence; that it was the source of the human soul, and the principle into which it would, either immediately after death, or ultimately after certain stages of purification, return and be absorbed. Secondly, as to human nature; that it was partly mortal, partly immortal; destined in one sense to survive death, in another to be destroyed by it. Now both these views fell very far short of what is commonly understood, when the ancients are said to have admitted or discovered the existence of the one true God, and the immortality of the soul. As far as the mere expression goes, they doubtless acknowledged the existence of one God as unequivocally as a Jew or a Christian; but if by the term God they understood a being of a different nature from him acknowledged by Jew and Christian, their mode of expression cannot be reasonably urged as a proof that they coincided with enlightened believers in this fundamental article of faith. Now that this was the case is plain. Taking the human soul as a portion and a sample of the Godhead, their view of a Divine source could not have differed essentially from their view of the human soul; it was necessarily endued with parts and passions, and its nature measured and judged of by reference to ours. The Stoics are by some understood to have gone so far as to deem a body requisite for the existence of the Divine mind.

Rise of Christianity.

Theistical Sects.

Their view of the divine nature

Their notions on the second point were still further removed from what we are apt to understand, when it is asserted that the ancients admitted the immortality of the soul. In truth, the immortality which they inculcated was even inconsistent with the future existence of man *as man*. Far from implying any future consciousness of separate existence of happiness or misery, it amounted to this, that a portion of the Divine essence had gone forth, (which process the Platonists and Orientals illustrated by emanations and rays from the fountain of light, until they nearly confounded the thing represented with its image,) and that whatever substance it pervaded became endued with some modification of life or reason; and that the withdrawing and resuming this vital ray occasioned the phenomena of death. This taking place, the deserted mass of matter went to annihilation, or else returned to a chaos, to await another union with another portion of creative virtue. What has all this in common with the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection? or was it not but natural that men should consider that doctrine when preached to them as somewhat new, and contradicting all their preconceived opinions?

Of the immortality of the soul.

From this view of the Philosophical creed of the Gentile world, it will not appear essentially to have differed from the esoteric doctrines of the Mysteries. The credit and authority of those doctrines were nevertheless greatly shaken by their appearance in this new form. Removed from the old basis of tradition, mystery, and State authority, the unsoundness of their foundation became more apparent to vulgar eyes; and the endless variety of opinion which prevailed, without any acknowledged standard, gave a doubtful character to the subject, and deprived every view of it alike of the appearance of Divine sanction.

Accordingly, with the rise and diffusion of Philosophy, a disbelief and contempt of Religion increased

The di... common ...

* See Lord Bacon's *Wisdom of the Ancients.*

History.

Religious subjects by the Greek Philosophers unfriendly to the credit of the Gentile Religion.

and spread abroad. The ruin of social order began to be predicted in the further increase of Scepticism so produced. The wisdom of other nations was extolled, because they did no more than expound the traditions of their fathers, and the Greek Philosophy was stigmatised as the source of innovation, and as tending to unsettle men's minds. "Who," exclaims Ælian, "does not admire the good sense of the Barbarians, none of whom ever fell into the atheistical absurdities of Euemerus, Diagoras, Epicurus, *and other Philosophers?* No Indian, Celt, or Egyptian, ever questioned whether there were Gods, or whether they concerned themselves in the affairs of men."

In the same spirit Diodorus Siculus asserts, that "the Chaldæans acted more wisely than the Greeks, who, addicting themselves to disputation, were ever ready to embrace new opinions, and thus obliged their disciples to wander through their whole lives in perpetual uncertainty."

The popular systems of the heathen Religion generally disbelieved.

Not that the belief of the Gentile world was then first shaken, or only by these means. The history of the behaviour of their believers, under circumstances wherein faith is put to the test, is everywhere decisive against the existence of such a principle, to any great extent at least.* Thus the Athenians are represented by their observant and faithful Historian and fellow-citizen, as becoming more and more irreligious as the ravages of the famous Plague at Athens increased; † and Pliny, in his account of the eruption of Vesuvius, in which his uncle perished, records amongst the striking events of that awful scene a general distrust of Divine aid, arising from the notion that the Gods themselves were possibly involved in the impending ruin.‡

Why they were nevertheless adhered to.

Powerful ties there were which bound men to the Religion of their fathers; ties which only a Divine hand could have unloosed, but they were not the result of conviction. Religion had become, partly through accident, partly through the policy of legislators, interwoven into the whole system of public and private life. Never separated from the glories of war, or the repose of peace, it came to be considered inseparable from each. Its genius haunted every path of life, and adapted itself to every change of manners and circumstances. In the Theatre, the Circus, and the midnight revel, it continued as familiar to the degenerate Romans, as when it gave a zest to the rustic Festival, or animated the rude pageantry of a Triumph in their days of simple hardihood. The tasteful and imaginative Greek believed it, if belief it may be called, not for its own sake, but for the sake of Homer, and Phidias, and Apelles,—for the sake of the Bard whose song was voucher for its truth, and for the monuments of art, in which it stood embodied and enshrined. The suppliant who seated himself beside the household Gods, and placed on his knee the child of his enemy, calculated wisely on the principle which sanctified the Gods themselves to the father and the master of the household.§ Thus, too, the policy of the crafty Julian,‖ in his endeavours to restore the reign of Paganism, was directed, not to the conviction of men's minds, but to a revival of these broken associations.

Rise of Christianity.

Application of the foregoing remarks to illustrate the mode in which Christianity was first preached and received among the Gentiles.

With this view of the Gentile world before us, we shall be able to estimate how far they stood in need of a Revelation, what reception they might be expected to give to Christianity, and how the first Christian preachers were likely to shape their teaching, so as to render it acceptable or intelligible, and to guard against the errors to which the Heathen were most liable. All their systems, we see, were recommended and embraced, because they were useful, or honourable, or convenient. Christianity alone advanced the singular claim of being true, and of being adopted because it was true. Religion had not yet become the subject of *a creed*. Its evidences, a theme so familiar to Christian ears, sounded to the Gentiles as an idle topic, the discussion of which they could not understand to be necessary to the reception of a Religion. "What is Truth?" said Pilate to Jesus,* not surely in jest, as Lord Bacon would explain it, but as if he had asked, What mean you by speaking about Truth? what has Truth to do with the subject? It was indeed a new way of propagating a Religion, to invite converts not to conform to its institutions, but to *believe*, and to let their actions be agreeable to Truth; and nothing was more natural, than that Christianity should receive names expressive of this grand peculiarity, the Truth and the Faith.

Probable unwillingness to examine it to the evidence of its truth.

Prejudice likely to be strong against its claim to exclusive reception.

Independently, then, of any agreement or disagreement which the Gentiles might find between the doctrines of the Gospel, and their preconceived notions, they would be indisposed to attend to the proofs which were offered of its Divine authority. There was another unfavourable circumstance about its claims. It could not but seem unreasonable and presumptuous that one Religion should be expected to prevail all over the world to the exclusion of every other; and that too a Religion derived, as it appeared, from a small contemptible tributary of the Empire. Had the proposal been merely to have Christianity admitted as one among the many foreign systems patronised at Rome, the proposal would hardly have been rejected; and this indeed seems to have been actually contemplated by Tiberius, but it was deemed preposterous in the Christians to insist on an exclusive claim.

General expectation that an extraordinary person was about to appear.

Bishop Horsley's account of it.

There was one circumstance, indeed, which might seem likely to have awakened the attention of the Gentiles to a more candid and earnest consideration even of these unusual claims. It is well attested that, at the birth of our Saviour, a very general rumour prevailed that an extraordinary person was about to appear, and effect some great change in the condition of the world. Bishop Horsley, learned and ingenious on this as on every subject, accounts for it by supposing Prophecies of the Messiah to have been preserved, together with other records of the primitive Religion of mankind, in the Sibylline verses, and in other writings of a similar character.† Admitting that he has made out a plausible case, his theory is nevertheless liable to this objection, that it supposes the Prophecies derived from Patriarchal times to have been more determinate and more easily interpreted than the corresponding Prophecies recorded in Genesis, or even than those of a much later period. For if we imagine the case of the Scriptural Prophecies themselves being brought under the notice of the Gentiles in the same

* See Whately's *Essays on some peculiarities of the Christian Religion.*

† Thucyd. lib. ii. c. 53. ‡ *Epist.* lib. vi. ep. 20.

§ See the description of Themistocles taking refuge with Admetus. Thucyd. lib. i. c. 136.

‖ See *Orat.* v. p. 161, and his insidious contrast between an attachment to the *Ancilia* and the Cross. (*Apud Cyril.* lib. vi. p. 194.)

* St. John, ch. xviii. v. 38. † See *Dissertation.*

History.

manner as the Sibylline verses were, the Gentiles would never surely have elicited even from them the alleged expectation, embracing as it does the precise period of the Messiah's appearance. Perhaps, too, it may be fairly questioned, whether the records of the Patriarchal era would not in all likelihood have been handed down in the histrionic form, such as the Mysteries, or by means of rude monuments, rather than as "the Sibyl's leaves." Whether indeed the character and contents of these strange productions were really and altogether such as they are represented, is itself a point on which the inquirer has no means of judging for himself, inasmuch as no specimen of the genuine Sibylline verses has been preserved.

What strikes us most forcibly in this prophetic view of the Heathen world is, that not only an event corresponding to the Messiah's Advent should be anticipated, but also the exact period of its accomplishment. It is not indeed improbable, that by astronomical observations alone the Eastern sages were guided in their visit to the holy infant. Still this will be to suppose that the wise men were otherwise acquainted with the destined birth-place of him who was expected, and will require a different account of the matter from that which has been given.

Another account of it.

Those, then, to whom Bishop Horsley's view shall seem unsatisfactory, may be disposed to refer the origin of the expectation (at least as regards the Eastern nations) to the Jewish Scriptures. Tacitus and Suetonius, it is to be observed, limit to the Eastern world the expectation of an universal monarch arising thence; and nothing is more probable than that the Prophecies of Daniel especially should be familiar to the Persian Magi.

It is remarkable that the Jews, from the period of their being intrusted with those Propheeies which would be most intelligible to the Heathen, were, as if by special appointment, brought more immediately into intercourse with the most powerful and influential nations of the world,—with the Assyrians and Babylonians, with the Persians, with the Greeks, and lastly with the Romans. Of these, the Greeks and Romans, it may be said, were little likely to have studied the sacred volume, even had their attention been solicited to it by those in whose hands it was deposited. Yet even these could hardly fail of imbibing some notion of the Messiah, and of the fulness of the time from the conversation of the Jews, who were everywhere resident amongst them. National vanity, and the ardour of a hope such as theirs about to be fulfilled, must have tempted them to descant on this, however reserved in general on Religious topics; and the more as the fated period drew nearer. The notion having once gained ground among the Gentiles, they would naturally enough see it intimated likewise in their national Oracles, whose number, variety, and generality, fitted them to furnish almost any view of any subject. Thus the attention of men being once directed to the topic, the vague descriptions of the Sibylline verses might have been applied to a specific time and person, and become useful for the intrigue of the Politician,* or the delicate flattery of the Poet.†

* It was brought forward at Rome, and applied to Julius Cæsar, with a view, as it would seem, of preparing the public mind for his assumption of Royalty, when a fit occasion offered.

† See Virgil's *Pollio*.

Rise of Christianity.

Why Christianity received no support from this expectation

Viewing this general expectation of the Heathen world, then, as derived either directly or indirectly from the Holy Scriptures, we shall be at no loss to account for the small influence it had in exciting the curiosity of the Gentiles to inquire more eagerly concerning the expected Great One, of those who proclaimed him as having now appeared, and as having sent them forth as his delegates. He who was to come would be viewed through the prejudiced medium of Judaism as a temporal Prince. But the obscure birth of Jesus, his unambitious course of life, and his meek submission to a humiliating death, seemed at once to render the Prophecy inapplicable to him. None other appearing to claim its application, according to this view, it was probably soon forgotten or disregarded. No appeal, at least that we know of, was ever made to it by the Apostles, nor do any of the Gentiles to whom they went, appear to have connected their mission with it.*

As to the Gospel itself, its doctrines and its precepts, the facility with which the Gentiles would understand or embrace them, would of course depend much on their existing views of Morals, of the Divine nature, and of a future state.

Its moral precepts generally such as to meet with a ready reception.

In the systems of the Greek Philosophers they possessed Moral rules, the close agreement of which with the Gospel precepts could not but cause the latter to be familiar, and ensure them a favourable reception. Here was the proper sphere of Reason, and she had done her part nobly. It is not perhaps too much to assert, that, with the exception of forgiveness of injury and of humility, the heathen sketch of the moral character (such as is found, for instance, in the *Ethics* of Aristotle) required no feature to be added, but only some correction and a higher finish.

Evidence to the truths of the Gospel arising from this agreement of its precepts with the conclusions of unenlightened Reason.

This, be it remembered, detracts nothing from the character of the Gospel. To deny it, were indeed to wrong Religion and its inspired teachers, in more respects than one. For, first, if the Gentiles had not the faculties to enable them to arrive at just notions of their duty, how could they be chargeable with that sinfulness which St. Paul imputes to them? Again, what right has the Christian advocate to recommend the Gospel on the score of its morality, if from the Gospel mankind first learnt what morality was? It is only arguing in a circle. The truest statement will always be found the most favourable to the Gospel of Truth.

Repugnance likely to be felt to the view of Morality as connected with Religion

The connection between Religion and Morals is another matter. To this indeed the Gentiles were strangers, and not easily to be reconciled. What Josephus has asserted of his countrymen was still more applicable to the Christians as contrasted with the heathen. Others made Religion a part of Virtue, they made Virtue a part of Religion. The duties of sacrifice, of prayer, and of reverence for the Gods, implied no obligation to practise Virtue; and the observance of these duties was no otherwise connected with moral behaviour, than as it constituted a part of the character of a good citizen.

There was withal a deep-rooted prejudice concerning the dignity of human nature. Men were supposed capable of raising themselves by merit to the highest scale of existence, and of deserving to be numbered with the Gods.

* It was again brought into notice by the rebellion of the Jews, who were said to have rested their hopes of succour on it; and it was then applied to Vespasian and Titus. See Tacit. *Hist.* lib. v. c. 13.

History.

Hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules
Enisus, arces attigit igneas. Horace.

Macte novâ virtute *puer* sic itur ad astra. Virgil.

And to any doctrine which should detract from the self-sufficiency of Virtue

That virtue should not be *entitled* to reward; that the good should find a place in heaven, not as their natural right, but as a favour; and that a great and mysterious atonement was requisite for the sins of each and of all, these were doctrines not merely unacceptable, but almost inconceivable.

Enough has been already said of the prevailing notions concerning the nature of the Gods, to show that they were familiar with the conception of a Deity assuming the form and body of Man. The doctrine of God manifested in the flesh, would not, therefore, be likely to startle them, nor do we accordingly hear of any surprise or scruple which it occasioned. At the same time, nothing could be more revolting to their natural views of such a Being, than that he should lead a life of humiliation and persecution, and submit to an ignominious death. It was Christ *crucified* that was "foolishness to the Greeks."

Whether the notion that the same Deity might become more than one object of worship might have affected their reception of the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity.

Another popular view which the Gentiles entertained concerning the nature of a Deity, must not pass unnoticed. It is well known that in the common belief of Greece, Diana, Hecate, and Luna, were held to be different objects of worship, and yet one and the same Deity. The Jupiter and Apollo of one place could not always be blended with the Jupiter and Apollo of another,* yet was there only one Jupiter and one Apollo. A striking illustration of this may be found in Xenophon's account of the retreat of the Ten Thousand. He had made a vow to Ephesian Diana of a portion of the spoils of war, and he fulfilled it, according to his own account, not by sending these gifts to Ephesus, but by consecrating a τέμενος for the purpose, to Ephesian Diana in Greece.†

How far this notion may have operated in enabling the Gentiles to understand, or in disposing them to listen to the Christian preachers, who taught that there was one God, and that he was to be worshipped in the person of God the Father who created all the world, of God the Son who redeemed all mankind, and of God the Holy Ghost who sanctifieth all the elect people of God, the Christian reader may determine for himself. Certain it is, that no Scriptural truth is more clearly taught than this. It is equally certain, that while for so many centuries of all the Christian doctrines that of a Trinity in Unity has been considered as the most obscure and mysterious; in the records and writings of the Apostles, there is not a trace of any scruple which it created—it seems to have called for no explanation, and is not even spoken of as a mystery.

Rise of Christianity.

Contempt which their preconceived notions were likely to inspire of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection and a future state.

That a general disbelief of a future state prevailed, has been already stated. The subject had indeed long ceased to furnish any serious argument for hope or fear. When Pericles is represented by the Historian as exhausting every topic of consolation in his eloquent address to the surviving friends of those who had fallen in battle, he speaks of their glorious memory, and of the parents' hope that other sons may be born to fill their place and emulate their worth, but not one syllable is there of their future life and immortality.* Cicero acknowledges that the Epistle of Sulpicius on the death of Tullia comprehended every argument for comfort which the case admitted,† yet we search that Epistle in vain for the slightest allusion to the one topic‡ which would have been uppermost in the mind of a believer, professedly consoling a father for the loss of his daughter.§

It was, therefore, nothing wonderful that St. Paul should be mocked by his Athenian audience for preaching Jesus and the resurrection.‖ The doctrine seemed beneath their serious notice, and was despised for its apparent absurdity. And this, not merely because it was disbelieved, but because men's minds had never been accustomed to it, even in the fables of Elysium and Tartarus. A bodily resurrection was unheard of, the idea of man's identity in a future state was altogether new; and heathen records agree with the statement of the Bible, that it was Jesus Christ who brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel.

* Thus Herodotus, enumerating the privileges of the Kings of Sparta, distinguishes the Priesthood of the Lacedæmonian Jupiter from that of the Heavenly Jupiter. *Erato*, c. 56.

† *Anab.* lib. v. c. 3.

* Thucyd. lib: ii. c. 35, *et seq.*

† *Ea scripsisti quæ levare luctum possent.*

‡ *Quod si etiam inferis sensus est*, &c. is a mode of expression which conveys more than a doubt that the dead were sensible of joy or sorrow. The introduction of the remark too, without a single suggestion of Tullia's immortal destiny, proves not that Sulpicius was a sceptic, but that he considered the mention of it as unfit for a serious argument.

§ Ciceronis *Epist.* lib. iv. ep. 5 and 6. ‖ *Acts*, ch. xvii. v. 23.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

RISE OF CHRISTIANITY.

History.

In estimating the state of Religion among the Jews at the period of the Advent of our Saviour, two points of inquiry must be kept distinct: the one, what their Law and Prophets would seem designed to teach them; the other, what they actually did learn from these sources. That the Jewish Scriptures were so interpreted as to render the promised Messiah unacceptable to the great body of the people, is plain from a cursory perusal of the Gospels. It is equally plain that the Jewish Scriptures were calculated to produce a quite contrary effect. With reference, therefore, to this, and to other points, it will be necessary to consider both the Jewish dispensation in itself, and as it was received by the People at large, and by the various sects which existed amongst them.

Allegorical nature of the Jewish Religion.

In God's occasional communications with any people or individual of old, his messages were conveyed as much by signs and types as by words. Of a practice so well known, no example or illustration can be necessary. Agreeably to this method, we find the Religion of the Jews deposited, partly in their Scriptures, partly in ceremonies and institutions, and the service required of them consisting even more in representation than in verbal expression. They sacrificed more than they prayed. Instead of a form of words annually addressed to Heaven on account of their deliverance from Egypt, the scene was annually represented by the ceremony of the Passover.

Its objects.

A Religion so constituted would naturally contain a vast body of rites, many of them in themselves trivial and unmeaning, and deriving importance and significance only from being viewed as symbols. Had the Ceremonial Law, indeed, been composed of rites and observances important or more than trivial in themselves, those who practised them would have been still more likely to regard them as valuable on their own account, and not for the further object to which they pointed. Considered thus, then, the ceremonial portion of the Law will appear as another mode of conveying the same instruction as its verbal precepts. It was unto each man "a sign upon his hand, and a memorial between his eyes, that the Lord's law might be in his mouth."* Some of its ordinances, no doubt, had reference to the idolatrous practices of the neighbouring Gentiles, concerning which our information is too imperfect for us to estimate fully the fitness of those ordinances. Others again were obviously lessons of Morality and Piety. A third, and the most important class, were calculated to prepare the nation for a candid and ready admission of the Messiah's claims, and of the Christian revelation. One or more of these objects was probably intended in each rite, however trivial.

Rise of Christianity.

The minute directions, for instance, respecting the treatment of lepers. To the Jews these directions furnished a sort of histrionic sermon, displaying the foul nature of Sin, its contagious character, the precautions requisite to enable the healthiest and strongest minds to escape its influence; lastly, its offensiveness to God, and the necessity of a mysterious cleansing and sanctification by blood. In all cases of legal defilement, purity was to be restored by the intervention of a High Priest, by the offering of a sacrifice, and (whenever it was practicable) by the blood of a victim. The continual repetition of these scenes was like the continual reading of Moral and Religious lessons to the Jews, in a language agreeable to the habits of the most ancient times, and therefore impressive and intelligible. And if these rites did not actually convey a notion of the one great High Priest, who was to cleanse all mankind from moral defilement by the sacrifice of himself, yet they were calculated to habituate the Jews to that way of thinking which should render the doctrine nothing strange and revolting, but on the contrary highly natural and acceptable.

Nevertheless, Christ crucified was to the Jews a stumbling-block, which must have been owing to some wrong bias which their minds received from those who pretended to guide them in the interpretation of the Law and the Prophets.

Causes which led to their misinterpretation.

To explain the nature and origin of this bias, two passages of Jewish History must be brought under notice. The one is the intercourse between the Jews and the Gentiles, especially the Egyptians; the other is the rise of the Traditional Law into supreme authority.

Connection with Egypt.

I. As early as the period of the Babylonian captivity some settlement of the Jews in Egypt appears to have been formed. At all events, from the foundation of Alexandria they began to be established there in great numbers. The illustrious founder of that city allowed them a share of privileges in common with his Macedonian colonists, and the free exercise of their Religion; and his liberal policy towards them was continued by

* *Exod.* ch. xiii. v. 9.

History. his successors. Increasing in numbers and importance, they at length obtained permission to build a temple for themselves at Leontopolis, in order to avoid the inconvenience attending the yearly resort of so many to Jerusalem. This was a most important step. Weakening the ties of filial dependence by which the Jews of Egypt were bound to the Holy City, it was the occasion of their becoming more devotedly attached to the place of their abode, and more liable to the mischievous effects produced on their faith by their connection with it. They now began to imbibe many of the absurd fancies of the Heathen Philosophy, so much cultivated at that time at Alexandria, and blended it in their view of their own sacred doctrines. Accustomed to contemplate a secondary meaning in their Law and Prophets, they too readily yielded to the seduction of the famous Platonic School of Alexandria, the aim of which was, by allegorical interpretation, so to adapt itself to every other system, as that both should appear consistent and the same—a method afterwards practised with the like success on Christianity. This *cabalistic* doctrine, as it has been called, soon spreading from Egypt to Judæa, the Jewish creed, both at home and abroad, became not a little changed and distorted by the artificial light thus thrown on it. Allusions to particular features of the corruption so caused, as it affected Jews and Christians, may be occasionally recognised in the New Testament; as, for instance, in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel.*

Platonic School.

As the period of the Advent drew nigh, the rest also of the Gentile world became so interspersed with Jews, as to justify almost a literal acceptation of St. James's assertion, that Moses had in every city them that preached him.† Yet it does not appear that the Jewish creed was generally affected by this varied intercourse. Egypt, at least, was the channel through which any foreign impression was conveyed. There was a fatality in the connection of the Jews with Egypt, and when it ceased to be a scourge it continued to be a snare to them.

Probable reasons for the permission of this intercourse with the Gentiles.

At the same time, it must not be supposed that the intercourse between the Jews and Gentiles was productive of unmixed mischief to the former. Part, indeed, of the scheme of Providence, in extending that intercourse so greatly at that precise period, might have been to afford the Jews, as well as the Gentiles, an opportunity of acquiring more preparatory light than either enjoyed, for the glorious scene which was approaching. And although this opportunity was not generally embraced by either, there were, doubtless, many, both of the Jews and of the Gentiles, on whom it was not lost; many among the Jews, such as Simeon and Anna; many among the Gentiles, such as the good Centurion and Cornelius. From this intercourse the Gentiles might have derived clearer notions of the character of that universal Lord who was expected to arrive out of the East, if, indeed, the expectation were not wholly derived from that source. On the other hand, the Jews might have been roused to search their Scriptures for the true account of certain matters on which the Gentiles speculated largely, and which were so imperfectly revealed to the Jews as to be likely to be unnoticed without some call for investigation—as, for instance, the doctrine of a future state. How much the publication of the Gospel was facilitated by the establishment of the Synagogues in every great city is obvious; and this, too, was not an exclusive benefit to the Gentiles, for the Jew abroad was likely to be more free and fearless in submitting his mind to the humiliating truths which were to be disclosed, inasmuch as he was removed from the chief seat of national prejudice, and was unawed by the presence of that authority which upheld it.

Rise of Christianity.

II. Of the true origin of the Traditional Law there is no certain account, which is remarkable, considering that it constituted the main line of separation between the contending Sects. According to its advocates, it was delivered by God to Moses on Mount Sinai, together with the Written Law, and was therefore asserted to be of equal authority with it. Their opponents contented themselves with refusing assent to this statement, without, however, either denying the antiquity of these Traditions, or assigning them any specific source or date.

Traditional Law.

It is probable, from this uncertainty, as well as from the character of the Traditions themselves, (for, if they have been faithfully recorded in the Talmuds, they are little more than a tissue of minute rules superadded to those in Scripture concerning the observance of the Ritual Law,) that they were the gradual accumulation of many centuries. Originally, perhaps, mere directions for determining matters left indeterminate in Scripture, they acquired from usage and habitual compliance an equal authority with the Law itself. Be it as it may, the enlargement of the Ritual Law suited well with that bias of mind in the nation at large, which in those latter days was more fully displayed in the character of the Pharisee—a tendency, namely, to forget the twofold nature of the Law, and to consider that as valuable on its own account, which there was every reason to believe was only valuable from its reference to some other object, even although that object might not always have been clear and distinctly to be seen. Going then on the principle, that the works of the Law were to be regarded as an ultimate and independent object, that its intent was to make the comers thereunto perfect, not to shadow out the good things appointed for that purpose, the Traditionist thought, consistently enough, that by adding rite to rite, and rule to rule, he should enlarge the sphere of meritorious conduct. And if the written Law contained *enough* for justification, the superadded value of the works of the unwritten Law would be more than the purchase of Divine reward.

Its probable origin

Its effects.

This was the righteousness of the Pharisees, the most considerable Sect at the period of the Advent. They were the class into which the learned naturally fell, and being reverenced for their Scriptural erudition, and for the strictness of their lives, the great body of the people was content to subscribe to their doctrines, and to adopt their views of Scripture without aspiring to be Pharisees in holiness any more than in learning. On them the vulgar gazed, as on men whose righteous attainments went so far beyond what was needful as to be admirable rather than good, and beheld them in their long fastings, their reiterated prayers, and their profound meditations, advancing ever, as it seemed,

The Pharisees.

* St. Paul's instruction to Timothy (*Tim.* ch. iv. v. 7) might have contained a similar allusion, as well as that to Titus, respecting "the Jewish fables," and "the foolish questions," μωρὰς ζητήσεις. *Tit.* ch. i. v. 14 and ch. iii. v. 9. The "endless Genealogies," mentioned in both epistles, meant very probably the fabulous generations of the Æons.

† *Acts*, ch. xv. v. 21.

History.

from superior to supreme sanctity.* It will be readily conceived, that to such men the doctrine of good works being insufficient and ineffectual for salvation, and of the necessity of atonement for the sins of all, would be light too distressing for them to open their eyes upon without a painful effort; and that they would for the most part be obstinately blind (as our Saviour termed it) from purely moral causes. And what must have been the result on the people who were under their guidance? The Pharisees bade men, indeed, conform to the Law, and especially to the Ceremonial Law, but they took away the key of knowledge that unlocked its mysterious meaning, or else substituted for its true secondary meaning something that was fanciful and foreign. They enjoined obedience to the divine precepts, even to the letter of the commandment, but whenever obedience proved inconvenient or hard, some one of the numerous Traditions (the divine source and authority of which they maintained) was readily found to nullify its force, to render it of no effect.

The Sadducees.

It might have been expected, that the Sect which professedly stood forth to oppose the corruptions of the Pharisees would have done something towards bringing the Jews back to a purer view of their Scriptures. But this was very far from being the case. The Sect alluded to—that of the Sadducees—is the only other (Religious Sect, at least) noticed in the New Testament. These pseudo-reformers rejected, indeed, the Traditions of the Pharisees, but they continued to look as blindly as their opponents on the genuine Scriptures; and they have even been charged with denying the authority of all except those written by Moses. This, it must be confessed, does not appear probable; at least such a tenet would seem inconsistent with the office of the High Priesthood, from which it is certain that they were not excluded. Nor, again, is it likely that in their controversy with the Pharisees, the latter would have appealed to the Prophets, unless the Prophets had been acknowledged as authority by both. The Sadducees were in truth free-thinkers and scoffers; a society which was the receptacle of all who were willing or able to free themselves from the restraints of Religion. The Sadducee was the rich sensualist, and the man of the world; and his tenets were, doubtless, pliable enough not to interfere with his promotion to the highest office in the Jewish Church.

It is observable, that one of the distinguishing features of a Sect so characterised should be the assertion of man's good and evil destiny, as dependent entirely on his own exertions. Whilst the Pharisee contended for a fated course of events, so contrived however as to be compatible with a free agency in man, the Sadducee maintained that he was left altogether to himself, to work out his own happiness or misery. And yet (notwithstanding his belief in those Scriptures which represented reward as attached to Virtue, and punishment to Vice) he lived the life which, *a priori*, would be assigned to the fatalist. So requisite does it seem, from every experimental view of human conduct, that other motives to the practice of Virtue should be added to the hope of reward, and the fear of punishment.

Rise of Christianity.

The doctrine of the Sadducees took its rise, it is said, from a refinement which their founder, Sadoc, made on the teaching of his master, Antigonus Sochæus. The latter had been wont to dwell on the duty of serving God, not like a slave with a view to reward and punishment, but from disinterested motives.* Upon this Sadoc built his theory, that no reward or punishment would be distributed in a future state. From this point it was a very easy step to the denial of man's immortality, and that was as easily followed up with a denial of the existence of Angels and of Spirits.

The Essenes.

Where and when the fraternity of the Essenes was first formed is not clearly made out. Most probably they owed their origin to Egypt, where the Jewish refugees who fled for security after the murder of Gedaliah were compelled, upon the captivity of the greater part of their body, to lead a recluse life, out of which this monkish institution might have grown.† In direct contrast with the Sadducees, they renounced the pomp and pleasures, and the very conveniences of life, and, retiring to caves and deserts, formed so distinct a community as to withdraw themselves even from the customary attendance on the Temple, essential as this was deemed to every true Israelite. Another point in which they stood opposed to the Sadducees, as to their speculative tenets, is, that they were unqualified fatalists.

Their secession from the great body of the nation seems a good reason why they should not be noticed in the Gospel narratives of our Lord's ministry. They had little better claim, indeed, to be regarded as a portion of the lost sheep of the house of Israel, to which he confined his labours, than the Samaritans. It is not improbable, however, that they might have formed part of the hearers of John the Baptist, whose rude mode of life, and wanderings in the desert, were likely to attract some of them into the class of his disciples, and to make the whole body early acquainted with the offer of salvation through Christ.

John the Baptist.

The mention of this distinguished forerunner of the Messiah suggests the propriety of some brief notice of the probable effect of his preaching, in correcting those false views which, agreeably to the foregoing remarks and statements, must have prevailed amongst the Jews. What we gather from the New Testament is, that he was employed in calling on men to repent, and in establishing clearer notions of Christ's approaching kingdom than were generally entertained. Thus his admonition to bring forth *fruits* meet for repentance, seems to have been addressed to the prevailing error, that an outward observance of Religion was sufficient. By "the axe laid to the root of the tree," he intimated, that the Jewish dispensation was not, as men fondly thought, to be perpetual, but was even now hastening to its fall. And lastly, his assertion that "God was able, out of the stones of the desert, to raise up children

---

* Goodwin, in his *Moses and Aaron*, gives a quaint but very graphic sketch of the varieties of the Pharisaical character, as represented in the Talmuds. Among them he enumerates

"*Pharisæus truncatus*, so called, as if he had no feet, because he would scarce lift them from the ground when he walked, to cause the greater opinion of his meditation.

"*Pharisæus mortarius*, so called, because he wore a hat in manner of a deep mortar, such as they use to bray spice in, insomuch that he could not look upward, nor of either side; only downward on the ground, and forward, or forthright." Lib. i. ch. x.

* The Pharisees themselves seem to have been divided on this question; hence the distinction made in the Talmuds between *Pharisæus ex amore*, and *Pharisæus ex timore*.

† Celibacy was enjoined upon the greater part, but not upon the whole body of the Essenes; for even this small community seems to have had its subdivisions, or, perhaps, more properly speaking, its gradations of ascetic life. (The reader will find a very interesting sketch of their character and habits in *The Pilgrimage of Helen*.)

History. unto Abraham," seems to point to the adoption of the Gentiles into the covenant. Add to this, that his peculiar office being to prepare the way of the Lord, it is probable that he might also have taught the application of the Prophecies to a spiritual, not a temporal, Saviour.

Necessity of his mission. The need of some divine messenger to prepare the way of the Lord, is indeed manifest from the foregoing sketch of the state of Religion as it then existed among the Jews. Such a messenger had been useful, even supposing the Jews to have employed their dispensation aright, for it was in itself of a nature to leave their minds doubtful, and to render error, on certain points relating to the Messiah, natural and excusable. With a view to these points, then, the coming of John would have been, at all events, acceptable. But he is described as coming in the spirit of Elias, who was *to restore* all things. His ministry, then, was chiefly a merciful provision, to supply (as far as was consistent with the general scheme of Providence) the deficiencies of that preparation which the Jews had failed to derive from their Law and Prophets. He came *to restore the appearance of the Law*,—that mouldering and defaced image, which had been given them, to the intent that the original might be recognised when it appeared amongst men.*

The first object which the Jews would be led from their Scriptures to look for in the dawn of the Sun of Righteousness, was the coming of a messenger, such as John the Baptist. But that messenger had been announced under the title of Elijah the Prophet. Hence, the mistake to which they obstinately adhered, that "Elias must first come,"—a mistake in itself natural enough, but one which the actual arrival of the messenger so strongly charactered as the Baptist was, ought to have been sufficient to remove, even before the scene was more fully opened by our Lord himself. That the claims of John should be left liable to misapprehension, or rather that they should require more than a careless, and much more than an uncandid consideration, in order to be recognised, is only in consistency with the usual tenour of God's dealing with mankind. And it may be further observed, that while it was necessary that men should know who Christ really was, in order that the beneficial effects of his ministry might be felt, this was a point not necessary to the reaping of the fruits of the Baptist's mission.

pectation a tempo- Saviour. Their recognition of the Messiah himself would, of course, depend on their interpretation of their Scriptures, together with whatever notions they might have elsewhere derived concerning him. Of the general impression so produced, the most prominent feature, and that which operated most strongly to blind them to all his mighty works, was the opinion that he was to be a temporal Saviour. This arose, not merely from a speculative view of the Scriptures relating to him, but much more from the habit of mind wrought into them by living under a dispensation, the sanctions of which were wholly temporal. This tone of feeling was vastly increased by the severe chastisements which the nation had endured from the Babylonian captivity down to their then degraded condition, as a distant tributary of Rome. These circumstances must be viewed as falling in with the natural propensity of human hope towards "the things that are seen," in order to account for that monstrous blindness which the Jews evinced towards those passages of their Scriptures which they acknowledged to be predictive of Christ, and which yet represented him under circumstances wholly inconsistent with temporal greatness in himself, or with temporal deliverance to be wrought for his people.

Rise of Christianity.

The Apostles not free from this prejudice. So strong was this prejudice, that the Apostles themselves could not until after the resurrection understand how his death was consistent with his character as the Messiah. "We trusted that it was he who should have redeemed Israel,"* was the tone of misgiving in which they spoke; and it is no unreasonable conjecture, that when Judas betrayed him to death, it was under an impression that he would be miraculously delivered from his enemies.† Certain it is, that not only during his life did Peter, James, and John question one with another, what his rising from the dead should mean,‡ but on the visit to the holy sepulchre the Evangelist expressly states, that "as yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise from the dead;"§ and accordingly it was the point which appears to have required more particular explanation from him in the last interview immediately before his ascension. "Then opened he their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day."‖ So that Christ crucified was as strictly a stumbling-block to the Jews, as it appears to have been foolishness to the Greeks.

Prejudice against the call of the Gentiles accounted for. That they should expect the Gentiles to be excluded from the immediate benefits of the Messiah's reign, is another prejudice, the origin of which must be sought for, not merely in their mode of interpreting Scripture, but in the notions naturally imbibed by living under a Theocracy. God had hitherto dealt with them, not merely as a *portion* of the general human race, but as his peculiar people. Now, being the only people on earth who worshipped Jehovah at all, they had never learnt to think of him distinctly as the God of all the Earth, and also as the God of Israel. These two views of Him became inseparably blended in their minds. They knew indeed that all the nations of the Earth were to be blessed, and they doubtless understood that it was to be a common blessing with that which was reserved for themselves; but agreeably to the above-mentioned mode of thinking, it seemed a requisite step to that object, that the nations of the Earth should be incorporated with themselves by conquest, that Jerusalem should be the seat of empire, and the Messiah the universal and eternal monarch. With this prejudice, the metaphorical images emblematic of his spiritual reign were regarded as literal descriptions; and when baffled in their attempts to render all the Prophetic picture conformable to this view, they boldly adopted the suggestion that two Messiahs might be intended, the one a lowly sufferer, the other a triumphant conqueror.¶

When therefore he did appear, even those whom his

* It is to be observed, that the prophetic promise of Elijah's coming immediately follows the injunction to "remember the Law of Moses."

"Remember the Law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and the judgments.

"Behold I will send you Elijah the Prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." Malachi, ch. iv. v. 4, 5.

It is necessary to consider these two verses as connected, in order to understand why Elijah was expected as *the Restorer*.

* St. Luke, ch. xxiv. v. 21.
† See Thruston's *Night of Treason*, p. 33.
‡ St. Matthew, ch. ix. § St. John, ch. xx. v. 9.
‖ St. Luke, ch. xxiv. v. 46. ¶ *Basnage*, lib. v. c. 10.

History.

miracles convinced, only looked on in dim suspense for the developement of the mysterious scheme, still supposing that the preparatory step would be his assumption of temporal power. On the other hand, the bitterness with which his adversaries caught his hints respecting the call of the Gentiles, was not, if we consider this prejudice aright, mere national selfishness. They doubtless considered the threatened transfer of God's Kingdom, as a transfer of his peculiar government to some other separate nation. Nay, it may be doubted whether their dark policy in delivering him over to the Roman governor, charged with treason, might not have arisen from this suspicion that he was meditating a transfer of the temporal Kingdom of God from them to the Romans, and intending (if indeed he were the Messiah) to assume with them his reign.* The design is at least artful enough to be probable; for the object would be, to render the Romans unfit for the intended favour, if they failed in their attempts to crucify him, and if they succeeded their success would be a surety that he was not the Messiah.

Party spirit strong among the Jews.

An accidental circumstance not a little inflamed this prejudice against the extension of the promised blessing, about the time of our Saviour's birth. This was the rise of the Hellenistic faction in Egypt. Party spirit was roused, and the Aramæan Jew burned with zeal for Jerusalem, Judæa, and whatever savoured of Judaism.

Why they demanded a sign of Christ.

What was likely, too, to confirm the Jews in adhering to this view of the Messiah, was a notion several times alluded to in the Gospels. Daniel had described him, in the metaphorical phrase of Prophecy, as "coming in the clouds of heaven."† This they understood literally, and under the impression that if Jesus were indeed the Messiah he would, in fulfilment of this Prophecy, exhibit himself visibly descending from the skies; they were slow to assent to the testimony of any other miracles, but continually and perseveringly demanded of him "the sign of the Son of Man in Heaven."

In reference to this point of error, again, it may be suggested, that the Jews were justified in adhering to the literal and more obvious meaning of their Prophecies. But this is not the case. For, as was before observed, the form of divine communication to them was not usually literal, but conveyed in types, symbols, and metaphors. With them, therefore, a secondary meaning in a Prophecy was more natural than the primary.‡ It should be observed too, that such a method seems in strict unison with the general character of the Mosaic dispensation, which was not so much a Revelation as a deposit of truths to be revealed; the form in which these truths were deposited, being calculated rather to mould men's minds for their reception than positively to teach them. It was the Gospel which was to bring them to light.

* When he was presented with a Roman coin, and questioned respecting Cæsar, and Cæsar's rights, it might have been with a design to tempt or try him on this point. (Matt. ch. xxii. v. 21.) The circumstance was alluded to in his accusation before Pilate. "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, *saying that he himself is Christ a King.*" St. Luke, ch. xxiii. v. 2.

† Daniel, ch. vii. v. 13.

‡ For this, among other reasons, our Lord might have chosen to convey his instruction to them in Parables and allusions. By conforming his plan of teaching thus far to the spirit of the Jewish Scriptures, he reminded them of the true character of those Scriptures, which were so composed, that "seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not hear."

Rise of Christianity.

That, with these perverse views, the Jewish people at large should be unfavourably disposed towards the claim of Jesus to be the Christ, is what might be expected. That which to us might seem most startling, most to demand doubt and hesitation in the character of a being so wonderful, and a doctrine so spiritual, was to them possibly no ground of scruple or surprise. That God manifested himself to mankind by his Spirit, they knew from the character of their Prophets, and from the record of the Creation. That he should also manifest himself in the flesh, this could not have been strange or unexpected. Their familiarity with the term Immanuel, and their acquantance with the early mode of divine intercourse through those mysterious messengers, who at sundry times conversed with the Patriarchs, must have rendered the doctrine of the Incarnation familiar and intelligible.* In Jesus the assertion of this was accounted blasphemy, not because of the doctrine, but because they did not receive him as the Messiah.

The doctrine of a divine Incarnation familiar to the Jews:

And of the Atonement.

So also with regard to the Atonement. It was obviously a notion to which their minds were long habituated. And yet it is not unlikely that the same principle which led them to separate the suffering from the triumphant Messiah, might have blinded them to the union of the Victim and the Priest in one person; and have led them to consider him whose soul was to be an offering for Sin, as distinct from him who was to make intercession for the transgressors.† One part of this doctrine, too, could not but be unacceptable to the Pharisaical party, namely, that the Atonement was *one, once made, for the sins of all.* That all, even the righteous should require this Atonement, was of itself mortifying and revolting to the self-approving Pharisee; but that all the rites and forms which typified or alluded to this act should be pronounced henceforth null and void, deprived them of every pretence of accumulating merit by the laborious observance of them, and was perhaps to them the hardest obstacle which they had to overcome.

Of a future state.

That the doctrine of a future state was familiar to the Jews at the period of the Advent admits of no question. It is well known to have been one of the points of controversy between the Pharisees and Sadducees; and as the former gave the tone of opinion and faith to the people, their belief in a future state may be fairly ascribed to the nation at large. The doctrine had been gradually developed by their Prophets, together with that of the Messiah's spiritual reign, of which indeed it was a necessary adjunct. Those then among the Jews who so understood their Scriptures, as to admit the spiritual application of these latter Prophecies, may be said to have seen their way far into this great secret of Revelation. But the case was somewhat different with the rest, and these we know formed an exceeding great majority. For it is obvious, that to expect a temporal authority to be established, and a temporal government to be conducted by means of eternal rewards and punishments, is incongruous and absurd; and under such a confused and disjointed view not only did those labour who rejected Jesus, but many of those who (however much convinced that he was the Messiah) were yet so encumbered with their national prejudices, as to continue to expect from him the assumption of temporal power.

* *Genesis*, ch. xviii. xix. xxxii. † Isaiah, ch. liii. v. 10 and 12.

History. So closely did the habits of the Mosaic dispensation adhere to those who had lived under it, and so great pains did it require to clear away the old incrustation, as it were, of the Law, with which Christianity had been plastered up and concealed, until it was safe to bring it forth into the light. Of all its glorious features which were then made manifest, life and immortality were the chief.

II. *Religion of the Samaritans.*

Although the Samaritans claimed for themselves all the privileges of the Mosaic covenant, yet our Saviour in his first mission of the Apostles distinguishes these from "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and, it may be added, from the Gentiles also. Accordingly, if we look to the accounts which are given of their origin and of the nature of their faith, we shall find Religion amongst them assuming a somewhat different character from that under which it has appeared, either in the Jewish or in the Gentile world. With the Jews it was Revelation neglected, with the Gentiles it was Revelation perverted, with the Samaritans it was Revelation corrupted.

History of their faith. Their origin and the history of their faith is this.* When the King of Assyria carried away the Ten Tribes into captivity, he repeopled Samaria with colonists drawn from various parts of his dominions. The new settlement becoming infested by wild beasts, the calamity was attributed to the wrath of the neglected God of Israel; and accordingly, on the application of the colonists, one of the captive Priests was sent from Assyria "to teach them how to fear the Lord." Thus was the knowledge of Jehovah introduced among them, although, in the first instance at least, they could only have regarded him as the tutelary Deity of the land, whom it was incumbent on them to associate with the former objects of their worship. Nor is it likely that their views would be greatly corrected or improved by the continual accession of Jewish refugees to their community; these being for the most part criminals, outcasts, the very refuse of the people.

Under all these disadvantages, the true faith must nevertheless have been gaining ground amongst them, for we find them at a subsequent period anxious to become incorporated with the Jews, so as to form one People and one Church. Sanballat their Governor sought to bring this about, by giving his daughter in marriage to Manasses, brother to Jaddus the Jewish High Priest. But the Jews could not brook the union. Manasses was forced into banishment, and with him went a numerous train of adherents into Samaria. The benefit which must have accrued to the Samaritan Religion from this event is obvious. The immediate result was the erection of an independent Temple on Mount Gerizim, and the more orderly observance of that which they maintained to be the pure Mosaic Law; because on the writings of Moses alone did they found their faith and their practice.

Temple on Mount Gerizim.

Still, it would appear from our Lord's interview with the woman of Sychar, that if at that period Idolatry was no longer practised amongst them, there was some gross error in their conception of the Supreme Being, probably the remains of their heathen prejudice respecting the local character of a Deity. The Evangelist's narrative might of itself perhaps lead us to this conclusion, for the remark of the woman, which occasioned Christ's censure of the Samaritan creed, may be fairly interpreted, as implying that God was not omnipresent, at least, not equally the object of worship everywhere.* Her argument seems to be, that Jerusalem could not be the place for men to worship Jehovah, because the Patriarchs had worshipped him on Mount Gerizim; his presence having been sought for by the Patriarchs on that mountain, how could he consistently be claimed as the God of Jerusalem? Hence the tenour of our Lord's reply, "Ye shall neither in this place, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father." "God is a Spirit," and "they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Other equally false and unworthy tenets have been ascribed to the Samaritans; and although our information on the subject, being chiefly derived from Jewish authority, must be received with due allowance, yet there can be little doubt that their creed was deeply tinctured with the wild fancies of the Platonic School of Alexandria. Among the individuals who contributed to this, the most noted was that Simon of whom mention is made in the *Acts of the Apostles*.† According to the early Christian writers,‡ he is said to have studied Magic and Philosophy in Egypt, and to have returned to his native country Samaria with the most preposterous pretensions. St. Luke's account is, that he "bewitched the people, giving out that he was some great one," and that the people called him "the great power of God." This looks very like an allusion to the doctrine of emanations. Simon was no doubt practising on the credulity of his countrymen, and had persuaded them to regard him as one of those superior Æons or Eternal Natures, which are described in the Philosophical jargon as subsisting within the πληρώμα of the Divine Essence.

Rise of Christianity.

Simon Magus.

And yet, whatever were the deficiencies or the mistakes of the Samaritan creed, to them, and not to the Jews, we know the Messiah vouchsafed in express terms to declare who he was. Both Jews and Samaritans were anxiously expecting him: but it is plain, that the expectation of the Samaritans was widely different from that of the Jews; for when the inhabitants of Sychar thronged forth at the woman's summons to gaze on him who was reported as fulfilling the Prophetic marks of the Christ, they were neither surprised nor offended at meeting with no greater personage than a lowly traveller, seated beside Jacob's well, and asking for a draught of water. The grounds of this difference form the most interesting point of the inquiry concerning the Religion of the Samaritans; and to the superior clearness and correctness of their notions it was doubtless owing, that they were favoured with this more explicit avowal of himself by the Messiah, and were otherwise noticed by him in the course of his ministry.

Christ's manifestation of himself to them.

Amongst the heresies of the Samaritans was their rejection of all the Scriptures save the Pentateuch, so that if their expectation was founded solely on the Scripture Prophecies, to the Pentateuch we must look for the ground-work of their faith. Now, whoever will run through these early promises of a Saviour will

Their expectation of the Messiah distinct from that of the Jews.

Probable errors of their creed.

* See 2 *Kings*, ch. xvii. Also Joseph. *Antiq.* lib. ix. cap. *ultim.* and Basnage, lib. ii. c. 4.

* St. John, ch. iv. † Ch. viii. v. 9.

‡ Justin. Martyr. *Apol.* ii. 69—91. Irenæi *Hær.* lib. i. c. 23, and the *Clementine Recognitions, passim.*

History.

perceive that the most prominent feature in them, as far as regards the objects of the blessing, is, that all the nations of the Earth shall be partakers of it.* It was the extension of the blessing, then, to all nations which formed the essential feature in their expectation, as distinguished from that of the Jews. Of spurious descent, and having now failed to identify their case with that of their rivals, they had not like them any prejudices to obstruct the ready admission of this great truth. Indeed their unsuccessful rivalry with the Jews might be supposed to have rendered them more sharp-sighted in eliciting what to them was a consolatory view of the Prophecies.

Reasons for Christ's avowal.

Now this being the point which beyond all others formed the greatest obstacle to the reception of the Messiah by his own people, it is not to be wondered at, that with a view to this the Samaritans should receive some particular notice from our Lord. In like manner then, as upon St. Peter's confession, he declared himself to that Apostle; so upon the Samaritan woman's avowal of the nature of her country's hope, to her also he made a similar declaration. With the same view perhaps he proposed to the Jews an example of a Samaritan as contrasted with a Levite; the former acting from a principle that all men are brethren, the latter devoid of fellow-feeling, and refusing to extend his charity to the wayfaring stranger though he were perishing for want of it.† We are the more authorized to make such an application of the Parable, from the *unneighbourly* character of the Samaritans, who appear to have indulged toward the Jews even more than an equal share of jealousy and spite.‡ It was only in their view of the promised blessing that they were less selfish and uncharitable, and, unlike the Jews, willing that all who needed, enemy or friend, stranger or fellow-countryman, should be free partakers of it. Supposing then that the Jews understood the Parable to allude to their unnatural denial of the greatest of God's blessings to him who was perishing in the highways for want of it,§ the reproof which they would read, might be thus interpreted, "If the Samaritans, using the light to be derived from a portion only of your Scriptures, have been able to see this great truth, how shall you stand excused on the score of ignorance, who profess to receive the whole volume of the book?"

Rise of Christianity.

Thus much on the supposition, that the Samaritan expectation was derived solely from the Jewish Scriptures. But if (as has been stated to be the opinion of some) the general expectation of the Heathen world had some origin independent of this, it is but natural to conjecture further, that those who were by descent almost altogether heathen, would not have been excluded from these sources of Traditionary Prophecy enjoyed by the rest of the Gentiles; and that their knowledge of these might have helped them to a clearer exposition of the Jewish record than the Jews themselves generally adopted.*

An inconsistency in the treatment of Christ explained.

Before we quit the subject altogether, it may be proper to notice an apparent inconsistency in the Gospel narrative of the Samaritans' behaviour towards Christ. Before he had performed any miracles, and merely for his word's sake, one whole city declared themselves satisfied of the truth of his claims, and yet, as those claims came to be more certainly proved, we find the Samaritans casting aside in this one point their opposition to the Jews, and so averse to receive him, as to provoke his disciples on one occasion to ask of him if he would call down fire from heaven to consume them.† But the reason of this is easily found in the rule which our Saviour laid down for the limits of his ministry, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans go not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."‡ This doubtless seemed to them a sanction of the Jewish prejudice, that to them alone, and for their sake only, was the Messiah come. On the occasion above alluded to, the reason given for their refusal to receive him is, that "his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem." They were mortified, disappointed, and perplexed; and the more so because of their enmity to the Jews. Hence for a season their clearer faith failed them; but as soon as Christianity began to be preached beyond the Jewish nation, they were foremost and readiest to embrace it. When Philip preached, they with one accord gave heed to him:§ and meanwhile, individuals, such as the grateful leper,‖ might throughout have been waiting patiently for the arrival of the promised period, notwithstanding the general perverseness and inconsistency.

---

* See especially *Gen.* ch. xii. v. 3; ch. xviii. v. 18; ch. xxii. v. 18; ch. xxvi. v. 4; ch. xxviii. v. 14.

† St. Luke, ch. x. ‡ Basnage, lib. ii. c. 5.

§ Elsewhere our Lord designates the Gentiles as persons in need, found in the highways and hedges. (St. Luke, ch. xiv. v. 23.) Any one accustomed to observe the recurrence of the same doctrine under different forms, in the various discourses of our Lord, will not perhaps be unwilling to admit the connection in this instance. Scarcely anything of importance is said by him, which we do not find again and again expressed or alluded to, so as to connect the former mention of the subject with the introduction of it in some fresh shape. This deserves the more notice, because beyond the ordinary advantage of renewing the impression of Truth on men's minds, it was a method especially appropriate to one who taught in Parables, and whose meaning (without some check of that kind) might have been, even on matters of importance, liable to be perverted or misunderstood, or at least would have furnished a plea for perversion and misapprehension.

* The Samaritans might easily have become acquainted with "the fulness of the time" from the Pentateuch, marked as it there is by Jacob's prophecy of the departure of the sceptre from Judah, a circumstance to which they would most anxiously advert. Bishop Horsley supposes that, besides the agreement of time, the character under which the Messiah presented himself to them as a preacher of righteousness was precisely that under which the writings of Moses would lead them to expect him. The passages which he conjectures to have furnished this view, are those which record the promises to Jacob, (*Gen.* ch. xxviii. v. 3; ch. xxxv. v. 11; ch. xlviii. v. 4; and the Song of Moses, *Deuteron.* ch. xxxiii. v. 2—5.) His argument however requires that the text of the latter should undergo no slight alteration, and even the former texts, as they now stand, will scarcely be allowed by all to warrant his application of them. See Horsley's *Sermons*, vol. ii. serm. 24—26.

† St. Luke, ch. ix. v. 51.

‡ St. Matt. ch. xv. v. 24; ch. x. v. 5, 6.

§ Acts, ch. viii. ‖ St. Luke, ch. xvii.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE MINISTRY OF CHRIST.

History.

Omissions in Christ's Ministry explained.

THERE are several remarkable omissions in our Lord's personal Ministry, such as that he never baptized, although Baptism was the rite of admission into his Religion; that he did not preach to the Gentiles, although the most distinguishing feature of the new dispensation was its extension to all mankind; that he established no Church during his abode on earth, and left no written laws behind him: all which seem to indicate, (what the Gospel account of him more expressly declares,) that he came to be the *subject* of Christianity more than the *author* of it. In the former view, he appears as God manifested in the flesh, and in that character accomplishing our redemption by his mysterious sufferings and death. In the latter, he appears as the teacher of mankind, instructing them in the method whereby they might attain to the divine favour thus made accessible to all. His Ministry so considered may be conveniently classed under the following heads:

I. His ordinary Life, considered in the light of an Example.

II. His Teaching.

III. His Miracles.

IV. His Institutions.

V. His Prophecies.

This view will not include a detailed account of the events of his life, obviously because the Bible is in the hands of all. A familiarity with them is presumed, and on this presumption they will be introduced or alluded to, not in the way of narrative, but as they fall under the several divisions into which the subject has been arranged.

I. *Example of Christ.*

The importance of example and precept united in the same person is obvious, and consists in the learner being at once impressed with a conviction that the teacher is sincere and his precept practicable, and being furnished with a pattern to excite and guide him in the practice of it. If, added to this, the same person be moreover the source of that object, on account of which the rules enjoined are valuable, the combined effect is of course considerably heightened.

Ministry of Christ.

Want of an example in the Mosaic dispensation.

That the divine commandments as delivered to mankind before the Incarnation of the Son of God laboured under a disadvantage, arising from the want of such an example, cannot be questioned. The disciple of the old dispensation was circumstanced like the tyro who has to learn an art from written rules for want of a master to practise under. To obviate this disadvantage, it was necessary that the commands should be more numerous, more minute and specific, and more literally enforced. Still, in some points, it would seem impossible that any mode of instruction should produce a similar effect to that which has resulted from the great Christian mystery. He, for instance, whom we have never seen nor conceived in thought, cannot become an object of the affections in the same manner as he with whom we are familiar. The command to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and all our soul, and all our strength, could never effect the same purpose, as God manifested in the flesh so as to become the natural object of sympathy, of love, and of gratitude.

Advantage of Christianity in this point illustrated.

On this principle doubtless it is, that the Resurrection of Christ is so much insisted on as an earnest of our own Resurrection. Not that the same truth would have admitted of a doubt, if only a declaration of it had been made by our Lord or the Holy Spirit; nor, again, that other proofs of his ability to raise us would not have sufficed; but it was a sample of the general Resurrection, "the first fruits of them who slept:" and a truth so experimentally proved, differed as much in its effect on the belief and feelings as mere precept differs from example, or rather as the effect of precept disjoined from the example of him on whose authority it rests, differs from the effect of precept, example, and authority, united in the same person.

For this end also the chastisement of our sins may have been exhibited in the person of a suffering Redeemer. For it is evident that (for ought we know) the redemption of mankind might have been effected, and the scene neither exhibited nor revealed to men. As it is, we feel the force of St. Paul's appeal, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for

History.

us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"*

Nature of Christ's example.

Jesus Christ is set forth by the sacred writers as the perfect pattern of Christian duty. By which we must understand, not that he fulfilled all the duties which a Christian life may embrace, but all which were within his sphere of action. It is perfection in the *mode* rather than in the extent which it embraces. It will nevertheless be found, on a very little reflection, to be extensive enough to furnish a model for the chief part of every man's life, and to be applicable in many points which would appear at first to lie beyond its compass. Thus, as a worker of miracles, his example cannot indeed be literally imitated, but it may still be adapted to the case of all. The same benevolence which was evinced in the exercise of divine means by him, may be testified in our behaviour by the use of human means conducive to the same purpose. We cannot, indeed, redeem a world by the sacrifice of our lives, but many sacrifices and personal denials there are which conduce to the welfare of others, and in making these we shall be acting like our great example. We cannot save men's souls, but we may help them into the way of salvation; and although we have no power to ascend to Heaven by any efforts of our own, by looking steadfastly on Him who has gone before us, we may kindle that hope, and that faith, whereby we shall ascend to Heaven like Him.

Again, there are relations of domestic and public life out of which duties arise, such as the Saviour cannot be literally said to have fulfilled, because he stood not in those relations, and had no opportunity of exemplifying the practice of the duties. We cannot contemplate him as a father and master of a household, but we see him in the bosom of his Apostolic family,—those whom, as if with this design, he calls his mother and his brethren;† and what example could more forcibly recommend the observance of family prayer, for instance, than that which he has so exhibited, by adding to his solitary devotions, and to his attendance on the public service of the Synagogue, the custom of praying in private with his disciples?

If we consider the sphere of life in which our Lord moved, it will be seen that although his example thus became applicable to many cases strictly beyond it, yet it was more particularly suited to the exercise of those moral duties which are peculiar to the Christian scheme, viz. humility and forgiveness of injuries. The propriety and advantage of this is obvious. To the Heathen Moralist these qualities, considered as virtues, were as new as the doctrines of the Atonement and the Resurrection. To the Jew, the latter at least was equally so; and both required that the practice of them should be recommended by a life such as the Saviour led, in which his condescension in dwelling amongst us was more apparent from his poverty and lowliness, than if he had been numbered with the rich and powerful; whilst his every act of mercy, and his every word of exhortation to the Jews, was a return of good for evil. The closing scene of his ministry was indeed only a more prominent display of those Gospel virtues exemplified in the whole course of it. He submitted voluntarily to a death appropriated to the meanest criminals, and he died praying for his enemies.

* *Rom.* ch. viii. v. 32. † St. Matt. ch 12. v. 49.

Ministry of Christ.

II. *His Teaching.*

Not Philosophical:

As to his mode of teaching, it was not systematic; and in this his example was imitated by the Apostles. The language and form in which it was delivered was unphilosophical; that is, instead of employing terms of science, he formed his expressions from passing occurrences, and whatever objects happened to be present to his hearers at the time of his addressing them. Or else he spoke in Parables, or made use of that ancient symbolical language so often adopted by the Jewish prophets, as, when he washed his disciples' feet, and set a child in the midst of them.

Importance of remembering this fact:

Whatever be assigned as the probable motive which occasioned our Lord to choose this unphilosophical and unsystematic mode of instruction, it is highly important that the fact should be clearly kept in view by the Christian who searches the New Testament for the great doctrines of Christianity. Without doing so, he cannot fail to be surprised and somewhat confounded at finding these doctrines neither arranged in order, nor often directly asserted, but lying in detached portions, each difficult perhaps to be found entire, but easily produced by combining one passage with another.

Probable reasons for it.

As by this method it often happened that one portion of the doctrine sought for will be found in the Old Testament, another in the New, the connection and unity of the two dispensations of which they are the several records become the more apparent, and this might have been one end contemplated by our Lord in adopting it. It entailed on the disciple of the Gospel the necessity of searching the earlier Scriptures for the words of eternal life.

A further advantage accrues from it to the evidence of Christianity. Its doctrines being thus diffused and intermingled with other matter, could not by any possibility have been so forged and inserted as to leave no mark occasionally of *seaming* and *joining*. Our Saviour's Gospel is like his robe, "without seam, woven throughout," and he who receives it must take it all, for it cannot be divided.

Matter of Christian doctrine.

As to the *matter* of his teaching, his discourses aim either at correcting what was perverted, and explaining what was obscure in the preceding state of morals and religious knowledge, or else they declare truths not before revealed. With the several leading topics which they embrace the Christian reader is presumed to be familiar, and it is sufficient to observe briefly, that of the former kind are his exhortations to *inward purity*, as opposed to mere outward acts of obedience, and compliance with the spirit rather than with the letter of the precept.

To the latter class belong the doctrines of Atonement and Grace; of the Trinity in Unity; certain points of Revelation relating to a Future State; and whatever else may be considered as peculiar to the Christian Revelation.

III. *His Miracles.*

Their object:

The chief object of our Lord's Miracles was to prove his mission, and it may be observed that in this case, and in that of Moses, (of all who ever pretended to found a Religion on them,) the Miracles supported the credit of the Religion, not the Religion the credit of the Miracles. As testimony, however, they do not properly

History.

form part of his Ministry (as a teacher,) but they have likewise a Moral and a Religious meaning, and in this point of view they do so.

They have a Moral meaning, because they are all benevolent, whereas as *proofs* they might have been destructive or indifferent, as were the Miracles of Moses and the Prophets. As it is, they not only prove that Christ came from God, but that he came with a benevolent purpose.

Their analogy with his doctrines.

They have also a Religious meaning, because they typified some of the chief doctrines of his Gospel. Thus when he converted into wine the water set for purification, he taught that Sin was cleansed by his blood, and not by the ritual observances of the Law. His divine nature was asserted by walking on the sea,* and by whatever other Miracles invested him with the Scripture characteristics of Jehovah. When he healed the sick, gave sight to the blind, and enabled the lame to walk, he not only proved his authority, and exercised his compassion, but suggested the inference, that he had come to restore our corrupted nature to its original purity, to enlighten the ignorant, as all men were, and to enable us to stand in the path of life, when without him we could not but fail and sink. And lastly, to show that the good effects of his coming were to extend to distant countries and future ages, the objects of his Miracles were occasionally persons who only touched him, or who were absent from him.

Hence possibly the necessity of faith in the persons on whom the Miracles of healing were wrought; for if these Miracles had no further intent than to prove his power, or even his benevolence, it is obvious that he, to whom were committed all things in Heaven and in Earth, did not need the concurrence of any object of power or of benevolence. But as he had made Faith necessary to that eternal salvation which he came to offer, it was fitting that the temporal deliverance should in like manner be offered with the same condition, if we suppose the latter to be intended as a type of the former; else the symbolical lesson would have been incomplete, and liable to misconstruction.

One observation more on our Lord's Miracles. They were not only *proofs* of his authority, and means of instruction, but also specimens of that mercy, the full and entire display of which is reserved for hereafter.

To understand this, it must be borne in mind that Satan brought into the world both Sin and Death, Moral and Natural Evil; and the result of our Lord's triumph over him was to be the removal of both. In healing the sick, then, and raising the dead, the Saviour may be considered as giving an instance of the exercise of his power in removing *natural evil;* whilst the same was evinced with regard to *moral evil*, by casting out Devils, the agents of him who was the source of Sin. It was doubtless in reference to this latter object, that he caused them on one occasion to depart into a herd of swine, thus proving that the possession was real, and not the result of a disordered imagination. The same end might have been likewise contemplated in the record of the Temptation; for in neither of these instances at least could the power of imagination account for the phenomenon. In the first the divine patient was above its delusions, in the other the brute was as much below it.*

Ministry of Christ.

IV. *His Institutions.*

Symbols long retained in Religious worship.

In the first rude state of language, signs, gestures, and actions were no doubt the chief mode of expressing all ideas. But in Religion, custom being more sacred than in the ordinary intercourse of life, the primitive vehicle of thought continued here longest in use, and was still the chief form of worship for ages after language became more intelligible than signs and symbols. In proof of this, we may observe the great proportion of the latter which was preserved in the Religious service of the Israelites.

Christian symbols.

As the progress of language advanced, the primitive usage gradually declined, and in the last establishment of Religion only two symbolical Institutions were appointed, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Their object.

These, then, we might expect to find expressing the most important truths of that last Revelation, in a form intelligible to the Savage as well as to the Philosopher, to men of all languages, and in all ages; and that such is the instruction which they convey is obvious. The great topics of our Lord's preaching were Repentance and Faith. The result of Repentance was—that men were freed from the influence of sinful habits. This, in metaphorical language, would be a cleansing from Sin, and in embodied metaphor or symbol, the act of washing. Again, the result of Faith was forgiveness of sins through the Atonement made by the death of Jesus Christ, and this is set forth by the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist.

Their distinction.

But why not, it may be said, in this latter, as in the former Sacrament, adopt the most direct and exact representation of the scene so recorded, such as would be the flesh and blood of an animal? The case appears to be this: the Atonement was so represented before the event took place, because a greater exactness was requisite to render the agreement of the event with its type so apparent as to be easily recognised and admitted; but so close a resemblance not being necessary in a commemorative symbol, (the event being already known, and the connection between them admitted) that symbol was changed, to prevent any confusion between the old rite, which was Prophetic, and the new one, which was Commemorative; between the Jewish sacrifice, which had no independent and inherent efficacy, and the Christian sacrifice which possessed it.

Probable reasons why Christ himself never baptized.

Christ instituted both these Sacraments, and no more than these, yet it is remarkable that he officiated only in the Holy Supper. A distinction which, considering the importance he attached to both, can hardly be supposed accidental. Indeed a design of making the distinction (whatever that design was) may perhaps be perceived in several of his Parables, and still more in that most allegorical of all his Miracles, the conversion of water into wine. The water *when made wine* was then, and not till then, placed into the hands of the Governor of the feast to be dispensed.

That our Lord foresaw the impious notion which would creep into his Church respecting the nature of the Bread and Wine administered in the Eucharist, and

* "Thy way is in the sea, thy path in great waters." *Psalm* lxxvii. v. 19.
"The Lord is mightier than mighty waves." *Psalm* xciii. v. 4, *et similia.*

* Warburton.

History.

officiated himself to render its absurdity more palpable; but that in Baptism there being no occasion for a similar precaution, he therefore did not officiate in that also, is by no means improbable. But the distinction may also have arisen from the nature of the things signified by the two Sacraments. They being, as it were, an epitome of the Christian scheme; Baptism represents the agency of the Comforter, the Eucharist the agency of the Son.

The admission into Christ's Church was the work, not of the Lord himself, but of his disciples filled with the Holy Ghost, and the ceremony of that admission was Baptism. But the redemption of those so admitted was the work of Christ, and of this the Eucharist was a symbolical pledge. By Baptism we are said to be sealed unto the day of redemption, and we are baptized unto his death.

The Lord's Prayer.

Besides these Institutions, our Lord appointed one Form of Prayer, which (beyond its obvious character as a model and a sanction for other forms) may not unreasonably be viewed in connection with the Sacraments, as uniting with them to form a peculiar illustration and testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity. One Form of Prayer was appointed, and that addressed to the Father; one Sacrament was instituted declaring the offiee of the Son; one more declaring the office of the Holy Ghost.

V. *His Prophecies.*

A Prophecy is a miracle performed for posterity, and to our Lord's Prophecies the same observation applies as to his Miracles. One intent of them was to prove the truth of his mission: "Now I tell you before it come, that when it is come to pass ye may believe that I am he." So considered, the Prophecies are not, strictly speaking, a portion of his ministry. But, like his Miracles, they were also the vehicles of instruction, and this view of them falls under the present subject of remark. They may be conveniently arranged under four heads, as treating

1. Of Himself.
2. Of his Church or Religion.
3. Of certain Individuals of his Church.
4. Of the Jewish Church or Religion.

1. *Concerning Himself.*

Their pre-eminence over other Prophecies.

Christ, in delivering Prophecies concerning himself, may be considered as employed in framing an index to the work which he had in hand. It is natural to suppose that those points which he thus selected were by him considered as the leading features of it, and were selected in order to direct attention to them especially, and above all others.

Accordingly he foretold his betrayal, his death, his resurrection, his ascension, and his second coming. Now if he had merely marked these for special notice by the finger of Prophecy, and left the doctrines arising out of them to be gathered from other parts of his own discourses, or from the preaching and writings of his inspired servants, (as is the case to a certain extent,) still, to these doctrines would belong a character of importance, corresponding to that bestowed on the events by his notice of them. But his Prophecies are frequently not only predictive, but explanatory; declaring at once the event to be, and the meaning and intent of it. Thus, in foretelling his death, the prediction conveys also the doctrine of the Atonement. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, *that* whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." "I am the good shepherd, the good shepherd giveth his life *for the sheep*." These and similar predictions then, when accomplished, became a commentary on the events. As in the first mentioned for instance, when he was seen lifted up on the cross, there could be no doubt that by this means it was effected, that "whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life."

Ministry of Christ.

2. *Concerning his Church.*

A didactic character may also be traced in the Prophecies relating to his Church or Kingdom on Earth. Viewed as the display of foreknowledge, they are, like other Prophecies, only Miracles in reserve, the germ of evidence which time was to unfold and bring to maturity. But the application of these Prophecies to a specific purpose of instruction, is the circumstance which entitles them to be considered as part of the Saviour's ministry. It is said that "holy men" of old spake not of themselves, but as "the Holy Spirit moved them." Not so our Lord. He was not the instrument of Prophecy, but Prophecy was an instrument in his hands, employed at his discretion, and so employed as to make a part of his didactic ministry.

Instruction to be derived from them.

Speaking of his Church, he sometimes alludes to it as already established; sometimes he points to the process by which that object was to be accomplished. Of the former subject, the leading topic was, that his Church was to embrace within its pale all the world. Contrasted with its origin, it was as the stately tree compared with the seed from which it sprang, and as a little leaven leaveneth the whole mass, even so his little family of believers were to impart the gift which they had received from him, not to any one favoured people or sect, but to all nations. Occasionally, too, his Church is represented as a field in which tares had sprung up, or by images of a like import.

Prophecy of the universal extent of Christianity.

Now, keeping all this in view, let us call to mind how much the early progress of the Gospel was impeded by the Jewish prejudices respecting the nature of a Divine dispensation, which even those who were converts to Christianity could not conceive to be a thing intended alike for Gentile and Jew. The ideas of a Divine dispensation and of a chosen people were nearly inseparable. What then could be more appropriate and useful, than that our Lord's Prophecies concerning his Church should point chiefly to its universality? In this point of view they were instruction, reproof, and prevention of error.

Of the difficulty of its propagation.

Again, the Prophecies relating to the establishing of his Church are full of the difficulties and distresses which awaited those who were employed in this work. The very assurance that the gates of Hell should not prevail against the fabric they were appointed to rear, is an implied declaration of extreme peril to be expected; as the promise that he would be with them always denotes that they should always need him. Of what use now could this view of the matter be to his followers in their arduous enterprise? that is, of what use, beyond the evidence arising from the fulfilment of Prophecy? It was, doubtless, no small consolation to them to know that their master had foreseen all their difficulties, and

History. provided against them. But there appears also a further design. Under the Mosaic dispensation men had imbibed two prejudices which were inconsistent with the new covenant: the one, that Revelation was given to a particular people; the other, that God's people were to expect from him temporal rewards and punishments. As the former notion was counteracted by the Prophecies relating to the universality of the Gospel, so the latter was to be corrected, by presenting to their minds continual warnings of persecution, hardship, and death. Agreeably to the doctrine of temporal rewards and punishments, the Jews had looked for a Messiah who should confer on his followers worldly glory and prosperity; but these earthly motives to obedience were henceforth to be cast out of Religion, and the Prophecies in question were placed as a guard to prevent their re-entrance.

We should say, then, that the Saviour's Prophecies relating to his Church, considered as part of his didactic ministry, were designed principally to correct the erroneous notion, that that Church was to be established on the same principle as the Jewish dispensation which it was to supersede.

3. *Concerning certain Individuals.*

St. Peter.

Three Prophecies relating to St. Peter are recorded in the Gospels. Of these the most important will be first considered.

Matt. xv. 18, explained. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

As we have no clue to any connection between this saying and any future supremacy vested in the Apostle because of it, it is to be considered as a Prophecy of the part he was to occupy rather than an appointment, and as such its didactic character will be here examined.

By many indeed the words are understood as having no peculiar reference to St. Peter, or rather as declaring no more concerning him than is elsewhere declared of the other Apostles. And, indeed, if Peter had been the Apostle's original name, and not applied to him by our Lord himself, as if on account of some peculiar quality which he possessed, it might be fairly argued, that our Lord's language to him only differed from that which he addressed to the others, in being an allusion to his name. But the name was obviously given him because of his future destination, not that destination so expressed because of the name. Bishop Marsh,* accordingly, has applied the Prophecy to him as to the founder of the Church at Jerusalem, which was, as he contends, more peculiarly the Church of Christ. His argument certainly rests upon the surest ground, the result. St. Peter was not the founder of the Church universal, but of the Church at Jerusalem.

The images of which the Prophecy is composed are a Rock—a Church built on it—the gates of Hell—and the Keys. At least, these are all the images contained in that portion of the Prophecy which was addressed to St. Peter, and to none else. Now, whatever meaning we choose to elicit from them, it will hardly be denied, on a moment's consideration, that they were amongst the most familiar to Jewish ears, because amongst the most common of their Scriptural figures. Secondly, that they apply in their literal signification most remarkably to the Jewish Temple, its situation, and other circumstances. Built on a Rock—the one Church of God heretofore, and its Keys the badge of authority to him who held them. That Church was now given over to the gates of Hades, and the Christian Church was to be established instead. Ministry of Christ.

Accordingly in this Prophecy, concerning the founder of the new Church at Jerusalem, our Lord has crowded together some of the most familiar Jewish images, and those of a kind calculated to recal the ancient Temple to men's minds. Now, however obscure his language might become to others, by reason of this assemblage of national figures, to the Jews it would on that very account be the more explicit, and they would the more readily recognise it, as intended more particularly for them. We hear of no doubts originating in these words, as to St. Peter's dominion—no question, in short, about the meaning, agitated in the early Church. When St. Peter took on him the ministry of the circumcision, and still more on his first preaching at Jerusalem, the converted Jew remembered the words of the Lord Jesus, and understood that the former Temple was now consigned to destruction, and the new one in the hands of him who bore the office designated by the Keys.

One remark may be added in further illustration of this Prophecy, which from its misapplication has assumed an importance beyond any which would attach to it from its natural character. The amazing size of the stones employed, both in the foundation and the superstructure of the Temple, was a subject of general admiration.* Accordingly the disciples are said, on one occasion, to have pointed them out to our Lord, with some degree of national vanity: "Master, see what manner of *stones*, and what *buildings* are here; and Jesus answered, and said unto them, Seest thou these great *buildings*? there shall not be left one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down." Now after this read the Prophecy in question, and it will seem nearly in so many words a negation concerning St. Peter's Church of that fate which was affirmed of the Temple and its service. In St. Mark's account, (which is the one quoted,) it is said that *one of the disciples* made the remark, and as St. Peter's name is afterwards first mentioned amongst those who made further inquiries respecting the overthrow of the sacred edifice, it is rather probable that he was the one. Perhaps, then, our Saviour might have been calling to his remembrance this conversation, (for it seems at the time to have excited no ordinary interest,) when he told him that not such should be the materials, nor such the fate of the new house of God at Jerusalem. The Apostle had just acknowledged him as the Son of the living God, and our Lord's reply was as if he had said, "Simon, thou didst heretofore extol the Temple and its foundation Rock, but in Jerusalem shall be built a nobler edifice, not by a Moses, an Elias, or any mere Prophet, but by him whom thou hast discovered to be the Son of the living God. And thou shalt find thyself

* See *Comparative View*, &c.

* See Josephus's description, (*De Bello Jud.* lib. vi. c. 6, *secundum* Rufinum.) Πίτρας δὲ τετραμένους πάχους τὰ μέγιστα ἦσαν τοῦ δομήματος —ἓν δὲ ἄξιμα τῶν τοιούτων θαυμάζειν καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς ἦσαν ἔργα.

History.

a firmer foundation stone to that building than those of which thou didst once boast unto me."* The two remaining Prophecies concerning St. Peter appear to have been intended as instructive, chiefly, if not solely, to the individual. That which foretold his denial of his Master conveying a rebuke for self-confidence, whilst that which described his ignominious death, was peculiarly applicable to him, who, of all the Apostles, expressed the greatest solicitude about the temporal kingdom attributed to the Messiah.

Matt. xxvi. 31, explained.

St. John.

"If this man tarry till I come, what is that to thee."

John, xxi. 22, explained.

What was affirmed in these words concerning St. John, was applied on another occasion to others whose names are not specified. "There be some standing here who shall not taste death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."† The didactic use of these prophecies seems to have been to check the erroneous notion, that whenever Christ spoke of his "coming" it meant his coming to judge the world at the last day. For the expression, "shall not taste death until, &c." rather implies that those persons should afterwards taste death; and that this expression concerning St. John was intended only to convey the same meaning, we learn from that Apostle himself: "Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die; yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die, but, If I will that he tarry till I come," &c.

Judas Iscariot.

Matt. xxvi. 25, explained.

As our Lord was to be betrayed by one of his Apostles, it seems but natural this should be made the subject of Prophecy by him, in order to prevent any possible objection respecting his want of foresight in the choice of the twelve. Such, then, might have been the primary design of this Prophecy. But, like his others, its record might have been intended to convey also some instruction to the Church in after times—even to us.

Indeed it cannot but strike one as remarkable, not that he should be betrayed, but that his betrayal (and that by one of his own friends,) should be made a necessary part in his scheme of life as marked out for him in ancient Prophecy, and that he should point to it, as to one of those important figures in the great Prophetic painting at which we are to pause and learn something.

It will, no doubt, occur to most of our readers, that the circumstances of the betrayal were such as to make it highly probable that Judas did not intend the death of his Master, but rather designed to force him to an open declaration of himself as a temporal King; the character under which he was at that time obstinately contemplated even by his most faithful followers. Otherwise, indeed, it would be impossible to account for his behaviour at the last supper. As, for instance, that he should leave the room to execute his purpose, knowing that our Lord was aware whither he was going, and with what intent. Doubtless he thought, that if his stratagem succeeded, his impatient zeal would not only have been excused, but even honoured and rewarded. The rejection of the wages of his guilt too, the natural result of severe disappointment, is perfectly consistent with this view.

Ministry of Christ.

It is probable, therefore, that the Apostles considered the crime of Judas simply as an act of treachery or treason. He is not called murderer, bloody, or inhuman, but traitor. Regarding the Church as a Kingdom of which Christ is the head, his offence was not so properly Moral as Political. It was a presumptuous attempt to change the constitution of that Kingdom, by introducing into it the pomp and power of this world. And if so, this Prophecy might have served (among many others more obviously framed with this view,) to warn the Apostles and their successors, not to betray the holy charge with which they were intrusted, by attempting, whether from motives of avarice and ambition, or from want of confidence in the support of Heaven, to convert Christ's spiritual crown into an earthly one.

Prophecy concerning Mary.

Matt. xxvi. 13; Mark, xiv. 9; John, xii. 1. explained.

The incident which gave occasion to this was the anointing the Lord's feet by Mary, who is said to have been the sister to Lazarus; and the Prophecy was, "Wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached in all the world, there shall also this that this woman hath done be told for a memorial of her." Our Lord adds the reason why he made a circumstance apparently so trivial the occasion of so marked a Prophetic declaration, "for in that she hath done it, she hath done it for my burial." It would seem therefore, that he wished to point to some connection between his death and his anointing, and this connection may perhaps be explained by the conversation which subsequently took place between him and his disciples, the subject of which was the nature of his Kingdom. Hitherto he had borne the form and office of a servant or minister, but his work was now done, and as Samuel of old entered the guard-room and anointed Saul King over Israel, so Mary came in to anoint Jesus on his approaching entrance upon his Kingdom. Immediately after this took place Judas went out to betray him, and a discussion commenced respecting the rank his followers were to hold in his Kingdom, as if arising out of some remark which he had made on what Mary had done. Lastly, we read his declaration, "I appoint unto you a Kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my Kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Nathaniel and the Thief on the Cross.

John, i. 51. Luke, xxiii. 43, explained.

There are two other Prophetic declarations which our Lord made to individuals, and which may seem to require notice in the view here taken of his Prophecies. The first is that to Nathaniel. "Hereafter ye shall see Heaven open, and the Angels of God ascending and

* The reader may here require to be reminded of the remark already made on the recurrence of the same topics in the various discourses of our Lord.

But, after all, the Protestant advocate need not be very solicitous about settling the precise import of the "grant to St. Peter," as it has been called; that is, as far as it affects the controversy between Protestants and Papists; for, whatever kind of *foundation* St. Peter was to the Church, it is obvious that the image employed in the metaphor excludes the notion of a *succession of persons similarly circumstanced*. Matt. ch. xxvi. v. 31. Mark, ch. xiv. v. 27. John, ch. xiii. v. 38, and ch. xxi. v. 18.

† Matt. ch. xvi. v. 28. Mark, ch. ix. v. 1. Luke, ch. ix. v. 29.

History.

descending upon the Son of Man." But, if this be applicable indeed to Nathaniel individually, for it is expressed in the plural, it can only be considered as a general figurative allusion to those signs of divine communication, the Miracles, by which he was to prove that he was the Son of God, the King of Israel, and is not therefore specific enough to be classed among the Prophecies.

The other was a Prophetic promise relating to a state beyond the ordinary use of Prophecy. We cannot recognise its fulfilment, nor was it, from its very nature, made with the common object and intent of all his prophecies, "that when these things come to pass ye may know that I am he." It is therefore rather to be classed with his other revelations of a future state, and as such belongs not to the present point of our inquiry.

4. *Concerning the Destruction of Jerusalem.*

The Holy City and the Temple, together with the existence of the Jews as a nation, comprised the externals of the old dispensation. All that was real and vital in that dispensation had been done away with on the opening of our Lord's mission; but the closing scene which was to annihilate the outward form, thus deprived of its living principle, was the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, and the dispersion of its worshippers. The visible Church having been ever regarded as coexistent with, and inseparable from, the dispensation itself, the total removal of the former was the sign and pledge that the latter was indeed taken away. Until this event the slow-believing Jew might have had some plea for asserting, that "in Jewry alone was God known," and "that Jerusalem was still the place where men ought to worship;" but the prophetic finger which charactered its downfal wrote a language, the interpretation of which was well understood to be, "The kingdom of heaven is departed from thee."

No wonder then that our Lord should dwell on this subject with such minuteness and solemnity as to give the Prophecy an air of importance beyond all his others. He came to do away with the old covenant and to establish the new. This was his work, and with reference to this, the propriety of those expressions whereby he announces *himself as the author of this formal consummation of his ministry* is obvious. Looking to the established line of our remarks, we may expect to find, too, the didactic tendency of such a Prophecy bearing upon some point of proportionate consequence; and a brief analysis of the structure of its language will show that such is remarkably the case. That language may be arranged under three heads:

Mark, xiii. 2. Luke, xix. 44. Luke, xxi. 6.

1. The literal descriptions of the events prophecied; for instance, "As for these things which ye behold, the days will come in the which there shall not be left one stone upon another."

Mark, xiii. 25. Luke, xxi. 26.

2. The metaphorical, or rather hieroglyphic language adopted from the Jewish Scriptures, especially the Prophets; for instance, "The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall down from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken."

3. The third source of imagery is the day of our Lord's second coming to judge the world; and as in this is suspended the *moral* of the Prophecy, to this our further remarks will be confined.

Up to the period of our Saviour's Advent, the progress of the Jewish dispensation had been so ordained as to be made applicable in its several successive parts to the Christian, when it should be given; applicable, as the type to its counterpart, the shadow to its substance. The history of the Jewish Church is, according to the interpretation of inspired wisdom, a series of Prophecies or emblems designed to be fulfilled in the Christian. When our Saviour came, and commenced his ministry, the closing scene of the old Covenant was all that remained; and here, by a reversed order, the closing scene of the Christian dispensation was made to furnish the instruments and emblems of Prophecy for the end of the Jewish. We shall first explain what we mean by this assertion, and then point out the didactic tendency of the Prophecy so established.

Ministry of Christ.

It is not unusual to say, that our Lord has blended in this Prophecy the events of the last day with those of the downfal of Jerusalem, which is not a complete view of the case, and hardly a correct one as far as it does go. His use of these mysterious images should rather be considered the same as his use of the hieroglyphic symbols of ancient Prophecy; that is, *they are employed in the Prophecy only in their secondary and symbolical meaning*. When, for instance, we read, that the Lord "will send his Angels and gather together his elect from the four winds, from the one end of heaven to the other," *the only meaning of the description in this place* we contend is, that which relates to the fate of his elect on the destruction of Jerusalem. We do not deny that it is capable of another interpretation, and that it is a description of part of the last day's eventful scene; nay more, we should say, that is its literal and original meaning; and so we should say of the expressions, "the stars falling from heaven," and "the sun being turned into darkness," that if they were not taking a part as it were in the figurative representation of Prophecy, they would signify the actual derangement of the heavenly system. But as, in this latter case, the descriptions are here introduced only in their secondary application, so we may conclude that in the former instance the same only is intended. For it is to be observed, that all the revelation concerning the last day contained in these Prophecies had been previously detailed in one form or another. The *revelation* had been already made, and this was only an adaptation of its imagery to the destruction of Jerusalem. The propriety of this method is another question; but those who are disposed to regard it as intricate and unnatural, should remember that the revealed circumstances of the last day had to the mind of a believer already assumed the form and certainty of recorded events, and admitted, in an address to him, of the same use as historical facts. For, to a believer, what is Prophecy but anticipated history?

Such appears to be the true character of this Prophecy. At the same time, that some indistinctness and confusion should exist in a cursory view of it is natural enough, considering that a portion of its imagery is derived from a state of things which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive." It is the necessary result of our want of an appropriate and literal language for unearthly revelation. All description of such mysteries can only be composed of terms adopted or metaphorical, and where (as in this Prophecy) a *second* transfer of these terms has been made, it is not immediately obvious, whether the objects from which that language is

History. borrowed be those whose original property it is, or those others which have invaded it, and taken possession for want of a language of their own.

But if the introduction of these topics into the Prophecy in question was not made with a view to reveal the mysteries of the last day, what was the intent? For this we must revert to the introductory remark, that the fate of Jerusalem represented the fate of the old dispensation. Now if the end of the world was to the Christian dispensation what the destruction of Jerusalem was to the Mosaic, the inference forced on men's minds by having these two corresponding events continually brought in close connection before them was, *that Christianity was the final covenant of God with man*, that Christ having once come, we were never to look for another; another Preacher of Righteousness; another Prophet; another Lord; another Mediator; another Redeemer.

That such was actually the impression wrought by these means on the earliest ages, may be not unfairly presumed, from the transition which soon took place in the application of the terms, "the last days," the "end of the world," &c. First adopted as descriptive of the end of Jerusalem, from the hint they continually afforded, by the mode of their use, that Christianity was the final dispensation, they gradually came to be used for the whole *Christian period*, considered in that light. Thus the Epistle to the Hebrews (the main object of which is this very point) opens with a contrast between the old and the new Covenants, and designates the period of the latter by "these last days." "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers in time past by the prophets, hath in *these last days* spoken unto us by his Son."

The sum of all this is, that the images of the end of the world were first employed in our Saviour's Prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, in the same manner as if, using hieroglyphics, he had expressed that event by a picture of the circumstances under which the world was to end, that the choice was designed for the purpose of inculcating the doctrine that Christianity was the final dispensation of God to mankind, and that from the impression thus produced the phrases of "the last days," the "end of the world," &c. came to signify the whole period of the Christian dispensation, viewed in the light of God's final covenant with his creatures.

The Temptation and Transfiguration.

There are two events in our Saviour's history, which although not generally considered as making part of his ministry to man, yet are so far mysteriously connected with it as to deserve a particular notice. The first is

The Temptation.

In the various expositions of this, more perhaps than of any other passage of Scripture, Theologians appear not unfrequently to have mistaken their proper province. Exercising all their ingenuity in the unprofitable attempt to explain the *real nature* of those mysteries which God has disclosed to us, instead of *their reference to us*, they have made this as well as many other awful and glorious spectacles of Revelation subjects of contemplation and wonder, rather than symbols of instruction. Revelation has been fitly called Light. Its great author has designated himself as Light. But it is a light to see by, not to gaze at. It is analogous, not to any dazzling meteor in the appearances of Nature, or to any splendid spectacle produced by Art, but to that glorious luminary, which is not the less serviceable in enabling us to be sure of our path that we cannot steadfastly behold it. Ministry of Christ.

Out of this arises another error. Mistaking the nature of Theological knowledge, we naturally mistake its extent and limits. If a subject be proposed to us, the real nature of which we are to study, it seems just and reasonable that it should be placed before us *in a complete form*. If Agriculture, for instance, had been a subject of revelation, men would doubtless not only have been instructed in the right method of preparing the earth, but would also have been informed of the necessity of sowing the seed, and whatever else might be requisite to secure a complete harvest. Accordingly, the Theologian who expects so to understand such parts of the scheme of redemption as have been revealed, as if the knowledge were absolute and not relative, naturally attempts to fill up the scheme, so as to make all appear rational, intelligible, wise, merciful, &c., all which is contrary to Scripture. For St. Paul affirms, in the first place, that "we see through a glass darkly," and secondly, that "now we only know *in part*." Scenes infinitely more mysterious, unaccountable, and awful than the Temptation, or even than the death of Christ, may have taken place in the scheme of man's redemption, of which we know no more than the unborn does of life. And even with regard to those points which are revealed, we shall strangely bewilder ourselves if we so use them, as forgetting that they are lights to see by, not to look at.

The character and design of the Temptation may perhaps be best understood by contrasting it with the Crucifixion. The former was the commencement, the latter the close of Christ's work. They correspond too in one remarkable circumstance. *Each was the hour of Satan.* In the first Christ was led into the wilderness purposely to be tempted by him, and that ended, the Devil departed from him "for a season." That the concluding scene of his ministry was the occasion when he was permitted to return, and once more to display the utmost exertion of his power, is not only probable from the character of the event, but seems to be clearly intimated by our Saviour's words, "This is your hour and the power of darkness;" "The Prince of this world cometh."

Now the great object of Christ's Ministry was to undo the mischief which the Evil Being had done. And this was twofold: first, he had introduced into the world Sin; secondly, he had introduced Death. Now it is admitted by all rational Christians, that the solemn spectacle on the Cross had reference to the latter. Christ's death there is said to be vicarious, that is, he died instead of those who were the proper subjects of death. "He died, that all who believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." In other words, he died for his Church. In the mysterious scene of the Crucifixion he may be considered as representing the universal Church, undergoing (as it must collectively, and in its members separately) the mortal decay and dissolution of this world, but escaping from the spiritual evils accompanying that decay and dissolution in a world to come. Christ died and rose again from the dead, in order to exhibit death as it was in future to take place, that is, separated from all that was most horrible

History. in it, divested of its "terrors," disarmed of its "sting," and no longer the same death.

Now let us turn to our more immediate subject, the Temptation. Satan had brought into the world Sin as well as Death; Sin before Death; its forerunner, and its cause. Now the Temptation appears to have been with regard to Sin what the Crucifixion was with regard to Death. It was a vicarious representation. Christ was first tempted instead of his Church, and afterwards died instead of it. But, as his death did not imply that his Church was not afterwards to be subject to mortality, but only that the worst and most peculiar evil of death was done away with; so, with regard to the Temptation, he was tempted instead of his Church, not in order that his Church should be no more tempted, but to show that the strongest temptations should no longer be necessarily fatal; that he who was then the earthly abode of the Godhead, having manifested and given a specimen of the curtailed and no longer resistless power of the Evil one, his followers might know that when he left the world, and God was manifested in another way, namely, by his Holy Spirit, that the abode of the Godhead on earth should still be equally secure against temptation, if the same use were made of the same power "working in it;"* that his Church, which is now the earthly residence of the Godhead, and whose members are "the temple of the Holy Ghost," should still indeed be tempted, as was he in whom "dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," but like him not necessarily unto sin.

That the Temptation, if exhibited with this view, should have some Prophetic reference to the trials of the Church in successive ages is natural. We should indeed be surprised to find it otherwise.† The temptations of individual Christians being of infinite variety, and being besides less important in detail, the trials of the Church more particularly as a body, would surely be the trials pointed to by this mystery. Especially too as it was the Church, and not any individual members, which was to be marked as finally triumphant over the wiles of Satan.‡

Let us then consider what have been the temptations of Christ's Church since its establishment, and let us compare them with the several stages of this singular and mysterious transaction.

The first suggestion of the Devil to Christ was, that after long fasting he should command the stones to be made bread. Now, although it seems by no means intended that the order of the Church's trials should be the same as that of its type, which indeed are not recorded in the same order by St. Matthew and St. Luke, yet it has so happened, that the first temptations of his Church arose from poverty and distress; and great need had it for the first three or four centuries to remember that "man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Ministry of Christ.

Again, the Tempter is represented as suggesting to Christ that, contrary to the course appointed him, trusting to the support of Angels and Spirits, he should cast himself down from a pinnacle of the Temple, with a view, perhaps, to dazzle and delude the multitude amongst whom he would have alighted.* Presumptuous reliance on Divine grace and favour, even to the despising of all appointed means, (such as his Church too has been tempted to indulge in,) is too exact a counterpart to be mistaken. We may even venture, perhaps, to pursue the analogy further, and to consider the suggestion of Satan, "Angels shall bear thee up," as the same which has tempted the Church to call in the aid of Saints and Spirits, to depend on them to bear it up, and to trust to their interposition for its security and success.

The remaining Temptation of our Lord is of still more obvious application. The Devil is said to have taken him up into an exceeding high mountain, and to have shown him all the Kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, and to have said unto him, "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." The parallel scarcely need be drawn. His Church also has seen the Kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, and has been tempted in the pride of Popish times to grasp at universal temporal dominion, and to forget its spiritual character. To this temptation it is still exposed, in proportion as its members look to temporal power and temporal glory as their proper objects of ambition.†

---

* "Destroy this temple, and in three days," are words which can be only understood as implying that Christ was then what the Jewish Temple had been, and what the Church was to be, viz. the abode of the Godhead.

† The several circumstances of the temptation, from their manifest reference to the establishment and trials of the Jewish Church, (the great type according to St. Paul of the Christians,) of themselves suggest this view of the transaction. The forty days' fast can hardly be considered as an unintentional coincidence with the forty days during which Moses was in the mount with God before the promulgation of the Jewish Law. The answers of our Saviour to the Tempter too, have all undoubted reference to the especial trials of God's early Church in its progress to the earthly Canaan.

‡ The only way in which the temptations of the Church are known is by the *success* of the Tempter. But it must be borne in mind, that the parallel between Christ and his Church is not impaired by this circumstance. For it is not the Church which has yielded, but certain members of it, (it matters not how large a proportion of them, suppose all, provided that by its recovery and reformation the Church itself is proved to have escaped.)

* This temptation in its primary import was, perhaps, of a twofold character; at least there seems to be good grounds for conjecturing that more was intended than to tempt the Saviour to an act of presumptuous confidence. The choice of the place, a pinnacle of the Temple, from which his descent would have been a public spectacle to the Jews, looks much as if it had some reference to the well-known prejudice that their Messiah, the Son of Man, should be seen descending visibly from the clouds, preparatory to his assumption of a temporal state and authority.

† There is a singular coincidence between the petitions of the Lord's Prayer and the Temptation; and when we recollect that this is the only prayer which Christ has left with his Church, the coincidence may seem not unworthy of notice. *Prayer.* Give us this day our daily bread.—*Temptation.* Command these stones that they be made bread. Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

Prayer. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, or the Devil.—*Temptation.* Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

Prayer. Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.—*Temptation.* He showeth him all the *Kingdoms* of the world, and the *glory* of them, and saith unto him, All these things *will I give thee*, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.

The coincidence may after all be accidental, but those who think otherwise may observe that one petition of the Lord's Prayer has no correspondent in the Temptation, *Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us.* To complete the analogy, then, it will be necessary to include in the Temptation that last trial of our Lord on the Cross, when the tempter returned after a season, and Christ's final triumph over him was marked by a prayer for the forgiveness of his murderers. How far the Church may seem from its history to have profited by this addition to the symbolical warnings of the Temptation, the lives of its martyrs will tell us.

History.

The Transfiguration.

One cannot but be struck, on perusing the Gospels, with the continual request of the Jews to have a *sign* given them from Heaven, even whilst our Lord was in the act of performing his signs and Miracles for their conversion. Their desire (as was before observed) appears to have been founded on the Prophecy of Daniel, which describes the Son of Man as "coming with the clouds of Heaven." The belief evidently was, that the Messiah should be seen literally descending from the Heavens, and arrayed in some brilliant emblems of his glory. That the fulfilment of this expectation might have been intended in the Transfiguration, seems not improbable from the remark of the Apostles who were permitted to be witnesses of it. Their words seem to denote that *all ground of scruple* was now removed: "How say the Scribes then that Elias must first come?"

The appearance of Moses and Elias conversing with him has been not unreasonably received as the token that the covenant was changed, and the Law and the Prophets succeeded by the Gospel.

Conclusion.

Before we close this part of our subject, the allegorical interpretation which has been claimed for certain passages of our Lord's ministry, may seem to call for some further remarks. It may be asked, "Why should such a mode of instruction be adopted, the more natural way being for our Lord to deliver his doctrines in express terms; and as he has actually done so, what need of another language to convey the same truth?" Ministry of Christ.

In the first place, then, to the Jews the more natural method was the allegorical; such being the character of their numerous rites, and of the greater part of their Scriptures.

Besides which, the Christian's view of the *doctrines* of his Religion was hereby connected with the *proofs* of it. The same Miracle furnished at once instruction and proof of the teacher's authority to instruct; so also did the completion of a Prophecy.

To which we may add, that in the case of a Miracle assuming the character of a Prophecy, the Miracle carries with it its own proof that it was not a forgery or delusion. The importance then of perceiving the secondary character of such Miracles, at least, is obvious.

It cannot but be denied that an injudicious application of the method very soon prevailed among Christians, and to this it is owing that it has so long fallen into disuse, and is so generally regarded as at best but fanciful.

Nevertheless, to exclude it altogether (as many are disposed to do) is, perhaps, to close our eyes against one half of the meaning of Scripture; and it may always be at least *safely* adopted, when it is not made the ground of any new doctrine.

TITUS FLAVIUS VESPASIANUS.

FROM A. D. 79 TO 81.

Biography. From A. D. 79. to 81.

THE death of Vespasianus did not create in the public mind any of those painful apprehensions which had accompanied the demise of several of his predecessors. The high character of Titus gave confidence to all ranks of the State. They beheld in him a Sovereign worthy of his father's reputation, and not undeserving, as they hoped, of that splendid dignity which the respect of the Roman people had conferred on the Flavian family. His military talents were proved by the successful issue to which he had brought the sanguinary and protracted war which was waged with the Jews; while his ability in discharging the more peaceful duties which belong to the administration of Law and the details of finance, had procured for him, within the walls of Rome, the most endearing impressions of public esteem.

Favourable opinions of Titus.

His education and character.

Suetonius, in his biography of this Emperor, traces his progress in early life from the mean dwelling in which he was born, near Septizonium, to the palace of the Cæsars, whither he was invited to share the education and the splendour which were bestowed upon the young Britannicus; whose fate, it is added, he very narrowly escaped, when the unfortunate son of Claudius fell a victim to the ambition of Agrippina and the jealousy of Nero.* The same writer takes pleasure in relating his proficiency in learning, and in describing the fine figure and manly appearance which graced his approach to maturity of age. Titus, we are assured, excelled not less in the arts of peace, than in those of war. To the study of Letters and the embellishments of Poetry, he added a remarkable dexterity in the use of arms, and in the exercises of horsemanship. He possessed a retentive memory, and the power of a free and elegant declamation; while, in the use of his pen, he had acquired so much facility as to be able not only to keep pace with a rapid speaker, but also to imitate any hand-writing with such a degree of exactness as to deceive the most practised eye. On the ground of this qualification, he himself used jocularly to boast that he was fitted to act the part of a consummate forger.† His maners, too, were gentle and insinuating. He was courteous, affable, and affectionate; familiar without sacrificing the dignity which belonged to his rank, and merciful without relaxing the obligations of military discipline. So conspicuous, indeed, were the amiable qualities which formed his character, that he obtained from his contemporaries the flattering title of the *Delight of Mankind*; a complimentary expression which has been transmitted in the page of History even to our own times.

His amiable qualities.

Beginning of public life.

He served his first campaigns in Germany and Britain; where the reputation which he gained was perpetuated by statues and images. During the intervals of war, he appears to have devoted his time to the practice of Law and the study of eloquence; the most liberal pursuits of his Age, and upon which he entered, says his biographer, more for honour than for profit.

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 79. to 81.

The appointment of Vespasianus to a command in Syria soon called Titus into the East, to participate in the toils and fame of the conquest of Judæa. Under the direction of his father, he reduced the strong towns of Tarichæa and Gamala, and thereby opened a path for accomplishing those still more brilliant achievements which crowned his labours under the walls of Jerusalem.

Services in the East.

When Galba had been raised to the Imperial throne, Titus was commissioned by the Commanders in Syria to carry to Rome a message of congratulation; but as intelligence of the Emperor's death met him at Corinth, he relinquished the journey into Italy, and returned without delay to the seat of war. It is said, indeed, that in passing the Island of Cyprus he was induced to consult the oracle of the Paphian Goddess; whose Priest, it is further remarked, sent him away full of hopes, both in regard to the issue of his voyage, and also as to the expectations of Sovereignty which had already begun to occupy his thoughts.*

Is sent to congratulate Galba.

Upon his arrival in Syria he found his father solicited by the army to assume the Empire, and even encouraged by Mucianus, Proconsul in that important Province. The good offices of Titus soon brought the two Generals to a final arrangement. Vespasianus was declared Master of Rome, by the titles of Augustus and Emperor; and the legions of the East were intrusted to his son, with instructions to prosecute the war against the infatuated and rebellious Jews.

Returns to Syria, and assumes the command.

His first cares after the destruction of Jerusalem were diverted to Parthia, that formidable rival of the Roman power on the banks of the Euphrates. He repaired to Zeugma, where he met the Ambassadors of Artabanus, and confirmed the peaceful relations which had for some time subsisted between the two countries. After this, his duty as well as his inclination required that he should present himself at Rome. Tacitus, indeed, insinuates that the pleasures of the Capital, and impatience to enjoy the honours which awaited him as the conqueror of Palestine, had induced him to press too eagerly the siege of Jerusalem, and to urge with undue haste the fate of the vanquished inhabitants. But there appears not to have been very good ground for this ungenerous charge. On the contrary, we have the authority of Suetonius, Dion Cassius, and even of Josephus, for asserting that it was not until an unseasonable expression of affection on the part of the army for their young commander had alarmed his prudence, and excited the suspicions of his enemies, that Titus resolved to withdraw himself from a scene where his loyalty and honour were exposed to impeachment.†

Meets the Parthian Ambassadors.

Leaves the East and proceeds to Rome.

* Suet. *Tit.* c. 1—3. Tacit. lib. ii. c. 1, 2.

† The words of Suetonius, (*Tit.* c. 3,) *E pluribus comperi notis quoque excipere velocissimè solitum:—imitarique chirographa, quæcunque vidisset ac sæpe profiteri, se maximum falsarium esse potuisse.*

* Suet. *Tit.* c. 5. Tacit. lib. ii. c. 1—4.

† Tacit. lib. v. c. 11. Suet. *Tit.* c. 5. Dion Cassius, lib lxvi.

Biography. From A. D. 79. to 81.

The innocent ceremony of wearing a crown at the consecration of the Egyptian Apis, having the warrant of an ancient custom to sanction it, could be misunderstood only by those who were desirous to found a weighty charge on a mere trifle. At all events the suspicions which were propagated respecting his views in the East obliged Titus to hasten his return to Italy.*

Anecdote of Apollonius Tyanæus.

We know not what credit is due to the account of Philostratus, who relates that when the Prince was at Argos, on his way to Rome, he sent for Apollonius Tyanæus, the noted impostor, to consult him in regard to his future prospects, and the maxims of government which it behoved him to pursue. In reference to the former, the soothsayer intimated to him that he was doomed to be poisoned by his brother Domitianus; a prediction, adds Philostratus, which was given in language so extremely obscure, that Titus was not supposed to comprehend its import. As to the duties of a sovereign, Apollonius did not feel himself compelled to have recourse to mystery. He advised the son of Vespasianus to imitate the wisdom and firmness which appeared in every part of his father's administration; and to submit with respectful silence to the reproofs of Demetrius, the Cynical Philosopher, who he assured him would make it his business to reprehend the monarch whenever he should be found to act amiss.†

Triumph at Rome.

The Prince was received at Rome by the title of Cæsar, and admitted to the honour of a joint Triumph with the Emperor. He soon became the depositary of all power, and the source of the executive authority in all its branches; discharging the office of Censor, which Vespasianus had assumed, and even watching over the duties of the Prætorian Præfect, never before administered but by a Roman Knight.

Temporary unpopularity.

The only stain which was ever attached to the life of Titus belongs to this period of his history, when his situation drew down upon him all the invidiousness of power, without supplying him with the means of securing popular affection. He is accused of having acted in some cases hastily and severely; and even of having gratified his personal resentment by condemning officers of rank to an ignominious death. He is, moreover, charged with avarice and bribery, on the authority of Suetonius, who asserts that those who had causes depending before the Emperor knew how to obtain a favourable hearing, by placing a sum of money in the hands of the Cæsar. He had given offence, too, by an unwise attachment to Berenice, the sister of King Agrippa; a Princess who obtained a great ascendency over him when serving in Judæa, and who followed him to Rome upon the close of the war. In a word, so seriously did the people regard these frailties in the character of their Prince, that they anticipated in his reign a renewal of the flagitious, tyrannical, and sanguinary deeds which had condemned to everlasting infamy the name and government of Nero.‡

Ascends the throne, and shows many good qualities.

But the character of Titus assumed its true lustre when, on the death of Vespasianus, he ascended the throne, and found himself permitted to follow the bent of his natural disposition. Sovereign power, the seducing charms of which have often proved fatal to men who in private life have been objects of love and esteem, improved the good qualities of Titus, and corrected all his failings.

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 79. to 81.

He began by showing deference even for the prejudices of his countrymen, who were unwilling that he should marry the sister of Agrippa. He sent her away from Rome, assuring her that his affections had undergone no change, but that he was no longer at liberty to yield to inclinations inconsistent with the welfare and wishes of his subjects. He likewise restricted himself in other indulgences, which, he knew, were likely to awaken the apprehensions of his people. He removed all ground of censure as to the profusion of his entertainments, the quality of his society, and the lateness of his hours. The dissolute companions of his early youth were no longer permitted to frequent his table; for while he wished that gaiety and freedom should reign at his feasts, he insisted that these should also be adorned with moderation and virtue.*

He confirms the donations of his predecessors.

He further signalized the commencement of his reign, by issuing an ordinance to relieve all who held lands of the Republic, from the necessity of having their grants or leases renewed upon every accession to the throne. Ever since the reign of Tiberius it had become a rule, that all territorial possessions conferred upon the servants of the State, should, upon the death of the Prince who made the benefaction, relapse into the hands of the new Emperor, who was solicited to renew or confirm the deed of his predecessors. Titus, aware of the expense and anxiety attending this regulation, resolved to ratify by one general decree all the gifts made by the Imperial Government. His example, too, became a law in all future times, which was never infringed by the most tyrannical or avaricious of those worthless adventurers whom intrigue and violence raised to the throne of Augustus.†

Generous conduct to two conspirators.

When he entered upon the office of High Priest he declared, that he looked upon that sacred dignity as a prohibition imposed upon him, never to stain his hands with the blood of any citizen; a resolution to which he firmly adhered throughout his whole reign. As a proof of this remarkable clemency it is mentioned, that when two Patricians were convicted of having conspired against him, he refused to give orders for their execution; declaring that he would rather die himself than be the occasion of death to any human being. He sent for the conspirators to attend him in the palace; when he embraced the opportunity of remonstrating with them on their undutiful attempt, and exhorted them to desist from such rash projects for the time to come. He reminded them, that the cares of sovereignty were only intrusted to those whom Heaven was pleased to select for so arduous a charge; that their machinations could never disturb the decrees of Fate; that it was not in his power to bestow upon them the dangerous preeminence to which they aspired, but that there was nothing else which his rank as Emperor enabled him to grant which he would deny to their requests. Meantime, as the mother of one of the criminals resided at a considerable distance from Rome, he directed a messenger to proceed to her house with the utmost expedition, and to assure her that the life of her son was in no danger. He then invited them both to sup with him; and next day being present at

* Suet. *ubi suprà.* † Phil. *in vit. Apol. Tyan.* lib. vi. c. 14, 15.
‡ Suet. *Tit.* c. 7. Tacit. lib. ii. c. 2. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvi. *Denique*, says Suetonius, *propalam alium Neronem et opinabantur et prædicabant.*

* Suet. c. 7. *Amicos elegit, quibus etiam post eum Principes, ut et sibi et Reipublicæ necessariis adquieverunt, præcipuèque usi sunt.*
† Suet. c. 8. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvi.

a combat of gladiators, he conducted them to his own seat in the theatre, placed one on each side of him to witness the spectacle, and when the arms of the combatants were, according to custom, brought to him for inspection, he put them into their hands and requested their opinion. *

Discourages public informers.

Dion Cassius relates, that Titus would neither listen in person, nor allow the Magistrates to lend a ready ear, to the accusations of informers; who, during the suspicious and unsettled times which had recently passed by, were accustomed to construe into treason against the Emperor the most innocent expressions that happened to drop from the lips of individuals in private society. "As for myself," said he, "I disregard entirely the strictures of weak, imprudent men, who speak in ignorance or envy. I am not conscious of any fault, and therefore I cannot be sensible to the reproaches of those who are incapable of appreciating my conduct, and of weighing my motives. In regard to my predecessors, again, I do not feel that I am answerable for their actions, or bound to vindicate their reputation where it is justly assailed. As they are now raised to the rank of Gods, let them avenge their own quarrel, if they conceive themselves wronged, and leave us to enjoy repose." †

Remarkable sayings.

The benevolence and clemency of this Emperor's character formed so striking a contrast to the cruelty of Nero, the severity of Galba, and even the unrelenting discipline of Vespasianus, that the history of his reign, and the pages of his biographers, present hardly any other topic, besides anecdotes of his kindness, and illustrations of his mercy and forbearance. The pen of Suetonius, which, unintimidated by the grossest vices and the most appalling scenes of bloodshed and revenge, describes without reserve the darkest incidents of the Imperial palace during former reigns, assumes a purer style and a loftier aim while tracing the outlines of the brief government of Titus. There is a vivid satisfaction manifested in the narrative wherein we are informed that this amiable Prince, recollecting one evening at supper that no one had profited by his exertions or his humanity since he had left his bedchamber in the morning, exclaimed, "My friends, I have lost a day." ‡ We detect the same feeling of delight in the apology which the biographer records, for the weakness which Titus displayed in not being able to deny a request. "It is not fitting," said the Emperor, "that any one should retire from an audience of his Sovereign with a heavy heart." §

Intrigues of Domitianus.

The beginning of this happy reign was somewhat clouded by the sullen temper and dark designs of Domitianus. This Prince, whose ambition had already suggested to him certain plans equally inconsistent with his duty as a subject and with the safety of the commonwealth, complained aloud on the accession of his brother, that the testament of the late Emperor had been vitiated; it being the intention of his father, he averred, that the two sons should inherit the throne jointly. He next meditated an attempt on the fidelity of the army, by presenting to them a donation, double in amount to that which had been bestowed by Titus; and it was not until he discovered the firm hold which the new Emperor had obtained upon the affections of the soldiers, as well as of the whole body of the Senate, that he consented to desist from his treasonable enterprise.

The intrigues and discontent of Domitianus were not unknown at Court. Titus, on the contrary, was perfectly acquainted with the secret springs of his brother's conduct, and also with the dangers which thereby threatened his own person and government; but the natural generosity of his mind opposed every expedient which was presented to him for avoiding those evils, if founded on the death or even the restraint of an individual, to whom Providence had placed him in so near a relation. He would not listen to any proposal for urging against Domitianus a criminal charge, by which his life might be endangered, or even his personal liberty invaded. He chose rather to lavish on him an increased degree of kindness, and to invest him with still higher honours. He made him his colleague in the Consulship, and declared his willingness to admit him to a participation in the government. Suetonius relates, that he often conjured him, with tears in his eyes, not to hate a brother whose love to him was sincere and constant; and, particularly, not to disgrace himself by attempting to obtain, by an unpardonable crime, that power which Nature had destined for him in due time, and which he already possessed almost entire. Historians have blamed this confidence and facility on the part of Titus; and the circumstances which attended the death of this popular Prince afford some ground for doubt, that the gloomy temper of Domitianus was not materially improved by those repeated tokens of affection and trust. *

Forgiving disposition of Titus.

War in Britain.

While the Emperor was busily employed in strengthening the foundations of peace and prosperity at home, and in removing from the minds and fortunes of the Roman people all traces which had been left of the civil wars and the successive tyrannies which had followed the death of Claudius, his General, the renowned Agricola, was pursuing a series of conquests in Britain, and planting among the barbarous inhabitants of that island the arts and institutions of Italy and Greece. It belongs to another part of our work to describe the progress of the Roman arms in this remote province, meantime, we proceed to give an abridged account of a disastrous event, arising from natural causes, the effects of which remain at the present hour to bear evidence to the extent of a calamity which continues to give a melancholy interest to the first year of Titus's government. †

Eruption of Vesuvius. A. D. 79.

It was in the month of August, in the seventy-ninth year of our Faith, that the first indications appeared of that memorable eruption of Vesuvius which laid waste the fair fields and some of the most splendid cities of Campania. The younger Pliny, on whose authority the narrative of this occurrence is usually made to rest, was at that time residing with his uncle at Mysænum, the principal station of the Imperial fleet. An immense cloud of smoke and ashes rose to a great height in the atmosphere, bearing some resemblance to the trunk and branches of a pine-tree; and as it was impossible to ascertain at such a distance the occasion of this unusual sight, the elder Pliny, who commanded at the port, gave orders to prepare for sea a swift-sailing ship, on board of which he immediately embarked, in order to obtain a nearer view of so striking a

* Suet. c. 9. † Dion Cassius, lib. lxvi.
‡ Suet. c. 8. *Amici, perdidi diem!*
§ *Non oportere quemquam a sermone Principis tristem discedere.*

* Suet. *Tit.* c. 9.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lxvi. Tacit. *Agricol.* c. 20.

Biography. From A. D. 79. to 81.

phenomenon, and to inquire philosophically into its proximate cause. *

This celebrated person had scarcely set sail, when every thing assumed a most appalling aspect. The earth shook with great violence, and the mountains trembled to their very tops. A noise like thunder was heard underground; the rocks along the shore re-echoed a strange and indescribable sound, which seemed to proceed from the very bowels of the earth; the soil was hot and almost burning; the sea boiled, and the whole firmament appeared on fire. At length the flames burst forth from the torn volcano, when a mass of stones and lava was thrown into the air, which in their descent covered the sides of the mountain as well as the surrounding plain. This eruption was succeeded by a cloud of smoke so dense and murky, that the sun was no longer visible, and the face of day was changed into a night of horror. The inhabitants fled from their tottering houses, and sought for safety in the fields; while others were seeking refuge from the solitary desolation of the country in the crowds which covered the highways near the towns. Those who were at sea were impelled by terror to turn their ships towards land; where they were met by thousands equally alarmed, seeking means to intrust their life and fortunes to the waves.

Meanwhile the cloud of smoke and dust carried dismay to the walls of the capital. The darkness which sunk down upon the city terrified the inhabitants of Rome to such a degree, that many of them threw themselves, with their families, into ships bound for Africa and Egypt; imagining, that Italy was about to atone for its sins by enduring the uttermost wrath of the Gods. But the immediate neighbourhood of Vesuvius presented a scene of still greater destruction and alarm. At Mysænum, a distance of nearly twenty miles, the ashes fell in such quantities, that the younger Pliny, who was obliged to sit down in the fields with his mother, to avoid the risk of being crushed in pieces by the throng of fugitives who fled in the dark, relates, that had they not used the precaution of constantly shaking the dust off their persons, they would have been smothered in a very short time.

The elder Pliny, having reached Stabiæ, passed the night in the house of a friend. While the Philosopher was asleep, the court which surrounded the dwelling was filled with large stones and ashes to such a depth, that it was not without considerable difficulty that any individual of the party made his escape; and in order to guard against the stones which were falling in great quantities everywhere around them, they covered their bodies with cushions and carpets.

The sun was now risen, but his beams could not penetrate the thick cloud which brooded over Stabiæ. Torches were therefore used in order to find a passage towards the beach; it having been determined to put to sea, as the only means of safety, provided the waves were sufficiently allayed to render such a retreat practicable. But the ocean was at that eventful moment more agitated than ever. Pliny threw himself on the ground wrapped in a cloak or blanket, and drank some cold water, which had been seasonably procured for him. Another discharge from the mountain, however, made all their cares prove fruitless. Every one yielded to the impulse of self-preservation and fled, except two slaves, who seemed willing to hazard their lives with the view of saving that of the great naturalist. Pliny made an effort to rise, supported by his faithful attendants; but he almost instantly dropped down again, suffocated, it was supposed, by the increasing heat of the sulphureous atmosphere, and by the cloud of dust which impregnated the air. Two days elapsed before his friends had recovered sufficiently from their terror to search for his body and give it burial; a duty which was then performed with all the respect due to so great a character, and with those feelings of regret and sorrow which never fail to attend the obsequies of public men who have fallen victims to the love of knowledge or to the exertions of patriotism. *

Titus Flavius Vespasianus. From A. D. 79. to 81.

Death of the elder Pliny.

His nephew has described in very moving language the horrors and anxiety of the dreadful night which succeeded his departure from Mysænum. It belongs not to us, however, to follow up the details of this calamity at greater length. Suffice it to remind the reader, that it was on this occasion the cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii were buried under that mass of ashes which has concealed them from the light of day for more than seventeen hundred years.

Destruction of Herculaneum and Pompeii.

The miserable events described above were followed by a pestilence at Rome; of which it is said that not fewer than ten thousand people died daily, during a considerable period. This malady is ascribed by historians to the pollution which is supposed to have affected the air, in consequence of the volcanic eruptions of Vesuvius; but it is more probable that it originated in the poverty and filth occasioned by the sudden increase made to the population of the Capital, when the fugitives from the ruined towns and villages of Campania sought an asylum within its walls.

Pestilence at Rome

Such misfortunes wounded deeply the compassionate heart of Titus. He felt, says Suetonius, not only like a Prince but as a father, for the sufferings of his people; and spared neither labour nor expense to relieve their distress. He set apart proper funds to repair the losses sustained by the people of Campania; intrusting the disbursement of them to two men of Consular rank, whose characters afforded an ample security for the wisdom and humanity of their administration. To accelerate his benevolent views, he proceeded thither in person the following year; using his utmost endeavours to console the afflicted, and to sow again the seeds of wealth and security in that beautiful division of his Empire.

Titus repairs to Campania.

Before he could return to Rome, that city was again visited with a frightful calamity. A fire broke out which raged three days and nights with the greatest violence, destroying an immense number of buildings, both public and private. Among the former were the Pantheon, the Octavian Library, and the Capitol, which last had been but recently restored, after the demolition which it had sustained at the hands of the infuriated Germans during the reign of Vitellius.

Fire at Rome.

No sooner had this afflicting event reached the ears of the Emperor, than he made known his determination to indemnify out of his own coffers all the losses which had accrued either to the State or to individuals. His country-houses were forthwith denuded of their

* Plin. *Epist.* lib. vi. ep. 16, 20.

* Plin. *Epist.* lib. xvi. ep. 20. Sust. *Tit.* c. 8. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvi.

richest ornaments, to embellish anew the temples of the Gods and other public edifices throughout the city; while, in regard to the claims of private sufferers, he appointed certain Roman Knights to regulate the amount of compensation due in every particular case, and to superintend the rebuilding of the streets which had been destroyed by the accident. So unwilling was he that any one besides himself should have a share in the honour of retrieving the fortunes of Rome, that he is said to have refused the contributions which were offered by some of his royal allies, by other cities of the Empire, and by certain of the richest among the Nobility. Titus was a stranger to every kind of avarice; and the rigid economy which he pursued in his personal enjoyments enabled him to command at all times sufficient means, not only to meet the demands of the public service, but also to contribute to the embellishment of his Capital, and the gratification of his subjects.

Generosity and self-denial of the Emperor.

Such was now the constitution of Roman society, that attention to the amusement of the lower class of citizens, in the time of peace, had become no less essential to the tranquillity of the Empire than military talents during the pressure of war. With this view Titus proceeded to finish the Amphitheatre of which his father had laid the foundation; adding to it Baths and other comforts for the gratification of the populace. Upon the dedication of this superb edifice he gave a course of Games, not inferior in magnificence to the most splendid spectacles yielded to a discontented mob by the vanity of Claudius, or the profusion of Nero. The sports lasted a hundred days, during which invention was racked to discover new modes of pleasing the eye and of stimulating the passions of the depraved multitude. Five thousand wild beasts were killed on the arena, in the space of one day. Mimic fleets and armies represented the combats on sea and shore by which the glory of Rome had been obtained, when her citizens were yet uncorrupted through Eastern pomp and Imperial donations. Lions and Elephants were compelled to minister to the entertainment of the masters of the world; and even the slender Crane was taught to engage in battle, and to tear the flesh of its opponent. But such particulars are unworthy of historical diligence; and the recital of them can only be justified as serving to illustrate the first steps in that progressive and melancholy decline which at length subjected the power of the Cæsars to the arms of barbarian conquerors.

Finishes the Amphitheatre and celebrated Games.

The Poet Martial has celebrated the judicious self-denial of Titus, who relinquished for the site of his Amphitheatre and Baths a part of the Imperial gardens enclosed by Nero:

Reddita Roma sibi est; et sunt, te præside Cæsar,
Deliciæ Populi quæ fuerant Domini.

It was observed, that on the last day of the Games the Emperor appeared greatly dejected, and even shed tears. Hoping that his nerves would be strengthened by the purer air of the country, he retired to the neighbourhood of Rietum, whence his family originally sprung; whither, alas, it should seem, he was accompanied by his brother Domitianus. A fever with which he was seized was unduly checked by the use of the bath to which he had become much addicted; and it is added by Suetonius, that the symptoms of the disease were greatly aggravated by adopting a suggestion of Domitianus, that the patient should be put into a tub filled with snow. Titus died on the thirteenth day of September, in the same house wherein his father expired, after a pacific and prosperous reign of two years and nearly three months.*

Illness and death.

The character of this Prince has been given in the history of his actions; and his name, even at the present day, conveys to the reader all those ideas of justice, clemency, wisdom, and benevolence which enter into the conception of a good sovereign. His virtues were the object of universal love and esteem; and they were prized still more highly after his death, when contrasted with the violent and ungovernable temper of the individual who succeeded him on the throne.

* Suet. *Tit.* c. 10. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvi. Plut. *de Sanitate.*

TITUS FLAVIUS DOMITIANUS.

FROM A. D. 81 TO 96.

Biography. From A. D. 81. to 96.

DOMITIANUS hurried from the lifeless body of his brother to secure at Rome the title and congratulations of Imperial power. The loss of Titus and the painful anticipations connected with the new reign occupied all the thoughts of the Senate and People; and hardly were there found within the walls of the city a sufficient number of unconcerned spectators to salute the son of Vespasianus on his accession to the throne.*

Character of Domitianus:

It would have been difficult even for a good Prince to transfer to himself all at once the affections which had been so deeply rooted in the public mind for the person of his immediate predecessor. But Domitianus, it has been observed, seemed only to strive by his vices to strike into every heart a more poignant regret for the misfortune which Rome had sustained in the death of his brother, and to render, by the same means, his own Government both contemptible and odious. We find, accordingly, that the praises bestowed by Historians upon Titus are everywhere contrasted with the execrations which were poured upon the character and administration of his successor; for, if we except the friendly pen of Josephus, there is no writer of those times who does not, by his reproaches, labour to confirm the bad opinion which was entertained of him, as well in Italy as in the remotest Provinces.

Gloomy and unsociable.

Dion assures us that his temper was gloomy and unsocial, incapable of the ordinary sentiments of love and attachment. Under his father's rule, he had crouched with the feelings of a slave; and at a later period he repaid the confidence of his brother by hatred and suspicion. His fears rendered him cruel, and his prodigality made him avaricious; and, under the influence of these odious passions, he sacrificed to a great extent the lives and property of the Roman People. Artifice and dissimulation were in him joined to the other vices which constitute a tyrant; for while he was more blood-thirsty and rapacious than Nero, he never showed any symptoms of that generosity, frankness, and love of the arts, which sometimes appeared in contrast with the barbarities and extravagance which have condemned the latter to never-ending infamy.†

Early life of Domitianus.

Suetonius reminds the reader that Domitianus was born at Rome when Vespasianus his father was about to enter upon his first Consulate; that his early youth was spent in a manner which could give no promise of future eminence or respectability; that he took up arms during the insurrection which terminated the reign of Vitellius; and that when the Capital was set on fire he made his escape, disguised in the dress of a Priest, and took refuge in a mean dwelling beyond the Tiber. When the Flavian family was invested with the purple, Domitianus, who was the only member of the Imperial House actually present in Rome, assumed the exercise of power with so high a hand, that no one could fail to perceive in his character the strongest lineaments of despotism and tyranny. In one day he disposed of twenty appointments on his own authority; a circumstance which drew from his father the jocular remark, that *he was amazed the boy had not also provided him with a successor.**

Titus Flavius Domitianus. From A. D. 81. to 96.

His thirst for military glory.

The ambition of this Prince, stimulated by the fame of his brother, was occasionally inflamed with the desire of military glory. We have already mentioned his resolution to accompany to the banks of the Rhine the General who commanded the legions against the insurgents in the German provinces; and Suetonius informs us that when Vologesus, the King of Parthia, solicited from the Romans an auxiliary force to join him in prosecuting a war with which he was threatened by a tribe of Scythians, and requested that one of the Emperor's sons might be placed at their head, Domitianus used all the arts of intrigue and bribery, in order to obtain the honour of conducting the victorious cohorts of Syria into the remoter East. We need scarcely add that the petition of Vologesus was rejected, and that the youthful hope of the Empire was constrained to remain at home to renew his acquaintance with the Muses, and to seek the rewards of eloquence.

His retired habits upon coming to the throne.

Soon after he succeeded to the government he indulged in that love of solitude, which pride and fear combined to render in a very short time the most confirmed of all his habits. In the beginning of his reign, says his Biographer, he accustomed himself to spend several hours every day in the strictest privacy; employed frequently in nothing else than in catching flies, and piercing them with a sharp instrument. This practice, so unworthy of him who was charged with the prosperity and fame of the greater part of the civilized world, gave rise to the well-known remark which was made to Vibius Crispus, when he asked if there were any one with the Emperor. It was replied, *No, not even a fly.*†

His fickleness and inconstancy.

This inglorious tranquillity was at that time only varied by occasional fits of activity, which were still more prejudicial to his reputation. He had seduced Domitia, the wife of Ælius Lamia, and, upon the birth of a daughter, he publicly declared his mistress the consort of his throne. But hardly had he elevated her to the splendid station of Augusta, than his jealousy was alarmed by certain familiarities to which she admitted the pantomime Paris, and he immediately drove her from his bed and palace. The ascendancy which Domitia had acquired over him was, however, much too strong to be thus suddenly dissolved; her society was become indispensable to the enjoyment of his domestic hours; on which account, says Suetonius, he invited her to return, on pretence that the people were dissatisfied

* Suet. *Domit.* c. 2. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvi.

† Tacit. *Agricol.* c. 45. Suet. *Domit.* c. 2. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii. *apud Vales.*

* Suet. *Domit.* c. 1. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii. Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 9.

† Suet. *Domit.* c. 3.

Biography. From A. D. 81. to 96.

with the divorce. The same author remarks, that in matters of State policy he was equally unsteady, mixing severity with occasional gentleness, and parsimony with the greatest profusion: till, at length, his very virtues assumed the appearance and had all the effects of vice, in private as well as in public life.*

It is not our intention to follow minutely the disgusting details of imbecility and crime which compose the annals of the reign of Domitianus. Unfortunately for the peace and dignity of Rome, the history of her affairs from the days of Augustus is almost entirely identified with the personal character of her rulers; but notwithstanding this fact, we question the expediency of filling our pages with a repetition of the cruel deeds and paltry amusements which year after year employed all the cares of the younger son of Vespasianus. The

Picture of his reign by Tacitus.

picture drawn by Tacitus, in his *Life of Agricola*, exhibits in a few strong lines the impression of fear and distrust which was stamped upon the minds of the Roman people. Wisdom, in those evil days, was compelled to put on the appearance of sloth and inaction. The powers of intellect and taste were blighted by the suspicions of tyranny. The freedom of conversation was denied; and we should have lost, says the Historian, the power of memory, if forgetfulness had been as much a voluntary act as abstinence from speech. Fifteen years, a large portion of human life, passed away, during which every liberal art was discouraged, and every man of genius and spirit either cut off by a violent death, or driven into obscurity.†

Dion Cassius has furnished us with a striking anecdote of the refined extravagance which sometimes mingled itself with the cruelty of this Prince. On one

Singular feast given to the Knights and Senators.

occasion he invited to an entertainment at the palace the principal members of the Senate and of the Equestrian Order. Upon their arrival they were shown into a large room hung with black cloth from the ceiling to the floor, and furnished with couches and other ornaments, all painted in the same colour. When they took their seats at table each man found before him a small monumental pillar, resembling those which the Romans were accustomed to place on their tombs. Every guest read his own name inscribed on this sepulchral decoration by means of the pale light of a lamp, such as those which were kept burning in the vaults wherein they deposited their dead. No private servant was permitted to attend his master; while, to supply this want, a troop of little boys appeared arrayed in sable garments, with their faces blacked, and taught to imitate the motions and cries of Demons. The meat served up displayed the same character. It was that which was usually offered in funeral ceremonies to the ghosts of the departed. The dishes and plate used at table were of the deepest black; and silence as profound as that of the grave reigned throughout the assembly. Domitianus alone opened his mouth; aggravating the fears of his company by telling them tragical stories of bloody deaths, and of massacres perpetrated by treacherous hosts. Every one present concluded that his last hour was come.‡ When he had sufficiently terrified his guests, and gratified his own bad taste, he sent them home with rich gifts, as a reward for the mental sufferings which they had endured.

Nevertheless, in his personal administrations in the capacity of judge, Domitianus is said to have set an example of great integrity; recommending uprightness to all the inferior officers, and punishing severely any one who dared to receive a bribe. On some occasions he subjected to his own immediate review Causes which had been inaccurately determined; and annulled by his supreme authority no small number of decrees, in which favour or mercenary motives had prevailed over the claims of justice. His various attempts for the reformation of manners have likewise been mentioned with approbation. He enacted several laws against women of dissolute morals; discouraged public accusers; and imposed the weight of a very severe penalty upon all who should be found guilty of personal libels and defamation. He moreover relieved from prosecution all who were indebted to the Treasury a longer period than five years. He followed the example of Titus in confirming without petition the grants of all former Emperors; and in order to remove from the officers under his command all temptation to rapacity, he made a liberal addition to their yearly salaries. For the same reason, as well as to increase their attachment to his person, he raised the pay of the soldiers. He lavished large sums on the Pantheon and Capitol, the ornaments of which were not completed in the former reign; and showed an equal zeal for the restoration of other public edifices which had been reduced to ruin by the late destructive fire. But these early claims to the gratitude of his country were cancelled by the cruel tyranny which marked his maturer age.*

Titus Flavius Domitianus. From A. D. 81. to 96.

Administration of justice, and reformation of morals.

His desire for military distinction impelled him, in the third year of his reign, to undertake an expedition against the *Catti*, a German people, whom Tacitus† represents as possessing the arts of peace and the knowledge of war in a higher degree than any of the neighbouring tribes. This act of hostility on the part of the Roman Emperor does not appear to have been provoked by any ambitious or threatening movements on his frontiers; and not expecting to be attacked, they were not prepared with the means of defence. If we are to believe Frontinus,‡ who has handed down the only particular account of this enterprise that has reached our times, we must bestow upon the Imperial leader all the praises which are due to wisdom in councils and vigour in the field. Pretending to have no other object in view besides taking a census of the Gauls, he pushed on his legions to the Rhine before his real intentions were discovered.

His expedition against the Catti. A. D. 84.

But Frontinus wrote his work on *Military Stratagems* while Domitianus was yet on the throne, and for that reason found it, perhaps, more convenient to flatter than to give a strict narrative of facts. Other authors have asserted, that the Roman Eagles were not seen on this occasion by any enemy whatever, but that the valour of the troops was employed under the eye of their master in plundering the territory of their allies, and in wasting the goods of a friendly tribe. The extermination of the *Cherusci*, a neighbouring tribe in alliance with Rome, which was soon afterwards effected by the *Catti*, is a distinct proof that the boasted victories of Domitianus had neither broken their spirit, nor effectually diminished their power. This exploit, however, was neither doubtful nor unimportant in the estimation

He obtains a triumph.

* Suet. *Domit. ubi suprà.* † Tacit. *in Vitâ Agricol.* c. 2, 3.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii. *apud Vales.*

* Suet. *Domit.* c. 8. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii.
† Tacit. *de Mor. German.* c. 30.
‡ Frontin. *de Strat.* lib. i. c. 1. Tacit. *Agricol.* c. 39. Stat. *Sil.* lib. i. c. 5. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii.

of Domitianus himself. Upon his return to Rome he looked to the Senate for the usual expressions of admiration and gratitude conferred on all Commanders whose fortune it had been to extend the boundaries of the State, and to subdue the power of their enemies. The title of *Germanicus* was forthwith either given or confirmed to the conqueror; for it is uncertain whether he had not already assumed that distinction for his march to Lyons during the war with Civilis. A Triumph was likewise decreed, and to supply the want of captives, whom he had neglected to bring from among the vanquished *Catti*, a sufficient number of slaves was purchased in the neighbouring countries, and dressed in the habits of German warriors, in order to complete the pageant. Medals were struck to perpetuate the memory of an event so brilliant and important; and from this epoch the Emperor never appeared in the Senate-house without being arrayed in his robe of Triumph.*

Domitianus institutes Games. A. D. 86.

Domitianus distinguished the fifth year of his government by the institution of Games similar to those which accompanied the periodical return of the Grecian Olympiads. Being designed in honour of *Jupiter Capitolinus*, they took their name from this civic attribute of the father of Gods and of men; and were, like the more celebrated Festival just mentioned, to be repeated every fourth year. They consisted, according to Suetonius, of several kinds of athletic exercises and contests, calculated to invigorate the powers of the mind as well as of the body. Women and even girls appeared on the arena to compete for prizes. The magnificence of Rome was exhausted on the splendour of the scene. The Emperor presided in person to stimulate and reward the ability of the performers; and the Priests of Jupiter vouchsafed their presence, in order to give the solemnity of a religious service to the amusements of the Prince. It is, perhaps, worthy of remark, that the last celebration of the Capitoline Games took place in the year 238, and that they appear to have been finally abolished soon after the conversion of the first Christian Emperor.†

Dacian war A. D. 87.

The tranquillity of Rome was disturbed in the sixth year of Domitianus by intelligence that the Chiefs of Dacia had risen in arms, attacked several garrisons, and even defeated some large bodies of legionary troops. Tacitus, in his *Life of Agricola*, makes an allusion to the Dacian war, when he reminds his reader of the armies which perished in that country and in Mœsia, owing to the cowardice or incapacity of the commanders; adding, that the Empire was in danger not only of losing both sides of the Danube, but even whole Provinces on its southern shore, and the stationary camps of the legions along its banks. Agricola had just returned from his successful campaigns in Britain; and every one wished to see that renowned General placed at the head of the troops which were destined to recover the honour of Rome, and to repel the inroad of barbarians, now become formidable by their skill in arms, and the talents of their King.

Decebalus raised to the throne, and prepares for war with the Romans.

The right of sovereignty, we are told, belonged at that period to Dura, the lineal descendant of the Dacian Princes. But feeling himself unequal to the duties of his high station, he resigned the crown to Decebalus, a Chief of great enterprise, courage, and patriotism. The commencement of the war was signalized by a rapid movement into Mœsia, where the Dacians, encountering the legions under Oppius Sabinus, gained a complete victory, and slew the Roman General. The news of this defeat roused Domitianus, who immediately left his Capital, and proceeded towards the Danube at the head of a powerful army. Decebalus, meantime, willing to secure the advantages which had attended his first operations in the field, made proposals to the Emperor to terminate hostilities; but finding soon afterwards that the command of the fresh legions was intrusted to Cornelius Fuscus,* a hot-headed ignorant soldier, without either experience or caution, he added to the terms of the projected peace the insulting condition, that every Roman in the camp should pay, in the name of tribute or as the price of safety, two pieces of money to the victorious Dacians.

Fuscus is defeated and slain

Fuscus, in order to avenge the disgrace which was thus offered to the majesty of Rome, crossed the Danube in search of the barbarian army. A bloody engagement ensued, in which the troops of Domitianus were again routed with great slaughter. Their General was killed, their arms and baggage fell into the power of the enemy, an Eagle was taken, and a great number of legionary soldiers was carried into captivity. These trophies, so galling to the pride of the Romans, were afterwards recovered during the more successful invasion of Dacia by the Emperor Trajan.†

Victory of Julianus.

After this disaster Julianus, an officer of tried ability, was invested with the principal command; with better fortune than Sabinus or Fuscus, he gave battle to Decebalus, and completely defeated him. Dacia now appeared at the mercy of the conqueror. It was only by a stratagem that even the Capital was saved from falling into his hands; while the King, finding himself sorely pressed, and despairing of being able to cope with the overwhelming power of Rome, proceeded to make a sincere and humble overture for peace. Instead of the haughty style which he had formerly employed, when opposed to the ignorant impetuosity of Fuscus, he now solicited a cessation of arms, professing his readiness to make to the Emperor any concession that was just and reasonable. But Domitianus knew not how to avail himself of this favourable turn of events; and instead of terminating his quarrel with the Dacian insurgents, he resolved to march against two other German nations, the *Quadi* and *Marcomanni*, who had refused to supply their contingent of recruits during the late campaign.‡

Peace with Decebalus.

After a fruitless attempt to appease his wrath, the Germans proposed to meet the Emperor in arms, and to dispute his progress into their country. But his imbecility did more for them than their own bravery and patriotism; for, after having murdered their ambassadors and rejected every offer of submission, he exposed his army to their attacks with so little skill, that he soon found himself compelled to relinquish the expedition in disgrace and confusion. His losses induced him to lend a ready ear to the propositions of Decebalus, and even to purchase peace, and the liberty of withdrawing unmolested the remains of his discomfitted cohorts, at the expense of a considerable ransom.

* Suet. *Domit.* c. 6. Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii. Tacit. *Agricol.* c. 39.
† Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs*, vol. ii.

* Tacit. lib. ii. c. 86. Suet. *Domit.* c. 6.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii.
‡ Ibid. lib. lxvii.

He even consented to pay to the barbarian a yearly tribute, which was continued till the days of Trajan.*

But Domitianus, though he had failed in reaping the fruits of victory, was determined not to relinquish its honours. He fatigued the patience of the Senators with long letters describing his exploits on the Danube, and amidst the wilds of Germany; including among the other labours of his imagination an epistle from Decebalus, expressed in the most submissive terms, and acknowledging the victories of the Imperial Commander. A Triumph was forthwith decreed to the conqueror of the North; and he was, at the same time, invited to add to the once honourable distinction of *Germanicus*, the ambiguous title of *Dacicus*, to which his recent services laid claim. Nothing could exceed the splendour of the Triumphal procession. Games, shows, statues, and arches attested the importance of his conquests. Dacia and the country of the rude Marcomans furnished their respective trophies to grace the car of their invincible master; while Poets and Orators lavished their fulsome encomiums on the rival of Julius Cæsar and the successor of Augustus and Titus. To conclude the imposing ceremony, the Temple of Janus was ordered to be shut; thereby announcing to the Roman People, that the repose of the world had been achieved by the happy exploits of their most warlike and fortunate Emperor.

The Emperor enjoys a Triumph.

These occurrences could not fail to excite at once the regret and ridicule of every citizen who took any interest in the reputation of his country. The younger Pliny has left in his *Letters*,† and more particularly in his *Panegyric*, a strong expression of the public feeling in regard to the ruinous campaigns and more foolish Triumphs of Domitianus. His sluggish and effeminate conduct, when accompanying the army, was attended with the very worst effects both upon officers and men. He was hardly ever seen on horseback, but was carried from place to place in a litter, like a sick or infirm woman; and if he ever ventured to travel by water, it was necessary to devise some means whereby the noise of the oars might be stilled, so as not to disturb the ears of the enervated tyrant. Nor were his jealousy and suspicion less fatal to the discipline of his troops than the example of his luxury and softness. Wanting confidence in his Generals, he never intrusted them with a sufficient degree of power, either to pursue an advantage in the field or to curb the licentiousness of the soldiers; and it is emphatically remarked, that they were less afraid of the wiles and sword of the enemy than they were of the snares spread for them by the Emperor.

Discipline relaxed.

The enormities which disgraced the reign of Domitianus were naturally followed by disaffection among the troops. Lucius Antonius, who commanded the legions in Upper Germany, induced his soldiers to revolt and declare him Emperor, trusting to the aid promised by several nations beyond the Rhine, which were likewise eager to throw off the yoke. The intelligence of this conspiracy created a deep sensation at Rome. Domitianus made preparations for punishing in person the treason of Antonius; and to prevent any movement in favour of the rebels among his partisans in the Capital, he ordered that every man of rank whose age permitted him to bear the fatigue of arms, should join his standard, and be ready to take a share in the campaign. But all these cares were rendered unnecessary by the defeat of the insurgents. Lucius Maximus, who appears to have commanded on the lower Rhine, marched against Antonius, and brought him to battle. While they were engaged, the German allies of the latter arrived on the opposite bank of the river; but not being able to cross, they had the mortification to witness his discomfiture, and the almost entire slaughter of his legions, who had resolved not to survive their treason.*

Revolt of Antonius in Germany:

His defeat by Maximus.

Much about the same time an insurrection took place in Africa. The *Nasamones*, a people who occupied the eastern borders of the ancient Carthaginian territory, unable to bear the pressure of the tribute with which they were loaded, rose against the collectors and put them to death. Flaccus, the Governor of Numidia, advanced against them with a considerable army to chastise their rebellion; but the *Nasamones*, drawing courage from despair, attacked him with so much fury, that the whole of his force was either dispersed or cut in pieces, and his camp fell into the hands of the conquerors. Their success proved fatal to the undisciplined Africans. Intoxicating themselves with the wine which they found in the tents of the Romans, they threw away their arms, and gave loose to the wonted extravagance of barbarian troops; when Flaccus, who had reassembled a body of fugitives, fell upon them in this exposed condition, and put every one of them to the sword. Zonaras, to whose industry we are indebted for these details, narrates that Domitianus was so proud of this victory, that he pronounced at a formal meeting of the Senate, "It was my pleasure that the *Nasamones* should cease to be, and now they no longer exist."†

Insurrection in Africa.

The government of Suetonius Paulinus in the southern parts of Britain had been marked with various success, and had been opposed by several determined struggles for independence. Having at length subdued the reluctant natives, he transferred a peaceful command to his successor Turpilianus, who resting satisfied with the extent of territory which already acknowledged the dominion of Rome, made no attempt to carry his arms farther northwards. This abstinence was imitated by Trebellius Maximus, to whose hands the supreme authority of the Province was next intrusted. Naturally inclined to indolence and the arts of peace, he endeavoured to confirm the influence of his countrymen upon the minds of the illiterate people whose passions he was appointed to watch, rather by inspiring them with the love of ease and of luxury, than by encountering their strength in repeated and bloody combats. The civil broils, too, which during his administration divided the inclinations and employed the arms of the Romans at home, dictated to him the expediency of reserving his legions entire, in case they might be called into action elsewhere. Vertius Bolanus, who relieved him in this command, pursued the same policy. Tacitus, indeed, insinuates that the genius of the officer was of too soft a texture for the arduous duties which his station imposed upon him, and that had he not profitted by the wise counsels and unwearied activity of Agricola, who was appointed his lieutenant, the public service must have sustained material detriment.

Britain Suetonius Paulinus.

Turpilianus.

Trebellius Maximus.

Vertius Bolanus.

* Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. *apud Vales.*

† Plin. *Epist.* lib. viii. c. 4, and *Paneg.* c. 11, 18, 20, 82, &c.

* Suet. c. 7. Plut. *Æmil.* Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii. Plin. *Epist.* lib. x. ep. lxi.

† Zonar. *Ann. Domit.*

Biography. From A. D. 81. to 96

Petilius Cerealis.

At all events, he left things nearly as he found them; having made it his principal study to insure the tranquillity of the Britons, and the repose of his own soldiers.*

But this pacific system was interrupted by the active mind of Petilius Cerealis, the officer who brought to a successful conclusion the war with Civilis the Batavian chief. The accession of Vespasianus to the throne had given stability to the government, and confirmed the loyalty of the troops both at home and abroad, on which account there was no longer any bar to the accomplishment of the design long cherished at Rome, of advancing the standards of the Empire to the remotest shores of the British island. Cerealis accordingly marched into the northern districts of the Province, and attacked the tribe of the *Brigantes*, a numerous and warlike people, who dwelt on the right bank of the Humber, and who had successfully defied the arms of Ostorius Scapula in the reign of Claudius.

Frontinus.

Frontinus adopted the system of his predecessor. He attacked the *Silures* who possessed the fertile plains between the Severn and the mountains of Wales, and also the strong ground which confines the shores of the Western Ocean. That brave people, by whom Scapula had been defeated, were totally subdued by the military science of Frontinus; who thus opened a path for the more extensive conquests of his successor Agricola.

Agricola.

This renowned Commander began his services as Governor of Britain, by attacking a tribe of resolute mountaineers, who had a short time before cut to pieces a regiment of horse on the frontiers of North Wales. Over these Agricola gained a decided advantage, even amid the fastnesses of their native rocks. Availing himself of the impression created by this unexpected success, he made a sudden inroad into the Isle of Anglesea, where Paulinus had been originally discomfitted, and reduced the inhabitants to the necessity of suing for peace.

The policy of Agricola for awhile was directed to the gradual civilisation of those portions of his Province which acknowledged the Imperial sway. He improved their architecture, educated their children, and introduced the Latin language and the dress of Rome. Luxury tempered the ferocity of savage independence; and many of those who had obstinately resisted the arms of the invaders unreluctantly surrendered themselves to the softer bondage in which he now enthralled them. Secure of his present possession he prepared for further conquest, and in the third summer of his government he penetrated to the banks of the Tweed, carrying with him in his fleet along the coast ample supplies and other munitions of war.

Advances into Scotland.

The succeeding year saw the standards of Domitianus advanced to the shores of the Forth and Clyde, the estuaries which bound the southern lowlands of Scotland. Agricola joined these arms of the sea by a chain of forts and other defences; the remains of which, mixed with those of the wall afterwards built by Severus, continue at this day to invite the researches of the antiquary. Enough was now done for security and profit; but, says Tacitus, neither the valour of the Roman armies, nor the glory of the Roman name, could be satisfied with any other boundary than that by which nature has marked the limits of the habitable globe.* Agricola resolved to plant his Eagles on the farthest rocks of Caledonia, and accordingly made preparations for a vigorous campaign the following summer, by sea and by land.

Titus Flavius Domitianus. From A. D. 81. to 96.

We have passed over the transactions of the fifth year, which are but very obscurely intimated by the Historian. The cares of the General appear to have been employed on the western coast of Scotland, not only in subduing the refractory clans which were scattered among the mountains and lakes of that wild district, but also in establishing garrisons in such convenient positions as might prevent, during his absence, the hazard of an invasion from the opposite shores of Ireland. It was, accordingly, not till the sixth year of his command that Agricola undertook his celebrated expedition against the Caledonians.†

This warlike people, to whom the fame of the Roman arms was not altogether unknown, were already busy in making preparations for defending their country. The hostile armies appear first to have come within sight of each other near the Grampian range. The natives presented themselves in great numbers, marshalled in separate bands under different leaders; all of whom, however, acknowledged the authority of Galgacus, who was invested with the chief command. Agricola likewise divided his legions into three bodies, with the intention of falling upon the enemy before they could unite their ranks; but the mountaineers no sooner observed this change in the disposition of his troops, than they altered their plan, and bringing together their several detachments, attacked in the night the weakest division of the Romans, and gained a complete victory. The Caledonians pursued the beaten legionaries to their camp, where the fight was renewed with great fury; nor was it till daylight, when Agricola appeared with a large body of fresh troops, that the current of victory began to be checked. The slaughter on both sides now became very great. The Caledonians were at length repulsed; and Tacitus adds, that had they not obtained an immediate refuge in their woods and marshes, this conflict would have terminated the war.‡

Defeat of the Romans.

Notwithstanding this remark, it is quite plain that the loss sustained by the IXth legion in this combat considerably damped the spirits of the whole army, and prevented Agricola from advancing farther into the mountains, till his men had recruited their numbers and their strength during the repose of the ensuing winter. Tacitus, at this juncture, suspends his narrative, in order to insert a remarkable adventure of a German cohort which deserted from the Roman camp. These auxiliaries, tired of the savage warfare in which they were engaged, rose upon the Centurion and inferior officers and slew them; then taking possession of three transports, they instantly put to sea under the care of as many pilots, whose services they had compelled. One of these guides proving faithless, the fugitives murdered the two others, and resolved to trust to fortune, either to find a passage into their native country, or to discover an asylum in some other land, at a distance from the severity of Roman discipline, and the hardships of a Caledonian war. The particulars of their voyage are exceedingly obscure. Tacitus assures us that they sailed round Britain, and were afterwards

Adventure of the German deserters.

* Tacit. *Agricol.* c. 16

* Tacit. *ubi suprà*, c. 23.
† Tacit. *in Vitâ Agricolæ*. c. 24, 25.
‡ Ibid. c. 26.

wrecked on the coast of Germany, and made prisoners by the *Suevi* and *Frisones*, having suffered, while they were at sea, the extremest miseries of cold and famine. In the end they were carried as slaves to Rome, where they filled the ears of the citizens with the wonders of their navigation.*

It was in the summer of the seventh year of Agricola's administration that the arms of Domitianus effected the complete conquest of Britain. The Caledonians, aware that their independence was still menaced, employed the interval allowed by the inactivity of the Romans, in training their youth, and in extending their alliances.

Fresh campaign.

They had learned by painful experience that union is necessary to repel a common danger; and were now willing to lay aside for a time their private quarrels, and to join their bands for the defence of liberty and the undisturbed possession of their vallies and hills. Agricola, on his side, was not less attentive to the duties of his office, and the ultimate views contemplated in his expedition. He increased his numbers by incorporating into the legions such Britons as had shown a firm attachment to his interests, and whose fidelity had been proved during the contingencies of a protracted and various war. He likewise ordered his fleet to sail round the coasts, make frequent descents, and spread terror and devastation on every hand; while he himself commenced his march at the head of a well-appointed army, and turned his face once more towards the Grampians, where the Caledonian General had posted his undisciplined hordes.†

Battle with Galgacus.

The Britons, says Tacitus, already numbered thirty thousand men, and crowds were still flocking to add to their strength. Not only young men full of spirits and vigour repaired to the camp from all quarters, but aged warriors, valuable for their experience, longed for an opportunity to add new honours to those which they had formerly acquired. Their zeal and courage sought vent in loud acclamations, and in repeated demands to be led on to battle. Galgacus is said to have at that moment addressed his ardent followers in a speech which has exhausted the eloquence of Tacitus.

The harangue of Agricola to his troops was shorter and less imposing. He thought it enough to remind them that the opportunity for which they had so long sighed, of putting an end to their fatigues, had now arrived; and that the enemy they had so often desired to see within the reach of their swords was now drawn up before them prepared for battle. He concluded by exhorting them to finish the noble work which they had so successfully begun, and to crown fifty years of war with the triumph of one great day.‡

The Roman General placed his auxiliaries in front, with the view at once of securing their fidelity and of saving the blood of his legions. Both armies fought for some time at a distance, as the Britons, who occupied the declivity of a hill, wisely resolved to retain this advantage of ground, and to assail their antagonists with missile weapons. At length several German cohorts, bearing heavy arms, brought a division of the Caledonians to close action; a mode of fighting in which the barbarians were sure to be worsted, by the cool bravery and discipline of men who had spent their lives in a camp. The main body of the natives descended from the high ground to support their friends in the plain; where they had no sooner arrived than Agricola ordered his cavalry to fall upon them, who soon succeeded in breaking their ranks, and throwing them into the utmost confusion and dismay. The victors pursued them from the field with great slaughter; but as the Britons were better acquainted than the Romans with the country through which they directed their flight, they availed themselves of every thicket, and wood, and marsh, to renew the combat, and to check the impetuosity of the conquerors. Agricola, whose vigilance never languished, perceived the danger into which his soldiers were about to fall, and gave orders to stop the pursuit; deeming it sufficient to prevent the junction of the scattered Caledonians, by parties of cavalry which he sent out to scour the adjacent vallies.*

Defeat of the Caledonians.

On the following day the Romans were furnished with the most satisfactory proofs that their victory was decisive, and that there was no longer any enemy to dispute with them the possession of the Grampian solitudes. Silence, such as reigns in a desert, smoking cottages, and the total absence of flocks and herds, afforded the strongest evidence that the vanquished inhabitants had retired, in order to bewail their losses, or to prepare revenge, into the shelter of more distant mountains. The season was already somewhat advanced, and Agricola therefore thought it expedient to seek for winter quarters in a richer and more temperate part of his Province. He returned southward; having given instructions to his army to proceed with slow marches and in good order through the intermediate country, that the natives might observe their strength was still unbroken, and their discipline unimpaired.†

Circumnavigation of Britain.

Meanwhile, he gave directions to the Commander of his fleet to sail round the island, in order to determine its extent, and, at the same time, to obtain direct evidence that Britain did not, at its northern point, connect itself with any other land. The success of the German cohort, the fame of whose achievement had already reached his ears, is said to have induced Agricola to employ his ships in this voyage of discovery; an undertaking which was accomplished not only without loss, but even with the most happy and prosperous results. The Præfect, after circumnavigating the tempestuous shores of Caledonia, and acquainting himself with the position of the Orkney islands, and even with that of the remote Thule, directed his course towards the southern parts of Britain, where he arrived in safety before the approach of winter. He landed, says Tacitus, at the port of *Trutala*; a haven which the industry of historians and geographers has in vain laboured to ascertain.

Topographical difficulties.

Tacitus, who is our principal authority for this voyage, as well as for the marches and battles of Agricola himself on land, had so imperfect an idea of the geographical position of the several places which he either names or describes, that few points in History are more difficult than to trace the path of the Romans in the northern division of our island, or to come to a satisfactory conclusion in regard to the locality of the most celebrated occurrences which have immortalized the progress of their arms. For example, the most indefatigable of our antiquaries have not been able to fix the scene of the memorable combat in which Agricola defeated

* Tacit. *in Vitâ Agricol.* c. 28. † Ibid. c. 29.
‡ Ibid. c. 33, 34.

* Tacit. in *Vitâ Agricol.* c. 35—37.
† Ibid. c. 38, c. 10 and 38.

Biography. From A. D. 81. to 96.

Galgacus, or the spot whereon he pitched his camp during the winter which intervened betwixt his sixth and seventh campaigns. Were it not that the Historian describes the line of the Roman General's march in the commencement of his operations beyond the Forth, we should be tempted to imagine, that the battle of the Grampians took place somewhere near the western coast of Scotland, and that the fleet which accompanied the movements of the army had sailed, not from the Thames or the Humber, but from the Mersey, or from the ports of Anglesea and Wales.*

This conclusion derives some countenance from the details of the voyage performed by the runaway cohort. They are described as sailing northward, along the coast, till they reached the extremity of the island; they then turned their faces in the opposite direction, bore down to a lower latitude, and were at length driven ashore in the country of the *Suevi*, a German tribe.† Had they sailed from any port on the eastern shores of Caledonia, and in their progress northward entered the Pentland Firth, they would have reached land, either in one of the Hebrides or in the north of Ireland, but could not by any hazard have touched on the coast of Germany, where they, in fact, terminated their wanderings. We arrive at the same result from studying the particulars recorded by Tacitus respecting the voyage of discovery undertaken by the orders of Agricola. The Præfect, after sailing northward round the island, arrived at a port near the mouth of the Thames; a result which unavoidably suggests and confirms the opinion, that he must have commenced his expedition somewhere on the western coast of Scotland; for had he started from the opposite coast and circumnavigated the northern shores, he would most probably have finished his voyage in the river Mersey, or in some one of the Welsh harbours.‡

Connected with these difficulties, a similar obscurity prevails in regard to the country of the *Horesti*, through which the legions returned after their victory over Galgacus. Cambden, Lipsius, Ernesti, and the greater number of commentators, place it on the southern banks of the Clyde, in a district known in modern times by the name of Eskdale; while Pinkerton and other geographers produce very plausible reasons for preferring the northern shores of the Forth, and for fixing on a tract of land between that river and the Tay. The former of these conjectures strengthens the notion, that the scene of the hostilities carried on between Agricola and Galgacus was on the western coast of Scotland: the latter, of course, corroborates the more general opinion, that the arms of Rome achieved their final triumph over British independence in the neighbourhood of the lofty mountains which separate the counties of Forfar and Aberdeen. But on neither side will the arguments bear a minute examination, or lead to a satisfactory result.§

It has been inferred from an expression used by Juvenal, that the conquests of Agricola did not remain long undisturbed after his recall to Rome. The Poet alludes to a war in Britain carried on against the Romans by a king named Arviragus; but the allusion, perhaps, is too vague to warrant an historical conclusion.*

Titus Flavius Domitianus. From A. D. 81. to 96.

The victorious General sent to Domitianus an account of his success, expressed in the most unassuming language, being aware of the jealous feeling which continued to lurk in the breast of the Emperor wherever military glory was concerned. The fame of Agricola, notwithstanding, is thought to have disturbed the self-complacency of his master, who could not conceal from himself that the mock Triumphs of the Danube were everywhere silently contrasted with the reality of the splendid achievements performed in the British Province. He gave orders, however, that the honours now usually conferred upon a successful Commander should be decreed to Agricola; whose presence at Rome he forthwith demanded, under the pretext of intrusting him with still more important duties. But this ungenerous ruler never forgave his warlike lieutenant the eminence to which he had attained by his important services; and the latter, contented with an honourable privacy, spent the residue of his years in the Capital without aspiring to any public employment.†

Recall of Agricola.

We return to the domestic administration of Domitianus, which assumed, as it drew towards its close, a deeper tinge of malignity. His cruelties and avarice exhausted, from time to time, the patience of the tributary States which owned allegiance to his Government, and drove them to the use of arms. The turbulent barbarians, too, who claimed the fertile plains on either side of the Ister, compelled him, in several instances, to take the field in defence of the Empire, and to retire from it as often with very doubtful success. We have already mentioned the revolt of Antonius, who commanded in upper Germany, and the victory gained over him by Lucius Maximus. It is worthy of notice that the conqueror, on that occasion, burnt all the papers which he found amongst the baggage of Antonius; with the view of precluding, on the part of the Emperor, the numerous prosecutions which would otherwise have been directed against men of the greatest integrity, on the ground of frivolous suspicions arising from a casual correspondence. But the fear and anger of Domitianus supplied the want of direct information. He let loose his fury against all who could be conceived to have any motive for wishing a change of government, or even the least knowledge of the designs which were entertained by Antonius. Nor did their death satisfy his cruelty. He invented the severest torments that could be devised; and spared no sort of punishment which combined exquisite suffering with the prolongation of life. The possession of wealth or of family honours was accounted a crime, and personal virtues were sure to be rewarded with a violent death. Slaves were hired to impeach their masters, and freedmen their patrons; while those who had no enemy to accuse them, found their very friends converted into the instruments of their destruction.‡

Tyranny of the Emperor.

At length even his nearest relations began to tremble for their safety; and actuated by the feeling of self-preservation, determined to deliver the world from the horrors and cruelty which had so long disgraced the palace of the Cæsars. A conspiracy was formed in

* Tacit. *ubi suprà*, c 25. † Ibid. c. 28. ‡ Ibid.

§ We must not neglect to state, that Sanson, in his *Description de l'Empire Romain, &c.* places the field of battle in which Galgacus was defeated in the Grampians, near the source of the Tay; and assigns to the *Horesti* the country northward of that river, now called Forfar or Angus.

* Juvenal. *Sat.* vi. v. 127:

aut de temone Britanno
Excidit Arviragus.

† Tacit. *Agricol.* c. 39, 42, 44. ‡ Ibid. *Hist.* lib. i. c. 2.

Biography. From A. D. 81. to 96.

which his wife is said to have participated. Nearly all the officers of the Imperial establishment were privy to the intended murder; and finding themselves secure, owing to the number of their confederates, they postponed the execution of their design until they gained the concurrence of Nerva, who had been exiled to Tarentum, and whom they wished to place on the throne when it should be vacant. On the eighteenth of September, in the year of Rome 847, Domitianus was despatched by the dagger of Stephanus, one of the ministers of the palace, who obtained admittance into his bed-closet under pretext of urgent business. The Emperor's body was saved from the indignities with which it was menaced, by the affection of his nurse; who contrived to have it privately removed and buried in the country, at a family villa near the Latin way. Afterwards, she conveyed his ashes to the Flavian Temple, where she mixed them with those of Julia, the daughter of Titus, to whose infancy she had likewise discharged the duties of a mother. But the statues and pictures which fear or courtly adulation had erected to him, were immediately pulled down and trampled under foot; and to this posthumous revenge the Senators added an expression of their indignation and resentment, which they were aware could only be partially realized. They issued a decree that the name of Domitianus should be immediately struck out of the Roman annals, and obliterated from every public monument.

Titus Flavius Domitianus. From A. D. 81. to 96.

APOLLONIUS TYANÆUS.

FROM U. C. 750. A. C. 4. TO A. D. 96.

Biography. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

His life written by Philostratus

Apollonius Tyanæus. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

APOLLONIUS, the Pythagorean Philosopher, was born at Tyana, in Cappadocia, in the year of Rome 750, four years before the common Christian era.* His reputation has been raised far above his personal merits, by the attempt made in the early ages of the Church, and since revived,† to bring him forward as a rival to the Author of our Religion. His life was written with this object, about a century after his death, by Philostratus of Lemnos, when Ammonius was systematizing the Eclectic tenets to meet the increasing influence of the Christian doctrines. Philostratus engaged in this work at the instance of his patroness Julia Domna, wife of the Emperor Severus, a Princess celebrated for her zeal in the cause of Heathen Philosophy; who put into his hands a journal of the travels of Apollonius rudely written by one Damis, an Assyrian, his companion.‡ This manuscript, an account of his residence at Ægæ, prior to his acquaintance with Damis, by Maximus of that city, a collection of his letters, some private memoranda relative to his opinions and conduct, and lastly the public records of the cities he frequented, were the principal documents from which Philostratus compiled his elaborate narrative, which is still extant.§ It is written with considerable elegance, but with more ornament and attention to the composition than is consistent with correct taste. Though it is not a professed imitation of the Scripture history of Christ, it contains quite enough to show that it was written with a view of rivalling it; and accordingly, in the following age, it was made use of in a direct attack upon Christianity by Hierocles* Præfect of Bithynia, a disciple of the Eclectic School, to whom a reply was written by Eusebius of Cæsarea. The selection of a Pythagorean Philosopher for the purpose of a comparison with Christ was judicious. The attachment of the Pythagorean Sect to the discipline of the established religion, which most other Philosophies neglected; its austerity, its pretended intercourse with Heaven, its profession of extraordinary power over nature, and the authoritative tone of teaching which this profession countenanced,† were all in favour of the proposed object. But with the plans of the Eclectics in their attack upon Christianity we have no immediate concern.

Birth and education.

Philostratus begins his work with an account of the prodigies attending the Philosopher's birth, which with all circumstances of a like nature we shall for the present pass over, intending to make some observations on them in the sequel. At the age of fourteen he was placed by his father under the care of Euthydemus, a distinguished rhetorician of Tarsus; but being displeased with the dissipation of that city, he removed with his master to Ægæ a neighbouring town, frequented as a retreat for students in Philosophy.‡ Here he made himself master of the Platonic, Stoic, Epicurean, and Peripatetic systems; giving, however, an exclusive preference to the Pythagorean, which he studied with Euxenus of Heraclea, a man whose life ill accorded with the ascetic principles of his Sect. At the early age of sixteen years, according to his Biographer, he resolved on strictly conforming himself to the precepts of Pythagoras, and, if possible, rivalling the fame of his master. He renounced animal food and wine; restricted himself to the use of linen garments,

He adopts the Pythagorean Philosophy.

* Olear. *ad Philostr.* i. 12.
† By Lord Herbert and Mr. Blount.
‡ Philostr. i. 3. § Ibid. i. 2, 3.

* His work was called Λόγοι φιλαλήθεις πρὸς Χριστιανούς· on this subject see Mosheim, *Dissertat. de turbatâ per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesiâ*, sec. 25.
* Philostr. i. 17, vi. 11. ‡ Ibid. i. 7.

Biography. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

and sandals made of the bark of trees; suffered his hair to grow; and betook himself to the Temple of Æsculapius, who is said to have regarded him with peculiar favour.*

On the news of his father's death, which took place not long afterwards, he left Ægæ for his native place, where he gave up half his inheritance to his elder brother, whom he is said to have reclaimed from a dissolute course of life, and the greater part of the remainder to his poorer relatives.†

Prior to composing any Philosophical work, he though it necessary to observe the silence of five years, which was the appointed initiation into the esoteric doctrines of his Sect. During this time he exercised his mind in storing up materials for future reflection. We are told, that on several occasions he hindered insurrections in the cities in which he resided, by the mute eloquence of his look and gestures;‡—a fact, however, which we are able to trace to the invention of his Biographer, who, in his zeal to compare him to his master, forgot that the disciples of the Pythagorean school denied themselves during their silence the intercourse of mixed society.§

Travels,

The period of silence being expired, Apollonius passed through the principal cities of Asia Minor, disputing in the Temples in imitation of Pythagoras, unfolding the mysteries of his Sect to such as were observing their probationary silence, discoursing with the Greek Priests about divine rites, and reforming the worship of Barbarian cities.‖ This must have been his employment for many years; the next incident in his life being his eastern journey, which was not undertaken till he was between forty and fifty years of age.¶

His object in this expedition was to consult the Magi and Brachmans on Philosophical subjects; in which he but followed the example of Pythagoras, who is said to have travelled as far as India for the same purpose. At Nineveh, where he arrived with two companions, he was joined by Damis, already mentioned as his journalist.** Proceeding thence to Babylon, he had some interviews with the Magi, who rather disappointed his expectations; and was well received by Bardanes the Parthian King, who after detaining him at his Court for the greater part of two years, dismissed him with marks of peculiar honour.††

In India.

From Babylon he proceeded to Taxila, the seat of Phraotes, King of the Indians, who is represented as an adept in the Pythagorean Philosophy;‡‡ and passing on, at length accomplished the object of his expedition by visiting Iarchas, Chief of the Brachmans, from whom he is said to have learned many valuable theurgic secrets.* Apollonius Tyanæus.

On his return to Asia Minor, after an absence of about five years, he stationed himself for a time in Ionia; where the fame of his travels and his austere mode of life procured considerable attention to his Philosophical harangues. The cities sent embassies to him, decreeing him public honours; while the Oracles pronounced him more than mortal, and referred the sick to him for relief.† From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

From Ionia he passed over to Greece, and made his first tour through its principal cities;‡ visiting the Temples and Oracles, reforming the divine rites, and sometimes exercising his theurgic skill. Except at Sparta, however, he seems to have attracted little attention. At Eleusis his application for admittance to the Mysteries was unsuccessful; as was, at a later period of his life a similar attempt at the Cave of Trophonius.§ In both places his reputation for Magic was the cause of his exclusion. In Greece.

Hitherto our memoir has given the unvaried life of a mere Pythagorean, which may be comprehended in three words, mysticism, travel, and disputation. From the date of his journey to Rome, which succeeded his Grecian tour, it is in some degree connected with the history of the times; and though much may be owing to the invention of Philostratus, there is neither reason nor necessity for supposing the narrative to be in substance untrue. Visits Rome.

Nero had at this time prohibited the study of Philosophy, alleging that it was made the pretence for Magical practices;‖—and the report of his excesses so alarmed the followers of Apollonius as they approached Rome, that out of thirty-four who had accompanied him thus far, eight only could be prevailed on to proceed. On his arrival the strangeness of his proceedings caused him to be brought successively before the Consul Telesinus and Tigellinus the Minister of Nero;¶ both of whom however dismissed him after examination; the former from a secret leaning towards Philosophy, the latter from fear (as we are told) of his extraordinary powers. He was in consequence allowed to go about at his pleasure from Temple to Temple, haranguing the people, and prosecuting his reforms in the worship paid to the Gods. But here, as before, we discover marks of incorrectness in the Biographer. Had the edict against Philosophers been as severe as he represents, neither Apollonius, nor Demetrius the Cynic, who joined him after his arrival, would have been permitted to remain; certainly not Apollonius, after his acknowledgment of his own Magical powers in the presence of Tigellinus.** Brought before Nero.

Denied by Philostratus all insight into the circum-

---

* Philostr. i. 8. Apollon. *Epist.* 5*v*.

† Ibid. i. 13.

‡ Ibid. i. 14. 15.

§ Brucker, vol. ii. p. 104.

‖ Philostr. i. 16.

¶ See Olear. *præfat. ad vitam.* As he died U. C. 849, he is usually considered to have lived to a hundred. Since, however, here is an interval of almost twenty years in which nothing important happens, in a part of his life too unconnected with any public events to fix its chronology, it is highly probable that the date of his birth is put too early. Philostratus says, that accounts varied, making him live eighty, ninety, or one hundred years; see viii. 29. See also ii. 12, where, by some inaccuracy, he makes him to have been in India twenty years *before* he was at Babylon. Olear. *ad locum et præfat. ad vit.* The common date of his birth is fixed by his biographer's merely accidental mention of the revolt of Archelaus against the Romans, as taking place before Apollonius was twenty years old, see i. 12.

** Philostr. i. 19.

†† Ibid. i. 26, *ad fin.*

‡‡ Ibid. ii. 1—40. Brucker, vol. ii. p. 110

* Philostr. iii. 51.

† Ibid. iv. 1. It is observable that this is the first distinct mention which his Biographer furnishes of his pretending to extraordinary power. The history of Lucian's Alexander leads us to suspect a secret understanding between him and the Priests, who might not be unwilling to avail themselves of his alliance in opposition to the exertions and miracles of St. Paul about that time in the same parts. That the Apostles were opposed by counter pretensions to miraculous power, we learn from *Acts*, ch. xiii. v. 8; see also *Acts*, ch. viii. and xix.

‡ Philostr. iv. 11, *et seq.*

§ When denied at the latter place, he forced his way in. Ibid. viii. 19.

‖ Ibid. iv. 35. Brucker (vol. ii. p. 118) with reason thinks this prohibition extended only to the profession of magic.

¶ Ibid. iv. 40, &c.

** Brucker, vol. ii. p. 120.

Biography. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

stances which influenced the movements of Apollonius, we must attend whither he thinks fit to conduct him. We find him next in Spain, taking part in the conspiracy forming against Nero by Vindex and others.* The political partisans of that day seem to have made use of professed jugglers and Magicians to gain over the body of the people to their interests. To this may be attributed Nero's banishing such characters from Rome;† and Apollonius had probably been already serviceable in this way at the Capital, as he was now in Spain, and immediately after to Vespasianus; and at a later period to Nerva.

Visits Spain,

His next expeditions were to Africa, to Sicily, and so to Greece,‡ but as they do not supply any thing of importance to the elucidation of his character, it may be sufficient thus to have noticed them. At Athens he obtained the initiation in the Mysteries, for which he had on his former visit unsuccessfully applied.

Athens,

And Alexandria.

The following Spring, the seventy-third of his life according to the common calculation, he proceeded to Alexandria:§ where he attracted the notice of Vespasianus, who had just assumed the purple, and seemed desirous of countenancing his proceedings by the sanction of Religion. Apollonius might be recommended to him for this purpose by the fame of his travels, his reputation for theurgic knowledge, and his late acts in Spain against Nero. It is satisfactory to be able to bring two individuals into contact, each of whom has in his turn been made to rival Christ and his Apostles in pretensions to miraculous power. Thus, claims which appeared to be advanced on distinct grounds are found to coalesce, and by the union of their separate inconsistencies contribute to expose each other. The celebrated cures by Vespasianus are connected with the ordinary juggles of the Pythagorean School; and Apollonius is found here, as in many other instances, to be the mere tool of political factions. But on the character of the latter we shall have more to say presently.

Introduced to Vespasianus.

His Biographer's account of his first meeting with the Emperor, which is perhaps substantially correct, is amusing from the regard which both parties paid to *effect* in their behaviour.‖ The latter, on entering Alexandria was met by the great body of the Magistrates, Præfects, and Philosophers of the city; but not discovering Apollonius in the number, he hastily asked, "whether the Tyanæan was in Alexandria," and when told he was philosophizing in the Serapeum, proceeding thither he suppliantly entreated him to make him Emperor; and, on the Philosopher's answering he had already done so in praying for a just and venerable Sovereign,¶ he avowed his determination of putting himself entirely into his hands, and of declining the supreme power unless he could obtain his countenance in assuming it.* A formal consultation was in consequence held, at which, besides Apollonius, Dio and Euphrates, Stoics in the Emperor's train, were allowed to deliver their sentiments; when the latter Philosopher entered an honest protest against the sanction Apollonius was giving to the ambition of Vespasianus, and advocated the restoration of the Roman State to its ancient republican form.† This difference of opinion laid the foundation of a lasting quarrel between the rival advisers, to which Philostratus makes frequent allusion in the course of his history. Euphrates is mentioned by the ancients in terms of high commendation; by Pliny especially, who knew him well.‡ He seems to have seen through his opponent's character, as we gather even from Philostratus;§ and when so plain a reason exists for the dislike which Apollonius, in his Letters, and Philostratus, manifest towards him, their censure must not be allowed to weigh against the testimony of unbiassed writers.

Apollonius Tyanæus. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

After parting from Vespasianus, Apollonius undertook an expedition into Æthiopia, where he held discussions with the Gymnosophists, and visited the cataracts of the Nile.‖ On his return he received the news of the destruction of Jerusalem; and being pleased with the modesty of the conqueror, wrote to him in commendation of it. Titus is said to have invited him to Argos in Cilicia, for the sake of his advice on various subjects, and obtained from him a promise that at some future time he would visit him at Rome.¶

Visits Æthiopia.

On the succession of Domitianus, he became once more engaged in the political commotions of the day, exerting himself to excite the countries of Asia Minor against the Emperor.** These proceedings at length occasioned an order from the Government to bring him to Rome; which, however, according to his Biographer's account, he anticipated by voluntarily surrendering himself, under the idea that by his prompt appearance he might remove the Emperor's jealousy, and save Nerva and others whose political interests he had been promoting. On arriving at Rome he was brought before Domitianus; and when, very inconsistently with his wish to shield his friends from suspicion, he launched out into praise of Nerva, he was forced away into prison to the company of the worst criminals, his hair and beard were cut short, and his limbs loaded with chains. After some days he was brought to trial; the charges against him being the singularity of his dress and appearance, his being called a God, his foretelling a pestilence at Ephesus, and his sacrificing a child with Nerva for the purpose of augury.†† Phi-

Imprisoned by Domitianus.

His trial.

* Philostr. v. 10.

† Astrologers were concerned in Libo's conspiracy against Tiberius, and punished. Vespasianus, as we shall have occasion to notice presently, made use of them in furthering his political plans. Tacit. *Hist.* ii. 78. We read of their predicting Nero's accession, the deaths of Vitellius and Domitianus, &c. They were sent into banishment by Tiberius, Claudius, Vitellius, and Domitianus. Philostratus describes Nero as issuing his edict *on leaving the Capital* for Greece, iv. 47. These circumstances seem to imply that astrology, magic, &c. were at that time of considerable service in political intrigues.

‡ Philostr. v. 11, &c. § Ibid. v. 20, &c.

‖ Ibid. v. 27.

¶ Tacitus relates, that when Vespasianus was going to the *Serapeum ut super rebus imperii consuleret*, Basilides an Egyptian, who was at the time eighty miles distant, suddenly appeared to him; from his name the Emperor drew an omen that the God sanctioned his assumption of the Imperial power. *Hist.* iv. 82. This sufficiently agrees in substance with the narrative of Philostratus to give the latter some probability. It was on this occasion that the famous cures are said to have been wrought.

* As Egypt supplied Rome with corn, Vespasianus by taking possession of that country almost secured to himself the Empire. Tacit. *Hist.* ii. 82, iii. 8. Philostratus however insinuates that he was *already* in possession of supreme power, and came to Egypt for the sanction of Apollonius. Τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν κεκτημένος, διαλεξόμενος δὲ τῷ ἀνδρί. v. 27.

† Philostr. v. 31.

‡ Brucker, vol. ii. p. 566, &c.

§ Ibid. v. 37, he makes Euphrates say to Vespasianus, Φιλοσοφίαν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, τὴν μὲν ἄκρα φύσει ταυτὶ καὶ ἀνωτάτω τὴν δὲ θεοκλυτεῖν φάσκουσαν παρεσυρῆ κατασυδόμενον γάρ τῷ θείῳ πολλὰ καὶ ἀνόητα, ἁμᾶς ταυτί φησι. See Brucker; and Apollon. *Epist.* 8.

‖ Ibid. vi. 1, &c. ¶ Ibid. vi. 29, &c.

** Ibid. vii. 1, &c. see Brucker, vol. ii. p. 128.

†† Ibid. viii. 5, 6, &c. On account of his foretelling the pestilence

Biography. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D 96.

lostratus supplies us with an ample defence, which he *was to have* delivered,* had he not in the course of the proceedings suddenly vanished from the Court, and transported himself to Puteoli, whither he had before sent on Damis.

This is the only miraculous occurrence which forces itself into the history as a component part of the narrative; the rest being of easy omission without any detriment to its entireness.† And strictly speaking, even here it is not the miracle of transportation which interferes with its continuity, but his mere liberation from confinement; which, though we should admit the arbitrary assertions of Philostratus, seems very clearly to have taken place in the regular course of business. He allows that just before the Philosopher's pretended disappearance, Domitianus had publicly acquitted him, and that after the miracle he proceeded to hear the cause next in order, as if nothing had happened;‡ and tells us, moreover, that Apollonius on his return from Greece gave out that he had pleaded his own cause and so escaped, no allusion being made to a miraculous preservation.§

His pretended miraculous disappearance.

After spending two years in the latter country in his usual Philosophical disputations, he passed into Ionia. According to his Biographer's chronology, he was now approaching the completion of his hundredth year. We may easily understand, therefore, that when invited to Rome by Nerva, who had just succeeded to the Empire, he declined the proposed honour with an intimation that their meeting must be deferred to another state of being.‖ His death took place shortly after; and Ephesus, Rhodes, and Crete are variously mentioned as the spot at which it occurred.¶ A Temple was dedicated to him at Tyana,** which was in consequence accounted one of the sacred cities, and permitted the privilege of electing its own Magistrates.††

His death.

His Works.

He is said to have written‡‡ a treatise upon Judicial Astrology, a work on Sacrifices, another on Oracles, a Life of Pythagoras, and an account of the answers he received from Trophonius, besides the memoranda noticed in the opening of our memoir. A collection of Letters ascribed to him is still extant.§§

It may be regretted that so copious a history, as that which we have abridged, should not contain more authentic and valuable matter. Both the secular transactions of the times and the history of Christianity might have been illustrated by the life of one, who, while an instrument of the partisans of Vindex, Vespasianus, and Nerva, was a contemporary, and in some respects a rival of the Apostles; and who, probably, was with St. Paul at Ephesus and Rome.* As far as his personal character is concerned, there is nothing to be lamented in these omissions. Both his Biographer's panegyric and his own Letters convict him of pedantry, self-conceit, and affectation incompatible with the feelings of an enlarged, cultivated, or amiable mind. His virtues, as we have already seen, were temperance and a disregard of wealth; and without them it would have been hardly possible for him to have gained the popularity which he enjoyed. The great object of his ambition was to emulate the fame of his master; and his efforts seem to have been fully rewarded by the general admiration he attracted, the honours paid him by the Oracles, and the attentions shown him by men in power.

Apollonius Tyanæus. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

His character examined.

We might have been inclined, indeed, to suspect that his reputation existed principally in his Biographer's panegyric, were it not mentioned by other writers. The celebrity which he has enjoyed since the writings of the Eclectics, by itself affords but a faint presumption of his notoriety before they appeared. Yet after all allowances, there remains enough to show that, however fabulous the details of his history may be, there was something extraordinary in his life and character. Some foundation there must have been for statements which his eulogists were able to maintain in the face of those who would have spoken out had they been altogether novel. Pretensions never before advanced must have excited the surprise and contempt of the advocates of Christianity.† Yet Eusebius styles him a wise man, and seems to admit the correctness of Philostratus, except in the miraculous parts of the narrative.‡ Lactantius does not deny that a statue was erected to him at Ephesus;§ and Sidonius Apollinaris, who even wrote his life, speaks of him as the admiration of the countries he traversed, and the favourite of Monarchs.‖ One of his works was deposited in the palace at Antium by the Emperor Hadrian, who also formed a collection of his letters;¶ statues were erected to him in the temples, divine honours paid him by Caracalla, Alexander Severus, and Aurelianus, and magical virtue attributed to his name.**

Admissions of the Fathers.

It has in consequence been made a subject of dispute, how far his reputation was built upon that supposed claim to extraordinary power which, as was noticed in the opening of our memoir, has led to his comparison with sacred names. If it could be shown that he did advance such pretensions, and upon the strength of them was admitted as an object of divine honour, a case would be made out, not indeed so strong as that on which Christianity is founded, yet remarkable enough to demand our serious examination. Assuming,

Miraculous pretensions.

---

he was honoured as a God by the Ephesians, vii. 21. Hence this prediction appeared in the indictment.

* Ἔνια καὶ λέγων ἀπελογήσατο ὁ θαύματος μάλα γε συνετόντα σιφρονισμένος, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι ὄντα ἐς μάτην αὐτῷ συνδεδιθίσται ἡ γραφή. Euseb. *in Hier.* 41.

† Perhaps his causing the writing of the indictment to vanish from the paper, when he was brought before Tigellinus, may be an exception, as being the alleged cause of his acquittal. In general, however, no consequence follows from his marvellous actions: *e. g.* when imprisoned by Domitianus, in order to show Damis his power, he is described as drawing his leg out of the fetters, and then—as putting it back again. Ἐπαμύσαντα αὖ τὸ σκέλος, τὸ σὺ λέγοιμι σφόνιον, vii. 38. A great exertion of power with apparently a small object.

‡ Philostr. viii. 8, 9. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπῆλθε τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, δαιμονίως καὶ ἡ ῥᾴθυμος αὐτῶν σφίσιν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὅστις οἱ πολλοὶ φόνου—παρεῖτο μὲν γὰρ ἐνίοις ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ δίκῃ.

§ Ibid. viii. 15. ‖ Ibid. viii. 27.

¶ Ibid. viii. 30. ** Ibid. i. 5, viii. 29.

†† A coin of Hadrian's reign is extant with the inscription, Τύανα ἱερὰ, ἄσυλος, αὐτόνομος. Olear. *ad Philostr.* viii. 31.

‡‡ See Bayle, art. *Apollonius*; and Brucker.

§§ Bishop Lloyd considers them spurious, but Olearius and Brucker show that there is good reason from internal evidence to suppose them genuine. See Olear. *Addend. ad præfat. Epistol.*; and Brucker, vol. ii. p. 147.

---

* Apollonius continued at Ephesus, Smyrna, &c. from A. D. 50 to about 59, and was at Rome from A. D. 63 to 66. St. Paul passed through Ionia into Greece A. D. 53, and was at Ephesus A. D. 54, and again from A. D. 56 to 58; he was at Rome in A. D. 65 and 66, when he was martyred.

† Lucian and Apuleius speak of him as if his name were familiar to them. Olear. *præf. ad Vit.*

‡ *In Hierocl.* 5. § *Inst.* v. 3.

‖ See Bayle, art. *Apollonius*; and Cudworth, *Intell. Syst.* iv 14.

¶ Philostr. viii. 19, 20.

** See Eusebius, Vopiscus, Lampridius, &c. as quoted by Bayle.

Not made by himself.

then, or overlooking this necessary condition, sceptical writers have been forward to urge the history and character of Apollonius as creating a difficulty in the argument for Christianity derived from Miracles; while their opponents have sometimes attempted to account for a phenomenon of which they had not yet ascertained the existence, and most gratuitously have ascribed his supposed power to the influence of the Evil principle.* On examination, we shall find not a shadow of a reason for supposing that Apollonius worked Miracles, in any proper sense of the word; or that he professed to work them; or that he rested his authority on extraordinary works of any kind; and it is strange indeed that Christians, with victory in their hands, should have so mismanaged their cause as to establish an objection where none existed, and in their haste to extricate themselves from an imaginary difficulty, to overturn one of the main arguments for revealed Religion.

Enumeration of these miracles.

To state these pretended prodigies is in most cases a refutation of their claim upon our notice,† and even those which are not in themselves exceptionable, become so from the circumstances or manner in which they took place. Apollonius is said to have been an incarnation of the God Proteus; his birth was announced by the falling of a thunderbolt and a chorus of swans; his death signalized by a wonderful voice calling him up to Heaven; and after death he appeared to a youth to convince him of the immortality of the soul.‡ He is reported to have known the language of birds; to have evoked the Spirit of Achilles; to have dislodged a demon from a boy; to have detected an Empusa who was seducing a youth into marriage; when brought before Tigellinus, to have caused the writing of the indictment to vanish from the paper; when imprisoned by Domitianus, to have miraculously released himself from his fetters; to have discovered the soul of Amasis in the body of a lion; to have cured a youth attacked by hydrophobia, whom he pronounced to be Telephus the Mysian.§ In declaring men's thoughts and distant events he indulged most liberally; adopting a brevity, which seemed becoming the dignity of his character, while it secured his prediction from the possibility of an entire failure. For instance: he gave previous intimation of Nero's narrow escape from lightning; foretold the short reigns of his successors; informed Vespasianus at Alexandria of the burning of the Capitol; predicted the violent death of Titus by a relative; discovered a knowledge of the private history of his Egyptian guide; foresaw the wreck of a ship he had embarked in, and the execution of a Cilician Proprætor.‖ We must not omit his first predicting and then removing a pestilence at Ephesus; the best authenticated of his professed Miracles, being attested by the erecting of a statue to him in consequence. He is said to have put an end to the malady by commanding an aged man to be stoned, whom he pointed out as its author, and who when the stones were removed was found changed into the shape of a dog.*

Their insipidity.

On the insipidity and inconclusiveness of most of these legends, considered as evidences o fextraordinary power, it is unnecessary to enlarge; yet these are the prodigies which some writers have put in competition with the Christian Miracles, and which others have thought necessary to ascribe to Satanic influence. Two indeed there are which must be mentioned by themselves, as being more worthy our attention than the rest: his raising a young maid at Rome, who was being carried to burial, and his proclaiming at Ephesus the assassination of Domitianus at the very time in which it took place.† But, not to speak at present of the want of all satisfactory evidence for either fact, the account of the former, we may observe, bears in its language and detail evident marks of being written in imitation of Scripture Miracles,‡ and the latter has all the appearance of a political artifice employed to excite the people against the tyrant, and exaggerated by the Biographer.§

But the trifling character of most of these prodigies is easily accounted for, when we consider the means by which the author professed to work them, and the cause to which he referred them. Of Miracles, indeed, which are asserted to proceed from the Author of nature, sobriety, dignity and conclusiveness may fairly be re-

* See Brucker on this point, vol. ii. p. 141, who refers to various authors. Eusebius takes a more sober view of the question, allowing the substance of the history, but disputing the extraordinary parts. See in *Hierocl.* 5 and 12.

† Most of them are imitations of the miracles attributed to Pythagoras.

‡ See Philostr. i. 4, 5, viii. 30, 31. He insinuates (cf. viii. 29 with 31) that Apollonius was taken up alive. See Euseb. 8.

§ Ibid. iv. 3, 16, 20, 25, 44, v. 42, vi. 43, vii. 38.

‖ Ibid. i. 12, iv. 24, 43, v. 11—13, 18, 30, vi. 3, 32. His prediction of the ruin of the Proprætor is conveyed in the mere exclamation,—*ὦ ἡ δῖνα ἡμέρα*, meaning the day of his execution; of the short reigns of Nero's successors, in his saying, that many *Thebans* would succeed him; *Ω χρόνον παμμιᾷ βεγχὼν*, adds Philostratus, *ἤχθοντο ὡς τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων στράγματα*. A like ambiguity attends, more or less, all his predictions.

* Philostr. iv. 10.

† Ibid. iv. 45, and viii. 26.

‡ This is manifest from the passage: *Κόρη τις ἔμελλε γάμοις τελεῖσθαι ἐδόκει, καὶ ὁ νυμφίος προὐλάβετο τῇ πλείᾳ, βοῶν ὑπέρα τοῦ αὐτοῦ γάμου. Συνωλοφύρετο δὲ καὶ ἡ Ῥώμη, καὶ γὰρ ἐνύγχανεν ἐμοὶ ἡ κόρη τιλάσσης ἐς ὑπάντης. Παρατυχὼν οὖν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος τῷ πάθει, κατάθεσθε, ἔφη, τὴν κλίνην. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑμᾶς τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ κόρῃ δακρύων παύσω. Καὶ ἅμα ἤρετο ὅ τι ὄνομα αὐτῇ εἴη; οἱ μὲν δὴ πολλοὶ φόνου λόγον ἀγορεύειν αὐτὸν, οἷος τῶν λόγων οἱ ἐπιτηδεῖοί τε καὶ τὰς ὀλοφύρσεις ἐγείρουσι. Ὁ δὲ, οὐδὲν ἀλλ' ἢ προσαψάμενος αὐτῆς, καί τι καὶ ἀφανῶς ἐπιστὰς, ἀφύπνισε τὴν κόρην οὗ δοκοῦντος ἐνιαυτοῦ. Καὶ φωνήν τε ἡ παῖς ἀφῆκεν, ἐπανῆλθέ τε ἐς τὴν οἰκίαν τῷ πατρὶ ὅσπερ ἡ Ἀλκήστις ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἀναζωθεῖσα.* Cf. Mark, ch. v. v. 39, &c. Luke, ch. vii. v. 11. See also John, ch. xi. v. 41—43. *Acts*, ch. iii. v. 4—6. In the sequel, the parents offer him money, which he gives as a portion to the damsel. See 2 *Kings*, ch. v. v. 15 and 16, and other similar passages of Scripture.

§ As Apollonius was before this busily engaged in promoting Nerva's interests among the Ionians, it seems probable that the words in question were uttered with a similar view. Dion (lib. 67) mentions a person in Germany who predicted the death of Domitianus; and says that the astrologers, (among whom Tzetzes numbers Apollonius) had foretold Nerva's advancement. There is little doubt all these predictions were intended to compass their own accomplishment. Dion confirms Philostratus's account of the occurrence in question; but merely says, that Apollonius *ἀναβὰς ἐπί τινα λόφον ὑψηλὸν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ ἑστηκὼς, καὶ συγκαλέσας τὸ πλῆθος*, cried out *πολλὰς πληγὰς*, &c. lib. 67. He then adds, *τοῦτο μὲν ὕστερον ἐγένετο, πλὴν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ*—an assurance truly satisfactory in testimony given 130 years after the event. Allowing, however, for some exaggeration, his account is perfectly consistent with the supposition that the exclamation of Apollonius was intended to subserve a political purpose. Let us now see how Philostratus has embellished the story. *Διαλεγόμενος περὶ τὰ τῶν ξυνόντων ἄλογα κατὰ μεσημβρίαν, ὅτε δὴ καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἐγίγνετο, σχεδὸν μὲν ὑφῆκε τῆς φωνῆς, οἷον δείσας· ὕπ' ἐλλοκώτερον ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν, ἐρρύθμισεν, ἵνα τοῖς μυστικοῖς λόγοις διαρθοῖ τι ἔτερον. Εἶτα ἐπάνεισιν, ὅσπερ οἱ τῶν λόγων ἐπεστόντες· βλίψας τι δυνὸς ἐς τὴν γῆν, καὶ σχοῖνος τρία ἢ τέτταρα τῶν βημάτων, παῖ τὸν τύραννον, παῖ, ἐβόα· οὐκ ὄκνιος ἐς πατέσσερα τοὺς ἐλευθέρους ἀληθείας ἕλκειν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ ἐρῶν καὶ ξυλλαμβάνειν δοκῶν τὰ δρώμενα. Ἐπιστληγμένης δὲ τῆς Ἐφέσου, παρῆν γὰρ διαλεγομένῳ πᾶσα,* (here he differs from Dion in an essential point) *ἱκέτευον, ὅσοι οἱ διαφθαρέντες ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων τινῶν ἀμφιβόλων τίλος, διαβῆτε, ἔφευ, ὦ ἄνδρες. ὁ γὰρ τύραννος ἀπέφηνεν τήμερον*, &c. viii. 26.

Biography. From U. C. 750 A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

Real nature of his pretensions.

quired; but when an individual ascribes his extraordinary power to his knowledge of some merely human secret, impropriety does but evidence his own want of taste, and ambiguity his want of skill. We have no longer a right to expect a great end, worthy means, or a frugal and judicious application of the Miraculous gift. Now, Apollonius claimed nothing beyond a fuller insight into nature than others had; a knowledge of the fated and immutable laws to which it is conformed, of the hidden springs on which it moves.* He brought a secret from the East and used it; and though he professed to be favoured, and in a manner taught by good Spirits,† yet he certainly referred no part of his power to a Supreme intelligence. Theurgic virtues, or those which consisted in communion with the Powers and Principles of nature, were high in the scale of Pythagorean excellence, and to them it was that he ascribed his extraordinary gift. By temperate living, it was said, the mind was endued with ampler and more exalted faculties than it otherwise possessed; partook more fully of the nature of the One universal Soul, was gifted with Prophetic inspiration, and a kind of intuitive perception of secret things.‡ This power, derived from the favour of the celestial Deities, who were led to distinguish the virtuous and high-minded, was quite distinct from Magic, an infamous, uncertain, and deceitful art, consisting in a compulsory power over infernal Spirits, operating by means of Astrology, Auguries and Sacrifices, and directed to the personal emolument of those who cultivated it.§ To our present question, however, this distinction is unimportant. To whichever principle the Miracles of Apollonius be referred, Theurgy or Magic, in either case they are independent of the First Cause, and not granted with a view to the particular purpose to which they are to be applied.‖

We have also incidentally shown that they did not profess to be Miracles in the proper meaning of the word, that is, *evident exceptions* to the laws of nature. At the utmost they do but exemplify the aphorism "knowledge is power."¶ Such as are within the range of human knowledge are no *Miracles*. Those of them, on the contrary, which are beyond it, will be found on inspection to be unintelligible, and to convey no *evidence*. The prediction of an earthquake (for instance) is not necessarily superhuman, an interpretation of the discourse of birds can never be verified. In understanding languages, knowing future events, discovering the purposes of others, recognising human souls when enclosed in new bodies, Apollonius merely professes extreme penetration and extraordinary acquaintance with nature. The spell by which he evokes Spirits and exorcises Demons, implies the mere possession of a secret;** and so perfectly is his Biographer aware of this, as almost to doubt the resuscitation of the Roman damsel, the only decisive Miracle of them all, *on the ground of its being supernatural*, insinuating, that perhaps she was dead only in appearance.† Hence, moreover, may be understood the meaning of the charge of Magic, as brought against the early Christians by their Heathen adversaries; the Miracles of the Gospels being strictly interruptions of physical order, and incompatible with Theurgic knowledge.‡

Apollonius Tyanæus. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96

When Christ and his Apostles declare themselves to be sent from God, this claim to a divine mission illustrates and gives dignity to their profession of extraordinary power. Whereas the divinity,§ no less than the gift of Miracles to which Apollonius laid claim, must be understood in its Pythagorean sense, as referring not to any intimate connection with a Supreme agent, but to his partaking, through his Theurgic skill, more largely than others in the perfections of the animating principle of nature.

Yet, whatever is understood by his Miraculous gift and his divine nature, certainly his works were not adduced as *vouchers* for his divinity, nor were they, in fact, the principal cause of his reputation. *We meet with no claim to extraordinary power in his Letters*; nor when returning thanks to a city for public honours bestowed on him, nor when complaining to his brother of the neglect of his townsmen, nor when writing to his opponent Euphrates.‖ To the Milesians, indeed, he speaks of earthquakes which he had predicted; but without appealing to the prediction in proof of his authority.¶ As, then, he is so far from insisting on his pretended extraordinary powers, and himself connects the acquisition of them with his Eastern expedition,** we may conclude that credit for possessing a Magical secret was a *part* of the reputation which that expedition conferred. A foreign appearance, singularity of manners, a life of travel, and pretences to superior

---

* Philostr. v. 12; in i. 2, he associates Democritus, a *natural philosopher*, with Pythagoras and Empedocles See viii. 7, sec. 8, and Brucker, vol. i. p. 1108, &c. and p. 1184.

† In his apology before Domitianus, he expressly attributes his removal of the Ephesian pestilence to Hercules, and makes this ascription the test of a divine Philosopher as distinguished from a Magician, viii. 7, sec. 9, *ubi vid.* Olear.

‡ Α'ε' ὁν τὸ θεῖον διαπαῦσαι λοιμώδεσιν μόνον ἐργάζεται τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἢ ἰσχὺν τοῖ τὰ μέγιστά τι καὶ θαυμασώτατα.... τοῦτό μοι, ὦ βασιλῆ, τὰς ἀνθρώπων ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἀκεφάλῳ φυλάττει, καν ἐᾶ θελεῖν τις ἀνδρὶ ὑδὸν ὦναι, διεξῆν τι, δεσμὸς ἐν παντόπρῳ ἀωρῇ, πάντα γιγνόμενά τε καὶ ἀόμενα, viii. 7, sec. 9. See also ii. 37, vi. 11, viii. 5.

§ Philostr. i. 2, and Olear. *ad loc.* note 3. iv. 44, v. 12, vii. 39, viii. 7; Apollon. *Epist.* 8 and 52; Philostr. *Proœm. vit. Sophist.*; Euseb. *in Hier.* 2; Mosheim, *de Simone Mago*, sec. 13. Yet it must be confessed that the views both of the Pythagoreans and Eclectics were very inconsistent on this subject. Eusebius notices several instances of *γοητεία* in Apollonius's miracles; in Hierocl. 10, 28, 29 and 31. See Brucker, vol. ii. p. 447. At Eleusis and the Cave of Trophonius, Apollonius was, as we have seen, accounted a Magician, and so also by Euphrates, Mœragenes, Apuleius, &c. See Olear. *Præf. ad vit.* p. xxxiii.; and Brucker, vol. ii. p. 136, note *k*.

‖ See Mosheim, *Dissertat. de turbatâ Ecclesiâ*, &c. sec. 27.

¶ See *Quæst. ad Orthodox.* xxiv. as quoted by Olearius, in his *Preface*, p. xxxiv.

* Eusebius calls it διά τις καὶ ἀρρήτος σοφία *in Hierocl.* 2. In iii. 41, Philostratus speaks of the κλῆσις αἷς θεοὶ χαίρουσι, the *spells* for evoking them, which Apollonius brought from India; cf. iv. 16; and in iv. 20 of the τελεσμῶν used for casting out an Evil Spirit.

† Εἴ τι σεσιδήρα τῆς ψυχῆς ἴδρει τι αὐτῇ, ὃς ἐλελήθει τὰς θρασυώσας, (λίγεται γὰρ ὡς ψευδάζει μὲν ὁ Ζεύς, ἡ δὲ ἀτμίζει ἀπὸ τῆ σφαγέντι) τί' ἀναζεσαυίαν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνέβαλψί τι καὶ ἀνέλαβεν, ἀρέσας ἡ κατάληψις, &c.

‡ Douglas (*Criterion*, p. 387, note) observes that some heretics affirmed that our Lord rose from the dead φαντασιώδως, only in appearance, *from an idea of the impossibility of a resurrection.*

§ Apollon. *Epist.* 17.

‖ See *Epist.* 1, 2, &c. 11, 44, the last-mentioned addressed to his brother begins εἰ θαυμαστὸν, εἰ μὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἀγαπῶσιν, τῶν δὲ καὶ διὸν, μόνη μίχει τῶν ἡ σωτρὶς ἀγνοῦ, δι' ἣν ἐξαιρέτως ἀνάδικος λαμπρὸς εἶναι; σοφὸ γὰρ ὦδ' ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, ὡς ἐμοῖ, γίγνου φανῆν, οἱ πίνι πολλῶν ἀμείνων λόγους τε καὶ ἤθους; that is, he complains that *whereas* he so excels in life and moral teaching, *yet* he is not considered by them as divine.

¶ *Epist.* 68. Claudius, in a message to the Tyanæans, *Epist.* 53, praises him merely as a benefactor to youth.

** Philostr. vi. 11. See Euseb. *in Hierocl.* 26, 27, καὶ δῆτα ὡς ἐξ Ἀράβων καὶ Μάγων καὶ Ἰνδῶν παραδεξόν τινα καὶ θεῖον αὐτὸν ἡμῖν ἀγαγὼν, παραδέξων αὐτεῦθεν ἀφηγημάτων παράδοχιτιν.

Biography. From U. C. 750. A. C 4. to A. D. 96.

knowledge, excite the imagination of beholders;* and, as in the case of a wandering people among ourselves, appear to invite the individuals thus distinguished to fraudulent practices. Apollonius is represented as making converts *as soon as seen*.† It was not, then, his display of wonders, but his Pythagorean dress and mysterious deportment which arrested attention, and made him thought superior to other men, because he was different from them. Like Lucian's Alexander,‡ (who was all but his disciple,) he was skilled in Medicine, professed to be favoured by Æsculapius, pretended to foreknowledge, and was supported by the Oracles; and being more strict in conduct than the Paphlagonian,§ he established a more lasting celebrity. His usefulness to political aspirants contributed to his success; perhaps also the real and contemporary Miracles of the Christian teachers would dispose many minds easily to acquiesce in any claims of a similar character.

His story an imitation of Scripture.

In the foregoing remarks we have admitted the general fidelity of the history, because ancient authors allow it, and there was no necessity to dispute it. Tried however on its own merits, it is quite unworthy of serious attention. Not only in the Miraculous accounts, (as we have already seen,) but in the relation of a multitude of ordinary facts, an effort to rival our Saviour's history is distinctly visible. The favour in which Apollonius from a child was held by Gods and men; his conversations when a youth in the Temple of Æsculapius; his determination in spite of danger to go up to Rome;‖ the cowardice of his disciples in deserting him; the charge brought against him of disaffection to Cæsar; the Minister's acknowledging, on his private examination, that he was more than man; the ignominious treatment of him by Domitianus on his second appearance at Rome; his imprisonment with criminals; his vanishing from Court and sudden reappearance to his mourning disciples at Puteoli;¶ these, with other particulars of a similar cast, evidence a history modelled after the narrative of the Evangelists. Expressions, moreover, and descriptions occur, clearly imitated from the sacred volume. To this we must add** the Rhetorical colouring of the whole composition, so contrary to the sobriety of truth;* the fabulous accounts of things and places interspersed through the history;† lastly we must bear in mind the principle, recognised by the Pythagorean and Eclectic schools, of permitting exaggeration and deceit in the cause of Philosophy.‡

Apollonius Tyanæus. From U. C. 750. A. C. 4. to A. D. 96.

After all, it must be remembered, that were the pretended Miracles as unexceptionable as we have shown them to be absurd and useless,—were they plain interruptions of established laws, were they grave and dignified in their nature, and important in their object, and were there nothing to excite suspicion in the design, manner, or character, of the narrator,—still the testimony on which they rest is the bare word of an author writing one hundred years after the death of the person panegyrized, and far distant from the places in which most of the Miracles were wrought; and who can give no better account of his information than that he gained it from an unpublished work,§ professedly indeed composed by a witness of the extraordinary transactions, but passing into his hands through two intermediate possessors. These are circumstances which almost, without positive objections, are sufficient by their own negative force to justify a summary rejection of the whole ac-

Inadequate testimony of Philostratus

---

* Hence the first of the charges brought against him by Domitianus was the *strangeness of his dress*. Philostr. viii. 5. By way of contrast, cf. 1 *Cor.* ch. ii. v. 3, 4; 2 *Cor.* ch. x. v. 10.

† Philostr. iv. 1, Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἶδον τὸν Δάμιδα τε Ἰωνίᾳ, περιελθόντα τε τὴν Ἔφεσον, οὐδὲ οἱ βάπτουσι ἴσχυσαν ἧττον τοῖς ἱματίοις ἢ πρὸς ταῖς ἰατρῶν τέχναις ἦσαν· ἀλλ' ἠσπάζοντο, ἃ μὲν σοφίας, ἃ δὲ ἰδοὺς, ἃ δὲ διαίτης, ἃ δὲ σχήματος, οἱ δὲ πάντων ὁμοῦ θαυμαστὰ ὄντος. See also i. 19, 21, iv. 17, 20, 39, vii. 31, &c. and i. 10, 12, &c.

‡ Brucker, vol. ii. p. 144.

§ Brucker supposes that, as in the case of Alexander, gain was his object; but we seem to have no proof of this, nor is it necessary thus to account for his conduct. We discover, indeed, in his character, no marks of that high enthusiasm which would support him in his whimsical career without any definite worldly object; yet the veneration he inspired, and the notice taken of him by great men, might be quite a sufficient recompence to a conceited and narrow mind.

‖ Cf. also *Acts*, ch. xx. v. 22, 23, ch. xxi. v. 4, 11—14.

¶ Philostr. i. 8, 11, iv. 36, 38, 44, vii. 34, viii. 5, 11.

** See the description of his raising the Roman maid as above given. Take again the following account of his appearance to Damis and Demetrius at Puteoli, after vanishing from Court, viii. 12. Ἀπολαφυσσομένου δὲ τοῦ Δάμιδος, καὶ τι καὶ τοιοῦτον ὑπόντος, ὦ γενναῖε ἔφη, ὃν ἐφίμισά σοι, τὸν καλὸν τε καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἰταλὸν; ἀκούσας ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος.. ὑψωθή, ὦτι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐκφάνητι. Ζῶντα; ἦφη ὁ Δημήτριος, τι δὲ τεθνᾶσα οὕτω σπουδάζεται ὑπὸ σοῦ πλήσιος· περιστὰς οὖν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος τὸν χεῖρα, λαζοῦ μου ἦφη, κἀν μὴ διαφύγω σε, εἰδωλόν εἰμί σου εἰ δὲ Πρωτεφάνους ἦμεν.... τι δὲ ὑποπτεύομαι ἀκούσιον, σιῶπᾶ καὶ Δάμιν ἔξῃν τί μι καὶ μὴ ἀποδιδλπίναι τὸ σῶμα. Οὐκέθ' ὅσα ἀπιστῶν ἦσαν, ἀλλ' ἀναστάντες, &c..... And presently Apollonius says, Τὰ δ' ὑπὲρ τῆς δίκης πιύσεσθε μὲν, ἐν μὲν ὑπαιθρῳ· δῆλα τι γὰρ ἱκανῶς ἤδη, καὶ βαδίζειν ὄρθ ις ἄστυ· ἡδίους δ' οἱ καθ' ἡδὺν λόγον παρεκπίμψαι βαδίζοντας· ἴσμεν οὖν διαλαλοῦντες, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐρωτᾶτε..... ἃ δ' οὕτω ἴσατε δῆλα, διήρου ἀπὸ τῆς προφάσεως, &c. here is much incautious agreement with Luke, ch. xxiv. v. 14—17, 27, 29, 32, 36—40. Also more or less in the following: vii. 30, *init.* and 34, *fin.* with Luke, ch. xii. v 11, 12: iii. 38, with Matt. ch. xvii. v. 14, &c. where observe the contrast of the two narratives: viii. 30, *fin.* with *Acts*, ch. xii. v. 7—10: iv. 44, with John, ch. xviii. v. 33, &c.; vii. 34, *init.* with Mark, ch. xiv. v. 65: iv. 34, *init.* with *Acts*, ch. xvi. v. 8—10: i. 19, *fin.* with Mark, ch. vii. v. 27, 28. Brucker and Douglas notice the following in the detection of the Empusa: Δαιμόνιον ὑφεὶς τὸ φάσμα, καὶ ἰδίαν μὴ βασανίζειν αὐτὸ, μηδὲ ἀναγκάζειν ὁμολογεῖν ὅτι εἴη, iv. 25, cf. Mark, ch. v. v. 7—9. Olearius compares an expression in vii. 30, with 1 *Cor.* ch. ix. v. 9.

* *E. g.* his ambitious descriptions of countries, &c. In iv. 30, 32, v. 22, vi. 24, he ascribes to Apollonius regular Socratic disputations, and in vi. 11, a long and flowery speech in the presence of the Gymnosophists,—modes of Philosophical instruction totally at variance with the genius of the Pythagorean school, the Philosopher's Letters still extant, and the writer's own description of his manner of teaching, i. 17. Some of his exaggerations and misstatements have been noticed in the course of the narrative. As a specimen of the Rhetorical style in which the work is written, we notice a form of expression in his account of the recovery of the Roman damsel, Ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἢ περισψάμενος αὐτῆς ἀφύπνισε,—contrast this with the simplicity of the Scripture narrative. See also the last sentence of v. 17, and indeed *passim*.

† *E. g.* his accounts of Indian and Æthiopian monsters; of serpents whose eyes were jewels of magical virtue; of pygmies; of golden water; of the speaking tree; of a woman half white and half black, &c.: he incorporates in his narrative the fables of Ctesias, Agatharchidas, and other writers. His blunders in geography and natural philosophy may be added, as far as they arise from the desire of describing wonders, &c. See also his pompous description of the wonders of Babylon, which were not then in existence. Prideaux, *Connection*, part i. book viii. For his inconsistencies, see Eusebius and Brucker. It must be remembered, that in the age of Philostratus the composition of romantic histories was in fashion.

‡ See Brucker, vol. i. p. 992, vol. ii. p. 378. Apollonius was only one out of several who were set up by the Eclectics as rivals to Christ. Brucker, vol. ii. p. 372. Mosheim, *de turbatâ Ecclesiâ, &c.* sec. 25, 26.

§ Philostr. i. 2, 3. He professes that his account contains much *news*. As to the sources, besides the Journal of Damis, from which he pretends to derive his information, he neither tells us how he met with them, nor what they contained; nor does he refer to them in the course of his history. On the other hand much (as we have above noticed) of the detail of Apollonius's journey is derived from the writings of Ctesias, &c. &c.

count. Unless indeed the history had been perverted to a mischievous purpose, we should esteem it impertinent to direct argument against a mere romance, and to subject a work of imagination to a grave discussion.

We are naturally led to pursue the subject which the life of Apollonius has thus introduced, by drawing an extended comparison between the Miracles of Scripture and those elsewhere related, as regards their respective object, nature, and evidence. We shall divide our observations under the following heads:

§ I. On the Nature and general Uses of Miracles.

§ II. On the antecedent Credibility of a Miracle, considered as a Divine Interposition.

§ III. On the Criterion of a Miracle, considered as a Divine Interposition.

§ IV. On the direct Evidence for the Christian Miracles.

§ I. *On the Nature and general Uses of Miracles.*

Definition of a Miracle

A Miracle may be considered as an event inconsistent with the constitution of nature, i. e. the established course of things in which it is found. Or, again, an event in a given system which cannot be referred to any law, or accounted for by the operation of any principle in that system. It does not necessarily imply a *violation* of nature, as some have supposed,—merely the *interposition* of an external cause, which, as we shall hereafter show, can be no other than the agency of the Deity. And the effect produced is that of unusual or increased action in the parts of the system.

A Miracle a relative term.

It is then a relative term, not only as it presupposes an assemblage of laws from which it is a deviation, but also as it has reference to *some one particular system*; for the same event which is anomalous in one, may be quite regular when observed in connection with another. The Miracles of Scripture, for instance, are irregularities in the economy of nature, but with a moral end; and forming one instance out of many, of the *providence* of God, i. e. an instance of occurrences in the natural world with a final cause. Thus, while they are exceptions to the laws of one system, they may coincide with those of another. They profess to be the *evidence of a Revelation*, the criterion of a divine message. To consider them as mere exceptions to physical order, is to take a very incomplete view of them. It is to degrade them from the station which they hold in the plans and provisions of the divine mind, and to strip them of their real use and dignity; for as naked and isolated facts they do but deform an harmonious system.

A Miracle distinguished from a merely extraordinary event.

From this account of a Miracle, it is evident that it may often be difficult exactly to draw the line between uncommon and strictly Miraculous events. The production of ice, *e. g.* might have seemed *at first sight* Miraculous to the Siamese; for it was a phenomenon referable to none of those laws of nature which are in ordinary action in tropical climates. Such, again, might magnetic attraction appear, in ages familiar only with the attraction of gravity.* On the other hand, the extraordinary works of Moses or Paul appear such, even when referred to those simple and elementary principles of nature which the widest experience has confirmed. As far as this affects the *discrimination* of supernatural facts, it will be considered in its proper place; meanwhile let it suffice to state, that those events only are connected with our present subject *which have no assignable second cause or antecedent*, and which, on that account, are from the nature of the case referred to the immediate agency of the Deity.

Revelation and all its evidences more or less Miraculous.

A Revelation, i. e. *a direct message from God to man*, itself bears in some degree a Miraculous character; inasmuch as it supposes the Deity actually to present himself before his creatures, and to interpose in the affairs of life in a way above the reach of those settled arrangements of nature to the existence of which universal experience bears witness. And as a Revelation itself, so again the evidences of a Revelation may all more or less be considered Miraculous. Prophecy is an evidence only so far as foreseeing future events is above the known powers of the human mind, or Miraculous. In like manner, if the rapid extension of Christianity be urged in favour of its divine origin, it is because such extension, under such circumstances, is supposed to be inconsistent with the known principles and capacity of human nature. And the pure morality of the Gospel, as taught by illiterate fishermen of Galilee, is an evidence, in proportion as the phenomenon disagrees with the conclusions of general experience, which leads us to believe that a high state of mental cultivation is ordinarily requisite for the production of such moral teachers. It might even be said that, strictly speaking, no evidence of a Revelation is conceivable which does not partake of the character of a Miracle; since nothing but a display of power over the existing system of things can attest the immediate presence of Him by whom it was originally established; or, again, because no event which results entirely from the ordinary operation of nature can be the criterion of one that is extraordinary.*

Miracles commonly so called,

In the present argument we confine ourselves to the consideration of Miracles commonly so called; such events, i. e. for the most part as are inconsistent with the constitution of the physical world.

Contrasted with the other branches of evidence for Revelation.

Miracles, thus defined, hold a very prominent place in the evidence of the Jewish and Christian Revelations. They are the most striking and conclusive evidence; because the laws of matter being better understood than those to which mind is conformed, the transgression of them is more easily recognised. They are the most simple and obvious; because, whereas the freedom of the human will resists the imposition of undeviating laws, the material creation, on the contrary, being strictly subjected to the regulation of its Maker, looks to him alone for a change in its constitution. Yet Miracles are but a branch of the evidences, and other branches have their respective advantages. Prophecy, as has been often observed, is a growing evidence, and appeals more forcibly to those who are acquainted with the Miracles only through testimony. A Philoso-

* Campbell, *on Miracles*, part i. sec. 2.

* Hence it is that in the Scripture accounts of Revelations to the Prophets, &c. a *sensible* Miracle is so often asked and given; as if the vision itself, which was the *medium* of the Revelation, was not a sufficient evidence of it, as being perhaps resolvable into the *ordinary* powers of an excited imagination, e. g. *Judg.* ch. vi. v. 36—40, &c.

phical mind will perhaps be most strongly affected by the fact of the very existence of the Jewish polity, or of the revolution effected by Christianity. While the beautiful moral teaching and evident honesty of the New Testament writers is the most persuasive argument to the unlearned but single-hearted inquirer. Nor must it be forgotten that the evidences for Revelation are *cumulative*, that they gain strength from each other; and that, in consequence, the argument from Miracles is immensely stronger when viewed *in conjunction with the rest*, than when considered separately as in an inquiry of the present nature.

Cogency of separate Miracles, as proofs of supernatural agency, varies.

As the relative force of the separate evidences is different under different circumstances, so again has one class of Miracle more or less weight than another, according to the accidental change of times, places, and persons addressed. As our knowledge of the system of nature, and of the circumstances of the particular case varies, so of course varies our conviction. Walking on the sea, for instance, or giving sight to one born blind, would to us perhaps be a Miracle even more astonishing than it was to the Jews; the laws of nature being at the present day better understood than formerly, and the fables concerning Magical power being no longer credited. On the other hand, stilling the wind and waves with a word may by all but eye-witnesses be set down to accident or exaggeration without the possibility of a full confutation; yet to eye-witnesses it would carry with it an overpowering evidence of supernatural agency by the voice and manner that accompanied the command, the violence of the wind at the moment, the instantaneous effect produced, and other circumstances, the force of which a narration cannot fully convey. The same remark applies to the Miracle of changing water into wine, to the cure of demoniacal possessions, and of diseases generally. From a variety of causes, then, it happens that Miracles which produced a rational conviction at the time when they took place, have ever since proved rather an objection to Revelation than an evidence for it, and have depended on the rest for support; while others, which once were of a dubious and perplexing character, have in succeeding Ages come forward in its defence. It is by a process similar to this that the anomalous nature of the Mosaic polity, which might once be an obstacle to its reception, is now justly alleged in proof of the very Miracles by which it was then supported.* It is important to keep this remark in view, as it is no uncommon practice with those who are ill-affected to the cause of Revealed Religion, to dwell upon such Miracles as at *the present day* rather require than contribute evidence, as if they formed a part of the *present* proof on which it rests its pretensions.†

Miracles do not of themselves prove the being of Creator:

In the foregoing remarks, the being of an intelligent Maker has been throughout assumed; and, indeed, if the *peculiar* object of a Miracle be to *evidence a message from God*, it is plain that it implies the admission of the fundamental truth, and demands assent to another beyond it. His *particular interference* it directly *proves*, while it only *reminds* of his *existence*. It professes to be the signature of God to a message delivered by human instruments; and therefore supposes that signature in some degree already known, from his ordinary works. It appeals to that moral sense and that experience of human affairs which already bear witness to his ordinary presence. Considered *by itself*, it is at most but the token of a superhuman being. Hence, though an *additional instance*, it is not a *distinct species* of evidence for a Creator from that contained in the general marks of order and design in the Universe. A proof drawn from an *interruption* in the course of nature is in the same *line of argument* as one deduced from the *existence* of that course, and in point of cogency is inferior to it. Were a being who had experience only of a chaotic world suddenly introduced into this orderly system of things, he would have an infinitely more powerful argument for the existence of a designing Mind than a mere interruption of that system can afford. A Miracle is no argument to one who is deliberately, and on principle, an atheist.

Yet lead to belief in that doctrine.

Yet, though not abstractedly the more convincing, it is often so in effect, as being of a more striking and imposing character. The mind, habituated to the regularity of nature, is blunted to the overwhelming evidence it conveys; whereas by a Miracle it may be roused to reflection, till mere conviction of a superhuman being becomes the first step towards the acknowledgment of a Supreme power. While, moreover, it surveys nature *as a whole*, it is not capacious enough to embrace its bearings, and to comprehend what it implies. In Miraculous displays of power the field of view is narrowed; a detached portion of the divine operations is taken as an instance, and the Final Cause is distinctly pointed out. A Miracle, besides, is more striking, inasmuch as it displays the Deity in action; evidence of which is not supplied in the system of nature. It may then *accidentally* bring conviction of an intelligent Creator; for it voluntarily proffers a testimony which we have ourselves to extort from the ordinary course of things, and forces upon the attention a truth which otherwise is not discovered, except upon examination.

They may prove the moral government of God.

And as it affords a more *striking* evidence of a Creator than that conveyed in the order and established laws of the Universe, still more so does it of a Moral Governor. For, while *nature* attests the being of God more distinctly than it does his moral government, a *Miraculous event*, on the contrary, bears more directly on the fact of his moral government, of which it is an immediate instance, while it only implies his existence. Hence, besides banishing ideas of Fate and Necessity, Miracles have a tendency to rouse conscience, to awaken to a sense of reponsibility, to remind of duty, and to direct the attention to those marks of divine government already contained in the ordinary course of events.*

Hitherto, however, we have spoken of solitary Miracles; a *system* of Miraculous interpositions, conducted with reference to a Final Cause, supplies a still more beautiful and convincing argument for the moral government of God.

---

* See Sumner's *Records of Creation*, vol. i.

† See Hume, *on Miracles*: "let us examine those Miracles related in Scripture, and, *not to lose ourselves in too wide a field*, let us *confine* ourselves to such as we find in the *Pentateuch*, &c. It gives an account of the state of the world and of human nature entirely different from the present; of our fall from that state; of the age of man extended to near a thousand years," &c. See Berkeley's *Minute Philosopher*, dial. vi. sec. 30.

* Farmer, *on Miracles*, ch. i. sec. 2.

Biography.

§ II. *On the antecedent Credibility of a Miracle, considered as a Divine Interposition.*

Miracles, being facts, can be proved only by means of Testimony.

In proof of Miraculous occurrences, we must have recourse to the same *kind* of evidence as that by which we determine the truth of Historical accounts in general. For though Miracles, in consequence of their extraordinary nature, challenge a fuller and more accurate investigation, still they do not admit an investigation conducted on different principles,—Testimony being the only assignable medium of proof for past events of any kind. And this being indisputable, it is almost equally so that the Christian Miracles are attested by evidence even stronger than can be produced for any of those Historical facts which we most firmly believe. This has been felt by unbelievers; who have been, in consequence, led to deny the *admissibility* of even the strongest Testimony, if offered in behalf of Miraculous events, and thus to get rid of the only means by which they can be proved to have taken place. It has accordingly been asserted, that all events inconsistent with the course of nature bear in their very front such strong and decisive marks of falsehood and absurdity, that it is needless to examine the evidence adduced for them.* "Where men are heated by zeal and enthusiasm," says Hume, with a distant but evident allusion to the Christian Miracles, "there is no degree of human Testimony so strong as may not be procured for the greatest absurdity; and those who will be so silly as to examine the affair *by that medium*, and seek particular flaws in the Testimony, are almost sure to be confounded."† Of these antecedent objections, which are supposed to decide the question, the most popular is founded on the frequent occurrence of wonderful tales in every Age and country, generally too connected with Religion; and since the more we are in a situation to examine these accounts, the more fabulous they are proved to be, there would certainly be hence a fair presumption against the Scripture narrative, did it resemble them in its circumstances and proposed object. A more refined argument is that advanced by Hume, in the first part of his *Essay on Miracles*, in which it is maintained against the credibility of a Miracle, that it is more improbable that the Miracle should be true than that the Testimony should be false.

Objections against the admissibility of Testimony.

Divine agency the cause of Miracles.

This latter objection has been so ably met by various writers, that, though prior in the order of the argument to the other, it need not be considered here. It derives its force from the *assumption*, that a Miracle is strictly a *causeless phenomenon*, a *self-originating violation of nature;* and is solved by referring the event to *divine agency*, a principle which (it cannot be denied) has originated works indicative of power at least as great as any Miracle requires. An adequate cause being thus found for the production of a Miracle, the objection vanishes, as far as the mere question of power is concerned; and it remains to be considered whether the anomalous fact be of such a character as to *admit* of being referred to the Supreme Being. For if it cannot with propriety be referred to him, it remains as improbable as if no such agent were known to exist. At this point, then, we propose taking up the argument; and by examining *what* Miracles are in their nature and circumstances referable to divine agency, we shall be providing a reply to the former of the objections just noticed, in which the alleged *similarity* of *all* Miraculous narratives one to another, was made a reason for a common rejection of all. And it is to an inquiry of this nature, that a memoir of Apollonius properly gives rise.

Apollonius Tyanæus.—Miracles.

In examining *what* Miracles may properly be ascribed to the Deity, Hume supplies us with an observation so just, when taken in its full extent, that we shall make it the groundwork of the inquiry on which we are entering. As the Deity, he says, discovers himself to us by his works, we have no rational grounds for ascribing to him attributes or actions dissimilar from those which his works convey. It follows then, that in discriminating between those Miracles which can and those which cannot be ascribed to God, we must be guided by the information with which *experience* furnishes us concerning his wisdom, goodness, and other attributes. Since a Miracle is an act out of the known track of divine agency, as regards the *physical* system, it is almost indispensable to show its consistency with the divine agency, at least, in some *other* point of view; if (i. e.) it is to be recognised as the work of the same power. Now, we contend that this reasonable demand *is* satisfied in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, in which we find a narrative of Miracles altogether answering in their character and circumstances to those general ideas which the ordinary course of divine providence enables us to form concerning the attributes and actions of God.

All Miracles not referrible to divine agency.

While writers expatiate so largely on the laws of nature, they altogether forget the existence of a *Moral* system; a system, which though but partially understood, and but general in its appointments as acting upon free agents, is as intelligible in its laws and provisions as the material world. Connected with this Moral government, we find certain instincts of mind; such as conscience, a sense of responsibility, and an approbation of virtue; an innate desire of knowledge, and an almost universal feeling of the necessity of Religious observances: while, in fact, Virtue is on the whole rewarded and Vice punished. And though we meet with many and striking anomalies, yet it is evident they are but anomalies, and possibly but in appearance so, and with reference to our partial information. *

The Scripture Miracles presented to the result of the Moral system.

These two systems, the Physical and the Moral, sometimes act in unison, and sometimes in opposition to each other; and as the order of nature certainly does in many cases interfere with the operation of Moral laws, (as *e. g.* when good men die prematurely, or the gifts of nature are continued to the bad,) there is nothing to shock probability in the idea that a great Moral object should be effected by an interruption of Physical order. But, further than this, however Physical laws may embarrass the operation of the Moral system, still on the whole they are subservient to it; contributing, as is evident, to the welfare and convenience of Man, providing for his mental gratification as well as animal enjoyment, sometimes even supplying correctives to his Moral disorders. If then the economy of nature has so constant a reference to an ulterior plan, a Miracle is a deviation from the subordinate for the sake of the superior system, and is very far indeed from improbable, when a great Moral end cannot be effected except at the expense of Physical regularity.

Interfering with the Physical.

* *I. e.* it is pretended to try *past* events on the principles used in conjecturing *future;* viz. on antecedent probability and examples. (*Treatise on Rhetoric*, ch. i. sec. 3.) See Leland's *Supplement to View of Deistical Writers*, let. 3.

† *Essays*, vol. ii. note L.

* See Butler's *Analogy*, part i. ch. iii.

Nor can it be fairly said to argue an imperfection in the divine plans, that this interference should be necessary. For we must view the system of Providence *as a whole;* which is not more imperfect because of the mutual action of its parts, than a machine the separate wheels of which affect each other's movements.

That is to be the criterion and evidence of a Revelation.

Now the Miracles of the Jewish and Christian Religions must be considered as immediate effects of divine power beyond the action of nature, for an important Moral end; and are in consequence accounted for by producing not a *physical* but a *final* cause. * We are not left to contemplate the bare anomalies, and from the mere necessity of the case to refer them to the supposed agency of the Deity. The power of displaying them is, according to the Scripture narrative, intrusted to certain individuals, who stand forward as their interpreters, giving them a voice and language, and a dignity demanding our regard; who set them forth as evidences of the greatest of Moral ends, a Revelation from God,—as instruments in his hand of effecting a direct intercourse between himself and his creatures, *which otherwise could not have been effected,*—as vouchers for the truth of a message which they deliver.† This is plain and intelligible; there is an easy connection between the Miraculous nature of their works and the truth of their words; the *fact* of their superhuman power is a reasonable ground for *belief* in their superhuman knowledge. Considering, then, our instinctive sense of duty and moral obligation, yet the weak sanction which reason gives to the practice of Virtue, and withal the uncertainty of the mind when advancing beyond the first elements of right and wrong; considering, moreover, the feeling which wise men have entertained of the need of some heavenly guide to instruct and confirm them in goodness, and that unextinguishable desire for a divine message which has led men in all ages to acquiesce even in pretended Revelations rather than forego the consolation thus afforded them; and again, the possibility (to say the least) of our being destined for a future state of being, the nature and circumstances of which it may concern us much to know, though from nature we know nothing; considering, lastly, our experience of a watchful and merciful Providence, and the impracticability already noticed of a Revelation without a Miracle—it is hardly too much to affirm, that the Moral system points to an interference with the course of nature, and that Miracles wrought in evidence of a divine communication, instead of being antecedently improbable, are, when directly attested, entitled to a respectful and impartial consideration.

When the various antecedent objections which ingenious men have urged against Miracles are brought together, they will be found nearly all to arise from forgetfulness of the existence of Moral laws. * In their zeal to perfect the laws of matter they most unphilosophically overlook a more sublime system, which contains disclosures not only of the *Being* but of the *Will* of God Thus Hume, in a passage above alluded to, observes, "Though the Being to whom the Miracle is ascribed be Almighty, it does not, upon that account, become a whit more probable; since it is impossible for us to know the attributes or actions of such a Being, otherwise than from the experience which we have of his productions *in the usual course of nature.* This still reduces us to past observation, and obliges us to compare the instances of the violation of truth in the testimony of men with those of the violation of the *laws of nature* by Miracles, in order to judge which of them is most likely and probable." Here the Moral government of God, *with the course of which the Miracle entirely accords,* is altogether kept out of sight. With a like heedlessness of the Moral character of a Miracle, another writer, notorious for his irreligion,† objects that it argues mutability in the Deity, and implies that the Physical system was not created good, as needing improvement. And a recent author adopts a similarly partial and inconclusive mode of reasoning, when he confuses the Christian Miracles with fables of apparitions and witches, and would examine them on the strict principle of those legal forms which from their secular object go far to exclude all *Religious* discussion of the question. ‡ Such reasoners seem to suppose, that when the agency of the Deity is introduced to account for Miracles, it is the illogical introduction of an unknown cause, a reference to a mere name, the offspring perhaps of popular superstition; or, if more than a name, to a cause that can be known only by means of the Physical creation; and hence they consider Religion as founded in the mere weakness or eccentricity of the intellect, not in actual intimations of a divine government as contained in the moral world. From an apparent impatience of investigating a system which is but partially revealed, they esteem the laws of the material system alone worthy the notice of a scientific mind; and rid themselves of the annoyance which the importunity of a claim to Miraculous power occasions them, by discarding all the circumstances which fix its antecedent probability, all in which one Miracle differs from another, the professed author, object, design, character, and human instruments.

Objections to the Scripture Miracles are founded on a forgetfulness of the Moral system

When this partial procedure is resisted, the *à priori* objections of sceptical writers at once lose their force. Facts are only so far improbable as they fall under no general rule; whereas it is as parts of an existing system that the Miracles of Scripture demand our attention, as resulting from known attributes of God, and corresponding to the ordinary arrangements of his providence. Even as detached events they might excite a rational awe towards the mysterious Author of nature. But they are presented to us, not as unconnected and unmeaning occurrences, but as holding a place in an extensive plan of divine government, completing the Moral system, connecting Man with his Maker, and introducing him to the means of securing his happiness in another and eternal state of being. That such is the professed object of the body of Christian Miracles,

Enumeration of circumstances in which the Scripture Miracles fall in with the known attributes of God.

* *Divine Legation*, book ix. ch. v. Vince, *on Miracles*, serm. 1.

† As, for instance, *Exod.* ch. iv. v. 1—9, 29—31; ch. vii. v. 9, 17. *Numb.* ch. xvi. v. 3, 28, 29. *Deut.* ch. iv. v. 36—40; ch. xviii. v. 21, 22. Josh. ch. iii. v. 7—13. 1 Sam. ch. x. v. 1—7; ch. xii. v. 16—19. 1 *Kings*, ch. xiii. v. 3; ch. xvii. v. 24; ch. xviii. v. 36—39. 2 *Kings*, ch. i. v. 6, 10; ch. v. v. 15; ch. xx. v. 8—11. Jer. ch. xxviii. v. 15—17. Ezek. ch. xxxiii. v. 33. Matt. ch. x. v. 1—20; ch. xi. v. 3—5, 20—24. Mark, ch. xvi. v. 15—20. Luke, ch. i. v. 18—20; ch. ii. v. 11, 12; ch. v. v. 24; ch. vii. v. 15, 16; ch. ix. v. 2; ch. x. v. 9. John, ch. ii. v. 22; ch. iii. v. 2; ch. v. v. 36, 37; ch. ix. v. 33; ch. x. v. 24—38; ch. xi. v. 15, 41, 42; ch. xiii. v. 19; ch. xiv. v. 10, 11, 29; ch. xvi. v. 4; ch. xx. v. 30, 31. *Acts*, ch. i. v. 8; ch. ii. v. 22, 33; ch. iii. v. 15, 16; ch. iv. v. 33; ch. v. v. 32; ch. viii. v. 6; ch. x. v. 38; ch. xiii. v. 8—12; ch. xiv. v. 3. *Rom.* ch. xv. v. 18, 19. 1 *Cor.* ch. ii. v. 4, 5. 2 *Cor.* ch. xii. v. 12. *Heb.* ch. ii. v. 3, 4. *Rev.* ch. xix. v. 10.

* Vince, *on Miracles*, serm. 1.

† Voltaire. ‡ Bentham, *Preuves Judiciaires*, liv. viii.

Biography.

can hardly be denied. In the earlier Religion it was substantially the same, though from the preparatory nature of the dispensation, a less enlarged view was given of the divine counsels. The express purpose of the Jewish Miracles is to confirm the natural evidence of one God, the Creator of all things, to display his attributes and will with distinctness and authority, and to enforce the obligation of Religious observances, and show the sin of idolatrous worship.* Whether we turn to the earlier or latter Ages of Judaism, in the plagues of Egypt; in the parting of Jordan, and the arresting of the Sun's course by Joshua; in the harvest thunder at the prayer of Samuel; in the rending of the altar at Bethel; in Elijah's sacrifice on Mount Carmel; and in the cure of Naaman by Elisha; we recognise this one grand object throughout. Not even in the earliest ages of the Scripture history are Miracles wrought at random, or causelessly, or to amuse the fancy, or for the sake of mere display: nor prodigally, for the mere conviction of individuals, but for the most part on a grand scale, in the face of the world, to supply whole nations with evidence concerning the Deity. Nor are they strewn confusedly over the face of the history, being with few exceptions reducible to three eras; the formation of the Hebrew Church and Polity, the reformation in the times of the idolatrous Kings of Israel, and the promulgation of the Gospel. Let it be observed, moreover, that the power of working them, instead of being assumed by any classes of men indiscriminately, is described as a prerogative of the occasional Prophets to the exclusion of the Priests and Kings; a circumstance which, not to mention its remarkable contrast to the natural course of an imposture, is deserving attention from its consistency with the leading design of Miracles already specified. For the respective claims of the Kings and Priests were already ascertained, when once the sacred office was limited to the family of Aaron, and the regal power to David and his descendants; whereas extraordinary messengers, as Moses, Samuel, and Elijah, needed some supernatural display of power to authenticate their pretensions. In corroboration of this remark we may observe the unembarrassed manner of the Prophets in the exercise of their professed gift; their disdain of argument or persuasion, and the confidence with which they appeal to those before whom they are said to have worked their Miracles.

These and similar observations do more than invest the *separate* Miracles with a dignity worthy of the Supreme Being; they show the *coincidence* of them *all* in one common and consistent object. As parts of a system, the Miracles recommend and attest each other, evidencing not only general *wisdom*, but a digested and extended *plan*. And while this appearance of design connects them with the acknowledged works of a Creator, who is in the natural world chiefly known to us by the presence of final causes, so, again, a plan conducted as this was, through a series of ages, evinces not the varying will of successive individuals, but the steady and sustained purpose of one Sovereign Mind. And this remark especially applies to the coincidence of views observable between the Old and New Testament; the latter of which, though written after a long interval of silence, the breaking up of the former system, a revolution in Religious discipline, and the introduction of Oriental tenets into the popular Theology, still unhesitatingly takes up and maintains the ancient principles of Miraculous interposition.

Apollonius Tyaneus. — Miracles.

An additional recommendation of the Scripture Miracles is their appositeness to the times and places in which they were wrought; as, *e. g.* in the case of the plagues of Egypt, which, it has been shown,* were directed against the prevalent superstitions of that country. Their originality, beauty, and immediate utility, are further properties falling in with our conceptions of divine agency. In their general character we discover nothing indecorous, light, or ridiculous; they are grave, simple, unambiguous, majestic. Many of them, especially those of the later dispensation, are remarkable for their benevolent and merciful character; others are useful for a variety of subordinate purposes, as a pledge of the certainty of particular promises, or as comforting good men, or as edifying the Church. Nor must we overlook the Moral instruction conveyed in many, particularly in those ascribed to Christ, the Spiritual interpretation which they will often bear, and the exemplification which they afford of particular doctrines.†

Accepting then what may be called Hume's canon, that *no work can be reasonably ascribed to the agency of God, which is altogether different from those ordinary works from which our knowledge of him is originally obtained*, we have shown that the Miracles of Scripture, far from being exceptionable on that account, are strongly recommended by their coincidence with what we know from nature of *his Providence and Moral attributes*. That there are some few among them in which this coincidence cannot be traced, it is not necessary to deny. As a whole they bear a determinate and consistent character, being great and extraordinary means for attaining a great, momentous, and extraordinary object.

Tests, derived from our knowledge of the divine attributes, by which all but Scripture Miracles are excluded.

We shall not however dismiss this criterion of the antecedent probability of a Miracle with which Hume has furnished us, without showing that it is more or less detrimental to the pretensions of *all* professed Miracles *but* those of the Jewish and Christian Revelations:—in other words, that none else are likely to have occurred, because none else can with any probability be referred to the agency of the Deity, the only known cause of miraculous interposition. We exclude then

1. *Those which are not even referred by the workers of them to divine agency.*

Miracles not from God.

Such are the extraordinary works attributed by some to Zoroaster; and, again, to Pythagoras, Empedocles, Apollonius, and others of their School; which only claim to be the result of their superior wisdom, and were quite independent of a Supreme Being.‡ Such are the supposed effects of witchcraft or of magical charms, which profess to originate with Spirits and Demons; for, as these agents, supposing them to exist,

* *Exod.* ch. iii.—xiv. xx. v. 22, 23; ch. xxxiv. v. 6—17. *Deut.* ch. iv. v. 32—40. Josh. ch. ii. v. 10, 11; ch. iv. v. 23, 24. 1 Sam. ch. v. v. 3, 4; ch. xii. v. 18. 2 Sam. ch. vii. v. 23. 1 *Kings*, ch. viii. v. 59, 60; ch. xviii. v. 36, 37; ch. xx. v. 28. 2 *Kings*, ch. xix. v. 15—19, 35. 2 *Chron.* ch. xx. v. 29. Is. ch. vi. v. 1—5; ch. xix. v. 1; ch. xliii. v. 10—12.

* See Bryant.

† Jones, *on the Figurative Language of Scripture*, lect. 10. Farmer, *on Miracles*, ch. iii. sec. 6, 2.

‡ See, in contrast, *Gen.* ch. xl. v. 8; ch. xli. v. 16. Dan. ch. ii. 27—30, 47. *Acts*, ch. iii. v. 12—16; ch. xiv. v. 11—18; a contrast sustained, as these passages show, for 1500 years.

did not make the world, there is every reason for thinking they cannot of themselves alter its arrangements.* And those, as in some accounts of apparitions, which are silent respecting their origin, and are referred to God from the mere necessity of the case.

2. *Those which are unworthy of an All-wise Author.*

Miracles unworthy of God.

As, for example, the Miracles of Simon Magus, who pretended he could assume the appearance of a serpent, exhibit himself with two faces, and transform himself into whatever shape he pleased.† Such are most of the Miracles recorded in the apocryphal accounts of Christ:‡ e. g. the sudden ceasing of all kinds of motion at his birth, birds stopping in the midst of their flight, men at table with their hands to their mouths yet unable to eat, &c.; his changing, when a child, his playmates into kids, and animating clay figures of beasts and birds; the practice attributed to him of appearing to his disciples sometimes as a youth, sometimes as an old man, sometimes as a child, sometimes large, sometimes less, sometimes so tall as to reach the Heavens; and the obeisance paid him by the military standards when he was brought before Pilate. Of the same cast is the story of his picture presented by Nicodemus to Gamaliel, which when pierced by the Jews gave forth blood and water. Under this head of exception fall many of the Miracles related by the fathers;§ *e. g.* that of the consecrated bread changing into a live coal in the hands of a woman, who came to the Lord's supper after offering incense to an idol; of the dove issuing from the body of Polycarp at his martyrdom; of the petrifaction of a fowl dressed by a person under a vow of abstinence; of the exorcism of the demoniac camel; of the stones shedding tears at the barbarity of the persecutions; of inundations rising up to the roofs of churches without entering the open doors; and of pieces of gold, as fresh as from the mint, dropt from heaven into the laps of the Italian Monks. Of the same character are the Miracles of the Romish Breviary; as the prostration of wild beasts before the martyrs they were about to devour; the Miraculous uniting of two chains with which St. Peter had been at different times bound; and the burial of Paul the Hermit by lions. Such again are the Rabbinical Miracles, as that of the flies killed by lightning for settling on a Rabbi's paper. And the Miracles ascribed by some to Mohammed, as that the trees went out to meet him, the stones saluted him, and a camel complained to him.‖ The exorcism in the Book of Tobit must here be mentioned, in which the Evil Spirit who is in love with Sara is driven away by the smell of certain perfumes.¶ Hence the Scripture accounts of Eve's temptation by the serpent; of the speaking of Balaam's ass; of Jonah and the whale; and of the Devils sent into the herd of swine, are *by themselves* more or less improbable, being unequal in dignity to the rest. They are then supported by the system in which they are found, as being a few out of a multitude, and therefore but exceptions (and, as we suppose, but *apparent* exceptions) to the general rule. In some of them, too, a further purpose is discernible, which of itself reconciles us to the strangeness of their first appearance, and suggests the possibility of similar reasons, though unknown, being assigned in explanation of the rest. As the Miracle of the swine, the object of which may have been to prove to us the reality of demoniacal possessions.*

Miracles of mere power, even when connected with some ultimate object, are often improbable for the same general reason, viz. as unworthy of an All-wise Author. Such as that ascribed to Zoroaster,† of suffering melted brass to be poured upon his breast without injury to himself. Unless indeed their immediate design be to exemplify the greatness of God, as in the descent of fire from heaven upon Elijah's sacrifice, and in Christ's walking on the sea,‡ which evidently possess a dignity fitting them to be works of the Supreme Being. The propriety indeed of the Christian Miracles, contrasted with the want of decorum observable in those elsewhere related, forms a most striking evidence of their divinity.

Here, too, *ambiguous* Miracles find a place, it being antecedently improbable that the Almighty should rest the credit of his Revelation upon events which but obscurely implied his immediate presence.

And, for the same reason, those are in some measure improbable *which are professed by different Religions;* because from a divine agent may be expected distinct and peculiar specimens of divine agency. Hence the claims to supernatural power in the primitive Church are in general questionable, as *resting* upon the exorcism of Evil Spirits, and the cure of diseases; works, not only less satisfactory than others, as evidence of a Miraculous interposition, but suspicious from the circumstance, that they were exhibited also by Jews and Gentiles of the same Age.§ In the plagues of Egypt and Elijah's sacrifice, which seem to be of this class, there is a direct contest between two parties; and the object of the divine messenger is to show his own superiority in the very point in which his adversaries try their powers. Our Saviour's use of the clay in restoring sight has been accounted for on a similar principle, such external means being in repute among the Heathen in their pretended cures.

3. *Those which have no professed object.*

Miracles without object.

Hence a suspicion is thrown on all Miracles ascribed by the Apocryphal Gospels to Christ in his *infancy;*

* Sometimes charms are represented as having an inherent virtue, independent of invisible agents, as in the account given by Josephus of Eleazar's drawing out a Devil through the nostrils of a patient by means of a ring, which contained in it a drug prescribed by Solomon. Joseph. *Antiq.* viii. 2, sec. 5. See *Acts*, ch. viii. v. 19.

† Lavington, *Enthusiasm of Meth. and Papists comp.* part iii. sec. 43.

‡ Jones, *on the Canon*, part iii.

§ Middleton, *Free Inquiry.*

‖ The offensiveness of these, and many others above instanced, consists in attributing *moral* feelings to inanimate or irrational beings.

¶ It seems to have been a common notion that possessed persons were beloved by the Spirit that distressed them. See Philostr. iv. 25.—*Gospel of the Infancy*, xiv.—xvi. xxxiii. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* p. 113, ed. Thirlb. We find nothing of this kind in the account of the Scripture demoniacs

* *Divine Legation*, book ix. ch. v.

† Brucker, vol. i. p. 147.

‡ Power over the elements conveyed the most striking proof of Christ's mission from the God of nature, who in the Old Testament is frequently characterised as ruling the sea, winds, &c. *Ps.* lxv. v. 7; lxxvii. v. 19. Job, ch. xxxviii. v. 11, &c. It is said, that a drawing of feet upon the water was the hieroglyphic for impossibility. Christ moreover designed, it appears, to make trial of his disciples' faith by this Miracle. See Matt. ch. xiv. v. 28—31. Mark, ch. vi. v. 52. We read of the power to "move mountains," but evidently as a proverbial expression. The transfiguration, if it need be mentioned, has a *doctrinal* sense, and seems besides to have been intended to lead the minds of the Apostles to the consideration of the Spiritual Kingdom. One of Satan's temptations was to induce our Lord to work a Miracle of mere power. Matt. ch. iv. v. 6, 7. See *Acts*, ch. x. v. 38, for the general character of the Miracles.

§ Middleton. Stillingfleet, *Orig. Sacr.* ii. 9, sec. 1.

Biography.

for, being prior to his preaching, they seem to attest no doctrine, and are but distantly connected with any object.—Those again on which an object seems to be *forced*. Hence many harmonizing in one plan arrest the attention more powerfully than a detached and solitary Miracle, as converging to one point, and pressing upon our notice the end for which they are wrought. This remark, as far as it goes, is prejudicial to the Miracle wrought (as it is said) in Hunneric's persecution, long after the real age of Miracles was past; when the Athanasian confessors are reported to have retained the power of speech after the loss of their tongues.

Those, too, must be viewed with suspicion *which are disjoined from human instruments, and are made the vehicle of no message*;* since, according to our foregoing view, Miracles are only then divested of their *à priori* improbability when furthering some great Moral end, such as authenticating a divine communication. It is an objection then to those ascribed to relics generally, and in particular to those attributed to the tomb of the Abbé Paris, that they are left to tell their own story, and are but distantly connected with any object whatever. As it is, again, to many tales of apparitions, that they do not admit of a meaning, and consequently demand at most only an *otiose* assent, as Paley terms it. Hence there is a difficulty in the narrative contained in the first verses of John, v.; because we cannot reduce the account of the descent of the angel into the water to give it a healing power under any known arrangement of the divine economy. We receive it, then, on the general credit of the Revelation of which it forms part.†

For the same reason, viz. the want of a declared object, a prejudice is excited *when the professed worker is silent, or diffident as to his own power*; since our general experience of Providence leads us to suppose that Miraculous powers will not be committed to an individual who is not also prepared for his office by secret inspiration. This speaks strongly against the cures ascribed by Tacitus to Vespasianus, and would be an objection to our crediting the prediction uttered by Caiaphas, if separated from its context, or prominently brought forward to rest an argument upon. It is in general a characteristic of the Scripture system, that Miracles and inspiration go together.‡—With a view to specify the object distinctly, some have required that the Miracle should be wrought *after* the delivery of the message.§ A message delivered an indefinite time after the Miracle, while it cannot but excite attention from the general reputation of the messenger for an extraordinary gift, is not so expressly stamped with divine authority, as when it is ushered in by his claiming, and followed by his displaying, supernatural powers. For if a Miracle, once wrought, ever after sanctions the doctrines taught by the person exhibiting it, it must be attended by the gift of infallibility; a sustained Miracle is inconsistent with that frugality in the application of power which is observable in the general course of Providence.‖ On the other hand, when an unambiguous Miracle, having been first distinctly announced, is wrought with the professed object of sanctioning a message from God, it conveys an irresistible evidence of its divine origin. Accident is thus excluded, and the final cause indissolubly connected with the supernatural event. We may remark that the Miracles of Scripture were generally wrought on this plan.* In conformity to which, we find moreover that the Apostles, &c. could not work Miracles *when they pleased*;† a circumstance more consistent with our ideas of the divine government, and connecting the extraordinary acts more clearly with specific objects than if the supernatural gift were unlimited and irrevocable.

Apollonius Tyanæus — Miracles.

Lastly, under this head we may notice Miraculous accounts, *which*, as those concerning Apollonius, *may be separated from a narrative without detriment to it*. The prodigies of Livy, *e. g.* form no part in the action of the history, which is equally intelligible without them.‡ The Miraculous events of the Pentateuch, on the contrary, or of the Gospels and Acts, though of course they may be rejected *together with* the rest of the narrative, can be rejected in no other way; since they form its substance and groundwork, and, like the figure of Phidias on Minerva's shield, cannot be erased without spoiling the entire composition.§

4. *Those which are exceptionable as regards their object.*

Miracle with insufficient object.

If the professed object be *trifling and unimportant*; as in many related by the Fathers, *e. g.* Tertullian's account of the vision of an Angel to prescribe to a female the exact length and measure of her veil, or the divine admonition which Cyprian professes to have received to mix water with wine in the Eucharist, in order to render it efficacious.‖ Among these would be reckoned the directions given to Moses relative to the furnishing of the Tabernacle, and other regulations of the ceremonial law, were not further and important objects thereby affected; such as, separating the Israelites from the surrounding nations, impressing upon them the doctrine of a particular Providence, prefiguring future events, &c.

Miracles wrought for the gratification of mere *curio-*

* Farmer, *on Miracles*, ch. v.

† The verse containing the account of the Angel is wanting in many MSS. of authority, and is marked as suspicious by Griesbach. The mineral spring of Bethesda is mentioned by Eusebius as celebrated even in his day.

‡ Douglas's *Criterion*. Warburton, *Serm. on Resurrection*.

§ Fleetwood, Farmer, and others.

‖ The idea is accordingly discountenanced, Matt. ch. vii. v. 22, 23. *Heb.* ch. vi. v. 4—6. *Gal.* ch. ii. v. 11—14.

* St. Mark ends his Gospel by saying, that the Apostles "went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and *confirming the word by signs* FOLLOWING." ch. xvi. v. 20. See also *Exod.* ch. iv. v. 29, 30. 1 *Kings*, ch. xiii. v. 2, 3. 2 *Kings*, ch. xx. v. 8—11. *Acts*, ch. xiv. v. 3, &c.

† *E. g. Acts*, ch. xx. v. 22, 23. *Phil.* ch. ii. v. 27. 2 Tim. ch. iv. v. 20. In the Book of *Acts* we have not a few instances of the Apostles acting under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit. The gift of tongues is an exception to the general remark, as we know it was abused; but this from its nature was, when once given, possessed as an ordinary talent, and needed no fresh divine influence for subsequent exercise of it. It may besides be viewed as a *medium* of conveying the message, as well as being the seal of its divinity, and as such needed not in every instance to be marked out as a supernatural gift. Miracles in Scripture are not done by *wholesale*, i. e. indiscriminately and at once, without the particular will and act of the gifted individual; the contrary was the case with the cures at the tomb of the Abbé Paris. *Acts*, ch. xix. v. 11, 12 perhaps forms an exception; but the Miracles there mentioned are expressly said to be *special*, and were intended to put particular honour on the Apostle. Cf. Luke, ch. vi. v. 19; ch. viii. v. 46, which seem to illustrate John, ch. iii. v. 34.

‡ *E. g.* he says "ADJICIUNT *miracula huic pugnæ*," ii. 7.

§ Whereas other extraordinary accounts are like the statue of the Goddess herself, which could readily be taken to pieces, and resolved into its constituent parts, the precious metal and the stone. For the Jewish Miracles, see Graves, *on the Pentateuch*, part i. It has been observed, that the *discourses* of Christ so constantly grow out of his *Miracles*, that we can hardly admit the former without admitting the latter also. But his *discourses* form his *character*, which is by no means an obvious or easy one to imagine, had it never existed.

‖ Middleton, *Free Inquiry*.

sity are referable to this head of objection. Hence the triumphant invitations which some of the Fathers make to their heathen opponents to attend their exorcisms excite an unpleasant feeling in the mind, as degrading a solemn spectacle into a mere popular exhibition.

Those, again, which have a *political or party object;* as the cures ascribed to Vespasianus, or as those attributed to the tomb of the Abbé Paris, and the Eclectic prodigies—all which, viewed in their best light, tend to the mere aggrandizement of a particular Sect, and have little or no reference to the good of Mankind at large. It tells in favour of the Christian Miracles, that the Apostles, generally speaking, were not enabled to work them for their own personal convenience, to avoid danger, escape suffering, or save life. St. Paul's preservation from the effects of the viper's bite on the Isle of Melita is a solitary exception to this remark, no mention being made of his availing himself of this Miracle to proselyte the natives to the Christian faith.*

For a similar reason, those bear a less appearance of probability which are wrought *for the conviction of individuals.* We have already noticed the contrary character of the Scripture Miracles in this respect: *e. g.* St. Paul's Miraculous conversion did not end with itself, but was followed by momentous and inestimable consequences.† Again, Miracles attended the conversions of the Æthiopian Eunuch, Cornelius, and Sergius Paulus; but these were heads and first fruits of different classes of men who were in time to be brought into the Church.‡

Miracles *with a bad or vicious object* are laden with an extreme antecedent improbability; for they cannot at all be referred to the only known cause of supernatural power, the agency of God. Such are most of the fables concerning the heathen Deities; not a few of the professed Miracles of the primitive Church, which are wrought to sanction doctrines opposed not only to Scriptural truth but to the light of nature;§ and some related in the Apocryphal Gospels, especially Christ's inflicting death upon a schoolmaster who threatened to strike him, and on a boy who happened to run violently against him.‖ Here must be noticed several passages in Scripture, in which a Miraculous gift seems at first sight to be exercised to gratify revengeful feelings, and which are, therefore, received on the credit of the system.¶

Unnecessary Miracles are improbable; as, those wrought for an object attainable without an exertion, or with less exertion, of extraordinary power.** Of this kind, we contend, would be the writing of the Gospel on the skies, which some unbelievers have proposed as but an adequate attestation to a Revelation; for, *supposing* the recorded fact of their once occurring be sufficient for a rational conviction, a perpetual Miracle becomes superfluous.* —Such, again, would be the preservation of the text of Scripture in its verbal correctness, which many have supposed necessary for its infallibility as a standard of Truth.—The same antecedent objection presses on Miracles wrought *in attestation of truths already known.* We do not, *e. g.* require a Miracle to convince us that the Sun shines, or that Vice is blameable. The Socinian scheme is in a great measure chargeable with bringing the Miracles of the Gospel under this censure; for it prunes away the Christian system till little is left for the Miracles to attest. On this ground an objection has been taken to the Miracle wrought in favour of the Athanasians in Hunneric's persecution, as above mentioned; inasmuch as it merely professes to authorize a comment on the sacred text, *i. e.* to sanction a truth which is not *new*, unless Scripture be *obscure.*†—Here, too, may be noticed Miracles wrought *in evidence of doctrines already established;* such as those of the Papists, who seem desirous of answering the unbeliever's demand for a perpetual Miracle. Popish Miracles, as has often been observed, occur in Popish countries, where they are least wanted; whereas, if real, they would be invaluable among Protestants. Hence the primitive Miracles become suspicious, in proportion as we find Christianity established, not only from the increasing facility of fraud, but moreover from the apparent needlessness of the extraordinary display. And hence, admitting the Miracles of Christ and his followers, future Miracles with the same end are somewhat improbable. For enough have been wrought to *attest* the doctrine; and *attention*, when once excited by supernatural means, may be kept alive by a standing Ministry, just as inspiration is supplied by human learning.

We proceed to notice *inconsistency in the objects proposed*, as creating a just prejudice against the validity of Miraculous pretensions. This applies to the claims of the Romish Church, in which Miracles are wrought by hostile Sects in support of discordant tenets.‡ It constitutes some objection to the bulk of the Miracles of the primitive Church, when viewed as a *continuation* of the original gift, that they differ so much in manner, design, and attendant circumstances, from those recorded in Scripture. "We see," says Middleton, (in the ages subsequent to the Christian era) "a dispensation of things ascribed to God, quite different from that which we meet with in the New Testament. For in those days, the power of working Miracles was committed to none but the Apostles, and to a few of the most eminent of the other disciples, who were particularly commissioned to propagate the Gospel and preside in the Church of Christ. But upon the pretended revival of the same powers in the following Ages, we find the administration of them committed, not to those who were intrusted with the government of the Church, not to the successors of the Apostles, to the Bishops, the Martyrs, nor to the principal champions of the Christian

* Rev. J. Blanco White, *against Catholicism*, let. 6. The Breviary Miracles form a striking contrast to the Christian in this point.

† *Acts*, ch. xxvi. v. 16.

‡ Ibid. ch. viii. v. 26, 39; ch. x. v. 3, &c.; ch. xiii. v. 12. These three classes are mentioned together in prophecy. Is. ch. lvi. v. 4—8.

§ *E. g.* to establish Monachism, &c.

‖ Jones, *on the Canon*, part iii.

¶ *Gen.* ch. ix. v. 24—27. *Judg.* ch. xvi. v. 28—30. 2 *Kings*, ch. ii. v. 24. 2 *Chron.* ch. xxiv. v. 22.

** It does not follow, because all Miracles are equally *easy* to an Almighty author that all are equally *probable;* for, as has been often remarked, a frugality in the application of power is observable throughout his works.

* Dr. Graves observes, of the Miraculous agency in the Age of Moses and Joshua, that "God continued it *only so long as* was indispensably necessary to introduce and settle the Jewish nation in the land of their inheritance, and establish this dispensation so as to answer the purposes of the divine economy. After this, he gradually withdrew his supernatural assistance; he left the nation collectively and individually to act according to their own choice," &c. *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, part iii. lect. 2.

† See Maclaine's note on the subject, Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* cent. v. part ii. ch. v.

‡ Douglas, *Criterion*, p. 105, note, (8vo edit. 1807.)

Biography.

cause; but to *boys*, to *women*, and, above all, *to private and obscure laymen*, not only of an inferior but sometimes also of a *bad character*."*—Hence, to avoid the charge of inconsistency in the respective objects of the Jewish and Christian Miracles, it is incumbent upon believers in them to show that the difference between the two systems is a difference in appearance only, and that Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil the Law. Here, *as far as its antecedent appearance is concerned*, the Miracle said to have occurred on Julian's attempt to rebuild the Jewish Temple is seen to great advantage. The object was great, the time critical, its consequences harmonize very happily with the economy of the Mosaic dispensation and the general spirit of the Prophetical writings, and the fact itself has some correspondence with the prodigies which preceded the final destruction of Jerusalem.†

Again, Miracles *which do not tend to the accomplishment of their proposed end* are open to objection; and those *which have not effected what they had in view*. Hence some kind of argument might be derived against the Christian Miracles, were they not accompanied by a prediction of their *temporary* failure in effecting their object; or, to speak more correctly, were it not their proposed object *gradually* to spread the doctrines which they authenticate.‡ There is nothing, however, to break the force of this objection when directed against the Miracles ascribed to the Abbé Paris; since the Jansenist interest, instead of being advanced in consequence of them, soon after lost ground, and was ultimately ruined.§

These Miracles are also suspicious, *as having been stopped by human authority;* it being improbable that a divine agent should permit any such interference with his plan. The same objection applies to the professed gift of exorcising demoniacs in the primitive Church; which was gradually lost after the decree of the Council of Laodicea confined the exercise of it to such as were licensed by the Bishop.|| And lastly, to the supernatural character of Prince Hohenlohe's cures, which were stopped at Bamberg by an order from authority, that none should be wrought except in the presence of Magistrates and Medical practitioners.¶

The foregoing tests neither disprove,

These are the most obvious objections which may be fairly made to the antecedent probability of miraculous narratives. It will be observed, however, that none of them go so far as to deprive testimony for them of the privilege of being heard. Even where the nature of the facts related forbids us to refer the Miracle to divine agency, as when it is wrought to establish some immoral principle, still it is not more than extremely improbable and to be viewed with strong suspicion. Christians at least must acknowledge that the *à priori* view which Reason takes would in some cases lead to an erroneous conclusion. A Miracle, *e.g.* ascribed to an Evil Spirit is, prior to the information of Scripture, improbable; and if it stood on its own merits would require very strong testimony to establish it, as being referred to an unknown cause. Yet, on the authority of Scripture, we admit the occasional interference of agents short of divine with the course of nature. This, however, only shows that these *à priori* tests are not decisive. Yet if we cannot always ascertain what Miracles are improbable, at least we can determine what are not so; moreover, it will still be true that the *more* objections lie against any professed Miracle, the greater suspicion justly attaches to it, and the less important is the fact even if proved.

Apollonius Tyanæus — Miracles.

Nor prove any positive Miracle to have occurred.

On the other hand, even when the external appearance is altogether in favour of the Miracle, it must be recollected, nothing is thereby *proved* concerning the fact of its occurrence. We have done no more than recommend to notice the evidence, whatever it may be, which is offered in its behalf. Even, then, could Miracles be found with as strong an antecedent case as those of Scripture, still direct testimony must be produced to substantiate their claims on our belief. At the same time, since there are none such, a fair prepossession is indirectly created in favour of the latter, over and above their intrinsic claims on our attention.

They are injurious to some few of the Scripture Miracles.

Some few indeed of the Scripture Miracles are open to exception; and have accordingly been noticed in the course of our remarks as *by themselves* improbable. These, however, are seldom such in more than *one* respect; whereas the other Miracles which came before us were open to *several or all of the specified objections at the same time*. And, further, as they are but a few in the midst of an overpowering majority pointing consistently to one grand object, they must not be torn from their Moral context, but, on the credit of the rest, they must be considered but apparent exceptions to the rule. It is obvious that a large system must consist of various parts of unequal utility and excellence; and to expect each particular occurrence to be complete in itself, is as unreasonable as to require the parts of some complicated machine, separately taken, to be all equally finished and fit for display.*

Conclusion of the antecedent question.

Let these remarks suffice on the question of the antecedent probability or improbability of a Miraculous narrative. Enough, it may be hoped, has been said, to separate the Miracles of Scripture from those else-

* Scripture *sometimes* attributes Miraculous gifts to men of bad character; but we have no reason for supposing such could work Miracles at pleasure, (see *Numb.* ch. xxii. v. 18; ch. xxiii. v 3, 8, 12, 20; ch. xxiv. v. 10—13,) or attest any doctrine but that which Christ and his Apostles taught; nor is our faith *grounded* upon their preaching. Moreover, their power may have been given them for some further purpose; for though to attest a divine message be the *primary* object of Miracles, it need not be the only object. "It would be highly ridiculous," says Mr. Penrose in his recent work on Miracles, "to erect a steam engine for the mere purpose of opening and shutting a valve; but the engine being erected is very wisely employed both for this and for many other purposes, which, comparatively speaking, are of very little significance."

† See Warburton's *Julian*.

‡ See Parables in Matt. ch. xiii. v. 3, 24, 31, 33, 47; ch. xxiv. v. 12. *Acts*, ch. xx. v. 29, 30. 2 *Thes.* ch. ii. v. 3. 2 Tim. ch. iii. v. 1—5, &c.

§ Paley, *Evidences*, part i. prop. 2.

|| It had hitherto been in the hands of the meaner sort of the Christian laity. After that time, "few or none of the clergy, nor indeed of the laity, were any longer able to cast out devils; so that the old Christian exorcism or prayer for the energumens in the church began soon after to be omitted as useless." Whiston, in Middleton.

¶ Bentham, *Preuves Judiciaires*, liv. viii. ch. x.

* In thus refusing to admit the existence of *real* exceptions to the general rule, in spite of *appearances*, we are not exposing ourselves to that charge of excessive systematizing which may justly be brought against those who, with Hume, reject the very notion of a Miracle, as implying an interruption of physical regularity. For the *Revelation* which we admit, on the authority of the general system of Miracles, imparts such accurate and extended information concerning the attributes of God, over and above the partial and imperfect view of them which the world affords, as precludes the supposition of *any* work of his being evil or useless. Whereas there is no *voice* in the mere analogy of nature which expressly denies the possibility of real exceptions to its general course.

where related, and to invest them with an importance exciting in an unprejudiced mind a just interest in their behalf, and a candid attention to the historical testimony on which they rest; inasmuch as they are ascribed to an adequate cause, recommended by an intrinsic dignity, and connected with an important object, while all others are more or less unaccountable, unmeaning, extravagant, and useless. And thus, viz. on the ground of this utter dissimilarity between the Miracles of Scripture and other prodigies, we are enabled to account for the incredulity with which believers in Revelation listen to any extraordinary account at the present day; and which sometimes is urged against them as inconsistent with their assent to the former. It is *because* they admit the Scripture Miracles. Belief in these has preoccupied their minds, and created a fair presumption against those of a different class;—the prospect of a recurrence of supernatural agency being in some measure discountenanced by the Revelation already given; and, again, the weakness and insipidity, the want of system and connection, the deficiency in the evidence, and the transient repute of marvellous stories ever since, creating a strong and just prejudice against those similar accounts which from time to time are noised abroad.

§ III. *On the Criterion of a Miracle, considered as a Divine Interposition.*

It has sometimes been asked, whether Miracles are a *sufficient evidence* of the interposition of the Deity? under the idea that *other* causes, besides divine agency, might be assigned for their production. This is obviously the converse objection to that we have as yet considered, which was founded on the assumption that they could be referred to *no* known cause whatever. After showing, then, that the Scripture Miracles *may* be ascribed to the Supreme Being, we proceed to show that they *cannot* reasonably be ascribed to those other causes which have been sometimes assigned, *e. g.* to unknown laws of nature, or to the secret agency of Spirits.

Miracles cannot reasonably be referred to the power of Spirits,

1. Now it is evidently unphilosophical to attribute them to the power of invisible Beings, short of God; because, independently of Scripture, (the truth of which, of course, must not be assumed in this question,) we have no evidence of the existence of such Beings. Nature attests, indeed, the being of a God, but not of a race of intelligent creatures between Him and Man. In assigning a Miracle, therefore, to the influence of Spirits, an hypothetical cause is introduced merely to remove a difficulty. And even did analogy lead us to admit their possible existence, yet it would tend rather to disprove than to prove their power over the visible Creation. They may be confined to their own province, and though superior to Man, still may be unable to do many things which he can effect; just as Man in turn is superior to Birds and Fishes, without having, in consequence, the power of flying or of inhabiting the water.*

even though Scripture informs us of their power.

Still it may be necessary to show, that *on our own principles* we are not open to any charge of inconsistency. For it has been questioned, whether, in admitting the existence and power of Spirits on the authority of Revelation, we are not in danger of invalidating the evidence upon which that authority rests. For the cogency of the argument from Miracles depends on the assumption, that interruptions in the course of nature must ultimately proceed from God; which is not true, if they may be effected by other Beings without his sanction. And it must be conceded, that explicit as Scripture is in considering Miracles as signs of divine agency, it still does seem to give created Spirits some power of working them; and even, in its most literal sense, intimates the possibility of their working them in opposition to the true doctrine.* With a view of meeting this difficulty, some writers have attempted to make a distinction between *great* and *small*, *many* and *few* Miracles; and have thus inadvertently destroyed the intelligibility of any, as the *criterion* of a divine interposition.† Others, by referring to the nature of the *doctrine* attested, for determining the author of the Miracle, have exposed themselves to the plausible charge of adducing, first, the Miracle to attest the divinity of the doctrine, and then, the doctrine to prove the divinity of the Miracle.‡ Others, on the contrary, have thought themselves obliged to *deny* the power of Spirits altogether, and to explain away the Scripture accounts of Demoniacal possessions, and the narrative of our Lord's Temptation.§ Without, however, having recourse to any of these dangerous modes of answering the objection, it may be sufficient to reply, that, *since*, agreeably to the antecedent sentiment of reason, God has adopted Miracles as the seal of a divine message, we believe he will never suffer them to be so counterfeited as to deceive the humble inquirer. Thus the information given by Scripture in nowise undoes the original conclusions of Reason; for it anticipates the objection which itself furnishes, and by revealing the express *intention* of God in Miraculous displays, guarantees to us that he will allow no interference of created power to embarrass the proof thence resulting, of his special interposition.‖ It is unnecessary to say

* Campbell, *on Miracles*, part ii. sec. 3. Farmer, ch. ii. sec. 1.

* *Deut.* ch. xiii. v. 1—3. Matt. ch. xxiv. v. 24. 2 *Thess.* ch. ii. v. 9—11.

† More or less, Sherlock, Clarke, Locke, and others.

‡ Prideaux, Clarke, Chandler, &c. seem hardly to have guarded sufficiently against the charge here noticed. There is an appearance of doing honour to the Christian doctrines in representing them as *intrinsically* credible, which leads many into supporting opinions which, carried to their full extent, (as they were by Middleton,) supersede the need of Miracles altogether. It must be recollected, too, that they who are allowed to *praise* have the privilege of *finding fault*, and may reject, according to their *à priori* notions, as well as receive. Doubtless the divinity of a clearly immoral doctrine could not be evidenced by Miracles; for our belief in the Moral attributes of God is much stronger than our conviction of the negative proposition, that *none but* He can interfere with the system of nature. But there is always the danger of extending this admission beyond its proper limits, of supposing ourselves adequate judges of the *tendency* of doctrines, and, because unassisted Reason informs us what is Moral and immoral *in our own case*, of attempting to decide on the *abstract* Morality of actions: e. g. many have rejected the Miraculous narrative of the Pentateuch, from an unfounded and unwarrantable opinion, that the means employed in settling the Jews in Canaan were in themselves *immoral*. These remarks are in nowise inconsistent with using (as was done in a former section) our *actual knowledge* of God's attributes, obtained from a survey of nature and human affairs, in determining the probability of certain professed Miracles having proceeded from Him. It is one thing to *infer* from the *experience* of life, another to *imagine* the character of God from the *gratuitous conceptions* of our own minds. From *experience* we gain but general and imperfect ideas of wisdom, goodness, &c. enough (that is) to bear witness to a Revelation when given, not enough to supersede it. On the contrary, our *speculations* concerning the divine attributes and designs, professing as they do to decide on the truth of Revealed doctrines, in fact go to supersede the necessity of a Revelation altogether.

§ Especially Farmer.

‖ Fleetwood, *on Miracles*, disc. 2. p. 201. Van Mildert's *Boyle Lectures*, serm. 21.

more on this subject; and questions concerning the existence, nature, and limits of Spiritual agency will find their place when Christians are engaged in settling among themselves the doctrines of Scripture. We take it, therefore, for granted, as an obvious and almost undeniable principle, that real Miracles, i. e. interruptions in the course of nature, cannot reasonably be referred to any power but divine: because it is natural to refer an alteration in the system to its original author, and because Reason does not inform us of any other Being but God exterior to nature; and lastly, because in the particular case of the Scripture Miracles, the workers of them confirm our previous judgment by expressly attributing them to Him.

Nor to unknown laws of nature.

2. A more subtle question remains, respecting the possible existence of causes in nature, to us unknown, by the supposed operation of which the apparent anomalies may be reconciled to the ordinary laws of the system. It has already been admitted, that some difficulty will at times attend the discrimination of Miraculous from merely uncommon events; and it must be borne in mind, that in this, as in all questions from which demonstration is excluded, it is impossible, from the nature of the case, absolutely to *disprove* any, even the wildest, hypothesis which may be framed. It may freely be granted, moreover, that some of the Scripture Miracles, if they stood alone, might reasonably be referred to natural principles of which we were ignorant, or resolved into some happy combination of accidental circumstances. For our purpose, it is quite sufficient if there be a *considerable number* which no sober judgment would attempt to deprive of their supernatural character, by any supposition of our ignorance of natural laws, or of exaggeration in the narrative. Raising the dead and giving sight to the blind by a word, feeding a multitude with the casual provisions which an individual among them had with him, healing persons at a distance, and walking on the water, are facts, even separately taken, far beyond the conceivable effects of artifice or accident; and much more so, when they meet together in one and the same history. And here Hume's argument from general experience is in point, which at least proves that the *ordinary* powers of nature are unequal to the production of works of this kind. It becomes, then, a balance of opposite probabilities, whether gratuitously to suppose a *multitude* of perfectly *unknown* causes, and these, moreover, *meeting* in one and the same history, or to have recourse to *one*, and that a *known* power, then Miraculously exerted for an extraordinary and worthy object. We may safely say no sound reasoner will hesitate on which alternative to decide. While, then, a fair proportion of the Scripture Miracles are indisputably deserving of their name, but a weak objection can be derived from the case of the few which, owing to accidental circumstances, bear, at the present day, less decisive marks of supernatural agency. For, be it remembered, (and it is a strong confirmatory proof that the Jewish and Christian Miracles are really what they profess to be,) that though the Miraculous character of *some* of them is more doubtful in one Age than in another, yet the progress of Science has made no approximation to a *general* explication of them on natural principles. While discoveries in Optics and Chemistry have accounted for a host of apparent Miracles, they hardly touch upon those of the Jewish and Christian systems. Here is no phantasmagoria to be detected, no analysis or synthesis of substances, ignitions, explosions, and other customary resources of the juggler's art.*—But, as before, we shall best be able to estimate their character in this respect, by contrasting them with other occurrences which have sometimes been considered Miraculous. Thus, too, a second line of difference will be drawn between them and the mass of rival prodigies, whether Religious or otherwise, to which they are often compared.

Apollonius Tyanæus.

Miracles

A Miracle then, as far as it is an evidence of divine interposition, being an ascertained anomaly in an established system, or an event without assignable Physical cause, those facts of course have no title to the name—

Tests between real and apparent Miracles deduced from the definition of the term

1. *Which may be referred to misstatement in the narration.*

Natural events misstated.

Such are many of the prodigies of the Heathen Mythology and History, which have been satisfactorily traced to an *exaggeration of natural events*: e. g. the fables of the Cyclops, Centaurs, of the annual transformation of a Scythian nation into wolves, as related by Herodotus, &c. Or *natural facts allegorized*, as in the fable of Scylla and Charybdis.—Or where the fact may be explained by *supplying a probable omission*; as we should account for a story of a man sailing in the air, by supposing a balloon described.† —Or where the Miracle is but *verbal*, as the poetical prodigy of thunder without clouds; which is little better than a play upon words, for, supposing it to occur, it would not be called thunder.—Or as when Herodotus speaks of wool growing on trees; for, even were it in substance the same as wool, it could not be called so without a contradiction in terms.—Or where the Miracle is one simply of *degree*, for then exaggeration is more easily conceivable;—thus many supposed visions may have been but natural dreams.—Or where it depends on the combination of a multitude of distinct circumstances, each of which is necessary for the proof of its supernatural character, and where, as in fine experiments, a small mistake is of vast consequence. As those which depend on a *coincidence of time*, which it is difficult for any persons to have ascertained; *e. g.* the exclamation which Apollonius is said to have uttered concerning the assassination of Domitianus at the time of its taking place; and, again, the alleged fact of his appearing at Puteoli on the same morning in which he was tried at Rome. Such, too, in some degree is the professed revelation made to St. Basil, who is said to have been Miraculously informed of the death of the Emperor Julian at the *very moment* that it took place.‡ Here we may instance many stories of apparitions; as the popular one concerning the appearance of an individual to the club he used to frequent *at the moment after his death*, who was afterwards discovered to have escaped from his nurses in a fit of delirium *shortly before* it took place, and actually to have joined his friends. We may add the case related to M. Bonnet, of a woman who pretended to know what was passing at a given time at any part of the globe; and who was detected by the simple expedient of accurately marking the time, and comparing her account with the fact.§ In the same class must be reckoned not a few of the answers of the Heathen Oracles, if it be worth while to

* See Farmer, ch. i. sec. 3.
† Bentham, *Preuves Judiciaires*, liv. viii. ch. x.
‡ Middleton, *Free Inquiry*.
§ Bentham, *Preuves Judiciaires*, liv. viii. ch. x.

allude to them; as that which informed Crœsus of his occupation at a certain time agreed upon. In the Gospel, the nobleman's son begins to amend at the very time that Christ speaks the word; but this circumstance does not constitute, it merely increases the Miracle.—The argument from Prophecy is in this point of view somewhat deficient in simplicity and clearness; as implying the decision of many previous questions, *e. g.* as to the existence of the professed prediction before the event, the interval between the Prophecy and its accomplishment, the completeness of its accomplishment, &c. Hence Prophecy affords a more learned and less popular proof of divine interposition than Physical Miracles, and, except in cases where it contributes a very strong evidence, is commonly of inferior cogency.

2. *Those which from suspicious circumstances attending them may not unfairly be referred to an unknown Physical cause.*

Events referrible to an unknown cause.

As those which take place in departments of nature little understood, *e. g.* Miracles of Electricity.—Again, an assemblage of Miracles confined to *one* line of extraordinary exertion in some measure suggests the idea of a cause short of divine. For while their number evinces a wish to display, their similarity argues a defect in, power. This remark is prejudicial to the Miracles of the primitive Church, which consisted almost entirely of exorcisms and cures; to the Pythagorean, which were principally Miracles of sagacity; and again, to the wonders of the tomb of the Abbé Paris, which were limited to cures, and cures too of particular diseases. While the Miracles of Scripture are frugally dispensed as regards *their object and seasons*, they are endlessly varied in their *nature;* like the work of one who is not wasteful of his riches, yet can be munificent when occasion calls for it.

Here we may notice *tentative* Miracles, as Paley terms them, *i. e.* where out of many trials only some succeed; for inequality of success seems to imply *accident*, in other words, the combination of *unknown Physical causes*. Such are the cures of scrofula by the King's touch, and those effected in the Heathen Temples;* and again, those of the tomb of the Abbé Paris, there being but eight or nine well authenticated cures out of the multitude of trials that were made.† One of the peculiarities of the cures ascribed to Christ is his invariable success.‡

Here, for a second reason, *diffidence in the agent* casts suspicion on the reality of professed Miracles; for at least we have the sanction of his own opinion for supposing them to be the effect of accident or unknown causes.

Temporary Miracles also, as many of the Jansenist and other extraordinary cures,§ may be similarly accounted for; for if ordinary causes can *undo*, it is not improbable they may be able originally to *effect*. The restoration of Lazarus and the rest were restorations to *their former condition*, which was mortal; their subsequent dissolution, then, in the course of nature, does not interfere with the completeness of the previous Miracle.

The Jansenist cures are also unsatisfactory, as being *gradual*, and, for the same reason, the professed liquefaction of St. Januarius's blood; a *progressive* effect being a characteristic, as it seems, of the operations of nature. Hence, those Miracles are most perspicuous which are wrought *at the word of command;* as those of Christ and his Apostles. For this as well as other reasons, *incomplete* Miracles, as imperfect cures, are no evidence of supernatural agency; and here, again, we have to instance the cures effected at the tomb of the Abbé Paris.

Again, the *use of means* is suspicious; for a Miracle may almost be defined to be an event *without means*. Hence, however miraculous the production of ice might appear to the Siamese considered *abstractedly*, they would hardly so account it in an actual *experiment*, when they saw the preparation of nitre, &c. which in that climate must have been used for the purpose. In the case of the Steam-vessel or the Balloon, which, it has been sometimes said, would appear Miraculous to persons unacquainted with Science, the Chemical and Mechanical apparatus employed could not fail to rouse suspicion in intelligent minds.—Hence professed Miracles are open to suspicion, if *confined to one spot;* as were the Jansenist cures. For they then become connected with *a necessary condition*, which is all we understand by a *means: e. g.* such may often be imputed to a *confederacy*, which (as is evident) can from its nature seldom shift the scene of action. "The Cock-lane ghost could only knock and scratch in one place;"* the Apostles, on the contrary, are represented as dispersed about, and working Miracles in various parts of the world.† These remarks are of course inapplicable in a case where the apparent means are known to be inadequate, and are not constantly used; as our Lord's *occasional* application of clay to the eyes, which, while it proves that he did not need its instrumentality, convey also an intimation, that all the efficacy of means is derived from his appointment.

3. *Those which may be referred to the supposed operation of a cause known to exist.*

Events referrible to the supposed operation of a known cause.

Professed Miracles of *knowledge* or *mental ability* are often unsatisfactory for this reason; being in many cases referrible to the ordinary powers of the intellect. Of this kind is the boasted elegance of the style of the Koran, alleged by Mohammed in evidence of his divine mission. Hence most of the Miracles of Apollonius, consisting, as they do, in knowing the thoughts of others, and predicting the common events of life, are no criterion of a supernatural gift; it being only under certain circumstances that such power can clearly be discriminated from the natural exercise of acuteness and sagacity. Accordingly, though a knowledge of the hearts of men is claimed by Christ, it seems to be claimed rather with a view to prove to *Christians* the *doctrine* of his divine nature, than to *attest* to the *world* his authority as a messenger from God. Again, St. Paul's prediction of shipwreck on his voyage to Rome was intended to *prevent* it; and so was the prediction of Agabus concerning the same Apostle's approaching perils at Jerusalem.‡ For a second reason, then, the argument from Prophecy is a less *simple* and *striking* proof of divine agency than a display of Miracles; it

* Stillingfleet, *Orig. Sacr.* book ii. ch. x. sec. 9.
† Douglas, *Criterion*, p. 133.
‡ Ibid. p. 260, cites the following texts: Matt. ch. iv. v. 23, 24; ch. viii. v. 16; ch. ix. v. 35; ch. xii. v. 15; ch. xiv. v. 12; Luke, ch. iv. v. 40; ch. vi. v. 19.
§ Douglas, *Criterion*, p. 190. Middleton, *Free Inquiry*, iv. sec. 3.

* Hey's *Lectures*, book i. ch. xvi. sec. 10.
† Douglas, *Criterion*, p. 337.
‡ *Acts*, ch. xxi. v. 10—14; ch. xxvii. v. 10, 21.

Biography.

being impossible *in all cases* to show that the things foretold were certainly beyond the ordinary faculties of the mind to have discovered. Yet *when this is shown*, Prophecy is one of the most powerful of conceivable evidences; strict fore-knowledge being a faculty not only above the powers but even above the comprehension of the human mind.

And much more fairly may apparent Miracles be attributed to the supposed operation of an existing Physical cause, when they are *parallel to its known effects;* as Chemical, Meteorological, &c. phenomena. For though the cause may not perhaps appear in the particular case, yet it is known to have acted in others similar to it. For this reason, no stress can be laid on accounts of luminous crosses in the air, human shadows in the clouds, appearances of men and horses on hills, and spectres when they are speechless, as is commonly the case, ordinary causes being assignable in all of these; or, again, on the pretended liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, or on the exorcism of demoniacs, which is the most frequent Miracle in the primitive Church.—The remark applies moreover to cases of healing, *so far* as they are not instantaneous, complete, &c.; conditions which exclude the supposition of natural means being employed, and which are strictly fulfilled in the Gospel narrative.—Again, some cures are known as possible effects of an *excited imagination;* particularly when the disease arises from obstruction and other disorders of the blood and spirits, as the cures which took place at the tomb of the Abbé Paris.* We should be required to add those cases of healing in Scripture, where the *faith* of the petitioners was a necessary condition of the cure, were not these comparatively few, and some of them such as no imagination could have effected, (*e. g.* the restoration of sight,) and some wrought on persons *absent;* and were not faith often required, *not* of the patient, but of the relative or friend who brought him to be healed.† The force of imagination may also be alleged to account for the supposed visions and voices which some enthusiasts have believed they saw and heard: *e. g.* the trances of Montanus and his followers, the visions related by some of the Fathers, and those of the Romish Saints; lastly, Mahomet's pretended night-journey to Heaven: all which, granting the sincerity of the reporters, may not unreasonably be referred to the effects of disease or of an excited imagination. Such, it is obvious, *might* be some of the Scripture Miracles, *e. g.* the various appearances of Angels to individuals, the vision of St. Paul when he was transported to the third Heaven, &c. which accordingly were wrought, as Scripture professes, for purposes distinct from that of *evidencing* the doctrine, viz. in order to become the medium of a Revelation, or to confirm faith, &c. In other cases, however, the supposition of imagination is excluded by the vision having been witnessed by more than one person, as the Transfiguration; or by its correspondence with distinct visions seen by others, as in the circumstances which attended the conversion of Cornelius; or by its connection with a permanent Miracle, as the appearance of Christ to St. Paul on his conversion, with the blindness in consequence, which remained three days.*

Apollonius Tyanæus.

Much more inconclusive are those which are actually *attended by a Physical cause known or suspected to be adequate to their production.* Some of those who were cured at the tomb of the Abbé Paris were at the time making use of the usual remedies; the person whose inflamed eye was relieved was, during his attendance at the sepulchre, under the care of an eminent oculist; another was cured of a lameness in the knee by the mere effort to kneel at the tomb.† Arnobius challenges the Heathens to produce one of the pretended Miracles of their Gods performed without the application of some prescription.‡ Again, Hilarion's cures of wounds, as mentioned by Jerome, were accompanied by the application of consecrated oil.§ The Apostles indeed made use of oil in some of their cures, but they more frequently healed without a medium of any kind.‖ A similar objection might be urged against the narrative of Hezekiah's recovery from sickness, both on account of the application of the figs and the slowness of the cure, were it anywhere stated to have been Miraculous.¶ Again, the dividing of the Red Sea, accompanied as it was by a strong east wind, would not have been clearly Miraculous, had it not been effected at the word of Moses. Much suspicion, too, is (as some think) cast upon the *miraculous* nature of the fire, &c. which put a stop to Julian's attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem, by the possibility of referring it to the operation of Chemical principles.—Lastly, answers to prayer, however *providential*, are not *Miraculous;* for in granting them, God acts *by means of*, not *out of*, his usual system, making the ordinary course of things *subservient* to a gracious purpose. Such events, then, instead of *evidencing* the divine approbation to a certain cause, must be *proved* from the goodness of the cause to be what they are interpreted to be. Yet by supposed answers to prayer, appeals to Heaven, pretended judgments, &c. enthusiasts in most ages have wished to sanction their claims to divine inspiration. By similar means the pretensions of the Romish hierarchy have been supported.

Miracles.

Here we close our remarks on the *criterion* of a Miracle; which, it has been seen, is no one definite peculiarity, applicable to all cases, but the combined force of a number of varying circumstances determining our judgment in each particular instance. It might even be said, that a determinate criterion is almost inconceivable. For when once settled, it might appear, as was above remarked, to be merely the Physical antecedent of the extraordinary fact; while, on the other hand, from the direction thus given to the ingenuity of impostors, it would soon itself need a criterion to distinguish it from its imitations. Certain it is, that the great *variety* of circumstances under which the Christian Miracles were wrought, furnishes an evidence for their divine origin, in addition to that derived from their publicity, clearness, number, instantaneous production, and completeness.—The exorcism of demoniacs, however, has already been noticed as being, perhaps, in every case deficient in the proof of its Miraculous nature.

Observations on the foregoing tests.

* Douglas, *Criterion*, p. 172.

† Mark, ch. x. v. 51, 52. Matt. ch. viii. v. 5—13. See Douglas, *Criterion*, p. 258. "Where persons petitioned themselves for a cure, a declaration of their faith was often required, that none might be encouraged to try experiments out of curiosity, in a manner which would have been very indecent, and have tended to many bad consequences." Doddridge, *on Acts*, ch. ix. v. 34.

* Paley's *Evidences*, part i. prop. 2.

† Douglas, *Criterion*, p. 143, 184, *note*.

‡ Stillingfleet, book ii. ch. x. sec. 9.

§ Middleton, *Free Inquiry*, iv. sec. 2.

‖ Mark, ch. vi. v. 13. ¶ 2 *Kings*, ch xx. v. 4—7.

Biography.

Accordingly, this class of Miracles seems not to have been intended as a *primary* evidence of a divine mission, but to be addressed to those who *already* admitted the existence of Evil Spirits, in proof of the power of Christ and his followers over them.* To us, then, it is rather a *doctrine* than an *evidence*, manifesting our Lord's *power*, as other doctrines instance his *mercy*.—With regard to the argument from Prophecy, which some have been disposed to abandon on account of the number of conditions necessary for the proof of its supernatural character, it should be remembered, that inability to fix the exact boundary of natural sagacity is no objection to such Prophecies as are undeniably beyond it; and that the mere inconclusiveness of some in Scripture, as proofs of divine prescience, has no positive force against others contained in it, which furnish a full, lasting, and in many cases, growing evidence of its divinity.†

§ IV. *On the direct Evidence for the Christian Miracles.*

Important as are the inquiries which we have hitherto prosecuted, it is obvious that they do not lead to any positive conclusion, whether certain Miraculous accounts are true or not. However necessary a direct anomaly in the course of nature may be to rouse *attention*, and an important final cause to excite *interest* and *reverence*, still the quality of the testimony on which the accounts rest can alone determine our *belief* in them. The preliminary points, however, have been principally dwelt upon, because objections founded on them form the strong ground of unbelievers, who seem in some degree to allow the strength of the direct evidence for the Scripture Miracles. Again, an examination of the direct evidence is less necessary here, because, though antecedent questions have not been neglected by Christian writers,‡ yet the evidence itself, as might be expected, has chiefly engaged their attention.§ Without entering, then, into a minute consideration of the facts and arguments on which the credibility of the Sacred History rests, we proceed to contrast the *evidence* generally with that produced for other Miraculous narratives; and thus to complete a comparison which has been already instituted, as regards the *antecedent probability* and the *criterion* of Miracles.

The Scripture Miracles have

For the present, then, we forego the advantage which the Scripture Miracles have gained in the preceding sections over all professed facts of a similar nature. In reality, indeed, the very same evidence which would suffice to prove the former, might be inadequate when offered in behalf of those of the Eclectic School or the Romish Church. For the Miracles of Scripture, and no other, are unexceptionable and worthy of a divine agent; and Bishop Butler has clearly shown, that, in a practical question, as the divinity of a professed Revelation must be considered, even the weakest reasons are decisive when not counteracted by any opposite arguments.* Whatever evidence, then, is offered for them is *entirely* available to the proof of their actual occurrence; whereas evidence for the truth of other similar accounts, supposing it to exist, would be *first* employed in overcoming the objections which attach to them all from their very character, circumstances, or object. If, however, we show that the Miracles of Scripture as far surpass all others in their *direct evidence*, as they excel them in their *à priori probability*, a much stronger case will be made out in their favour, and an additional line of distinction drawn between them and others.

Apollonius Tyanæus. — Miracles.

far stronger evidence in their favour than other Professed Miracles, though they do not require evidence equally strong.

The credibility of Testimony arises from the belief we entertain of the character and competency of the witnesses; and this is true, not only in the case of Miracles, but when facts of any kind are examined into. It is obvious, that we should be induced to distrust the most natural and plausible statement when made by an individual whom we suspected of a wish to deceive, or of relating facts which he had no sufficient means of knowing. Or if we credited his narrative, we should do so, not from dependence on the reporter, but from its intrinsic likelihood, or from circumstantial evidence. In the case of *ordinary* facts, therefore, we think it needless, as indeed it would be endless, to inquire rigidly into the credibility of the Testimony by which they are conveyed to us, because they in a manner speak for themselves. When, however, the information is *unexpected*, or *extraordinary*, or *improbable*, our only means of determining its truth is by considering the credit due to the witnesses; and then, of course, we exercise that right of scrutiny which we before indeed possessed, but did not think it worth while to claim. A Miracle, then, calls for no *distinct species* of Testimony from that offered for other events, but for a Testimony strong in proportion to the improbability of the particular fact attested; and it is as impossible to draw any line, or to determine *how much* is required, as to define the quantity and quality of evidence necessary to prove the occurrence of an earthquake, or the appearance of any meteoric phenomenon. Everything depends on those attendant circumstances, of which we have already spoken, the object of the Miracle, the occasion, manner, and human agent employed. If, *e. g.* a Miracle were said to be wrought for an immoral object, then of course the fact would rest on the credibility of the Testimony alone, and would challenge the most rigid examination. Again, if the object be highly interesting to us, as that

What kind of testimony is to be required for a Miracle.

* See *Div. Leg.* book ix. ch. v. Hence the exercise of this gift seems almost to have been confined to Palestine. At Philippi St. Paul casts out a spirit of divination *in self-defence*. *Acts*, ch. xvi. v. 16—18. In the transaction related *Acts*, ch. xix. v. 11—17, Jews are principally concerned.

† Some unbelievers have urged the irrelevancy of St. Matthew's citations from the Old Testament Prophecies in illustration of the events of Christ's life, *e. g.* ch. ii. v. 15. It must be recollected, however, that what is evidence in one age is often not so in another. That certain of the texts adduced by the Evangelist furnish *at the present day* no proof of divine prescience, is very true; but, unless some kind of argument could have been drawn from them *at the time* the Gospel was written, from traditional interpretations of their sense, we can scarcely account for St. Matthew's introducing them. The question is, has there been a *loss* of what was evidence formerly, (as is often the case,) or did St. Matthew bring forward as a Prophetical evidence what was manifestly *not* so, as if to hurt the effect of those other passages, as ch. xxvii. v. 35, which have every appearance of being real predictions?—It has been observed, that Prophecy in general *must* be obscure, in order that the events spoken of may not be understood before their accomplishment.

‡ Especially by Vince, in his valuable Treatise *on the Christian Miracles*; and Hey, in his *Lectures*.

§ As Paley, Lyttleton, Leslie, &c.

* The only fair objection that can be made to this statement is, that it is antecedently *improbable* that the Almighty should work Miracles with a view to *general conviction*, without furnishing *strong evidence* that they really occurred. This was noticed above, when the antecedent probability of Miracles was discussed. That it is *unsatisfactory* to decide on scanty evidence is no objection, as in other most important practical questions we are constantly obliged to make up our minds and determine our course of action on insufficient evidence.

Biography.

professed by the Scripture Miracles, we shall naturally be careful in our inquiry, from an anxious fear of being deceived. But in any case the Testimony cannot turn out to be *more* than that of competent and honest men; and an inquiry must not be prosecuted under the idea of finding something beyond this, but to obtain proofs of this. And since the existence of competency and honesty may be established in various ways, it follows that the credibility of a given story may be proved by distinct considerations, each of which, separately taken, might be sufficient for the purpose. It is obvious, moreover, as indeed is implied by the very nature of Moral evidence, that the proof of its credibility may be weaker or stronger, and yet in both cases be a *proof;* and, hence, that no limit can be put to the conceivable accumulation of evidence in its behalf. Provided, then, the existing evidence be sufficient to produce a rational conviction, it is nothing to the purpose to urge, as has sometimes been alleged against the Scripture Miracles, that the extraordinary facts might have been proved by different or more overpowering evidence. It has been said, for instance, that no Testimony can fairly be trusted which has not passed the ordeal of a legal examination. Yet, calculated as that mode of examination undoubtedly is to elicit truth, surely Truth may be elicited by *other* ways also. Independent and circumstantial writers may confirm a fact as satisfactorily as witnesses in Court. They may be questioned and cross-questioned, and moreover brought up for reexamination in any succeeding Age; whereas, however great may be the talents and experience of the individuals who conducted the legal investigation, yet when they have once closed it and given in their verdict, we believe upon *their credit*, and we have no means of examining for ourselves. To say, however, that this kind of evidence might have been *added* to the other, in the case of the Christian Miracles,* is merely to assert that the proof of the credibility of Scripture might have been *stronger than it is;* which we have already allowed it might have been, without assignable limit.

The credibility, then, of a Testimony depending on the evidence of *honesty* and *competency* in those who give it, it is prejudicial to their character for *honesty*.

Tests relative to the honesty of witnesses. Gain, &c.

1. If desire of *gain, power*, or other *temporal advantage* may be imputed to them. This would detract materially from the authority of Philostratus, even supposing him to have been in a *situation* for ascertaining the truth of his own narrative; as he professes to write his account of Apollonius at the instance of his patroness, the Empress Julia, who is known to have favoured the Eclectic cause. Again, the account of the Miracle performed on the door-keeper at the cathedral at Saragossa, on which Hume insists, rests principally upon the credit of the Canons, whose interest was concerned in its establishment. This remark, indeed, obviously applies to the Romish Miracles generally. The Christian Miracles, on the contrary, were attested by the Apostles, not only without the prospect of assignable worldly advantage, but with the certainty and after the experience of actual suffering.

Party spirit.

2. When there is room for suspecting *party spirit* or *rivalry;* as in the Miraculous biographies of the Eclectic philosophers; in those of Loyola and other Saints of the rival orders in the Romish Church; and in the present Mohammedan accounts of the Miracles of Mohammed, which, not to mention other objections to them, are composed with an evident design of rivalling those of Christ.*

Apollonius Tyanæus. — Miracles.

3. Again, a tale once told may be persisted in from *shame of retracting*, after the motives which first gave rise to it have ceased to act, even at the risk of suffering. This remark cannot apply to the case of the Apostles, until some reason is assigned for their getting up their Miraculous story in the first instance. If necessary, however, it could be brought with force against any argument drawn from the perseverance of the witnesses for the cures professedly wrought by Vespasianus, "*postquam nullum mendacio pretium;*" for, as they did not suffer for persisting in their story, had they retracted they would have gratuitously confessed their own want of principle.

Shame.

4. *A previous character for falsehood* is almost fatal to the credibility of a witness of an extraordinary narrative, *e. g.* the notorious insincerity and frauds of the Church of Rome in other things, are in themselves enough to throw a strong suspicion on its Testimony to its own Miracles. The primitive Church is in some degree open to a charge of a similar nature.† Or *an intimacy with suspicious characters, e. g.* Prince Hohenlohe's connection with the Romish Church and that of Philostratus with the Eclectics, since both the Eclectic and Romish Schools have countenanced the practice of what are called pious frauds.

Character for falsehood.

5. *Inconsistencies* or *prevarications* in the Testimony, *marks of unfairness, exaggeration, suppression of particulars, &c.* Of all these we convicted Philostratus, whose memoir forms a remarkable contrast to the artless and candid narratives of the Evangelists. The Books of the New Testament, containing as they do separate accounts of the same transactions, admit of a minute cross-examination, which terminates so decidedly in favour of their fidelity, as to recommend them highly on the score of honesty, even independently of the known sufferings of the writers.

Marks of unfairness.

6. Lastly, witnesses may be objected to who have the *opportunity* of being dishonest; as those who write at a distance from the time and place of the professed Miracle, or without mentioning particulars, &c. But on these points we shall speak immediately in a different connection.

Facilities for dishonesty.

Secondly, witnesses must be, not only *honest*, but *competent* also, *i. e.* such as have *ascertained* the facts which they attest, or who report *after examination*. Here then we notice,

Tests of competency of witness

1. Deficiency of examination implied in the *circumstances of the case*. As when it is first published in an *age or country remote from the professed time and scene of action;* for in that case room is given to suspect failure of memory, imperfect information, &c.; whereas to write in the presence of those who know the circumstances of the transactions, is an appeal which increases the force of the Testimony by associating them in it. Accounts, however, whether Miraculous or otherwise, possess very little *intrinsic* authority, when written so far from the time or place of the transactions recorded, as the Biographies of Pythagoras, Apollonius,

from the circumstances of the case.

* Some of our Saviour's Miracles, however, *were* subjected to judicial examination. See John, ch. v. and ix. In v. 16 the measures of the Pharisees are described by the technical word, ἐδίωκον.

* See Professor Lee's Persian Tracts, p. 446, 447.

† Hey, *Lectures*, book i. ch. xii. sec. 15.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, Mohammed, Loyola, or Xavier.* The opposite circumstances of the Christian Testimony have often been pointed out. Here we may particularly notice the providential dispersion of the Jews over the Roman Empire before the Age of Christ; by which means the Apostle's Testimony was given in Heathen countries, as well as in Palestine, in the face of those who had both the will and the power to contradict it if incorrect.

While the Testimony of contemporaries is necessary to guarantee the truth of ordinary History, Miracles require the Testimony of *eye-witnesses*. For ordinary events are believed in part *from their being natural*, but *Testimony* being the main support of a Miraculous narrative must in that case be the best of its kind. Again, we may require the Testimony to be *circumstantial* in reference to dates, places, persons, &c.; for the absence of these seems to imply an imperfect knowledge, and at least gives less opportunity of inquiry to those who wish to ascertain its fidelity.†

Miracles which are *not lasting* do not admit of adequate examination; as visions, extraordinary voices, &c. The cure of diseases, on the other hand, is a *permanent* evidence of a divine interposition; particularly such cures of bodily imperfections as are undeniably Miraculous in their nature, as well as permanent; to these, then, our Lord especially appeals in evidence of his divine mission.‡ Lastly, statements are unsatisfactory in which the Miracle is described as wrought before a very *few;* for room is allowed for suspecting mistake, or an understanding between the witnesses. Or, on the other hand, those wrought *in a confused crowd;* such are many standing Miracles of the Romanists, which are exhibited with the accompaniment of imposing pageants, or on a stage, or at a distance, or in the midst of candles and incense. Our Saviour, on the contrary, bids the lepers he had cleansed *show* themselves to the Priests, and make the customary offering as a *memorial* of their cures.§ And when he appeared to the Apostles after his Resurrection, he allowed them to *examine* his hands and feet.‖ Those of the Scripture Miracles which were wrought before few, or in a crowd, were *permanent;* as cures,¶ and the raising of Jairus's daughter; or were of so *vast a nature*, that a crowd could not prevent the witnesses from ascertaining the fact, as the standing still of the Sun at the word of Joshua.

From the character of the witnesses.

2. Deficiency of examination implied in the *character, &c. of the witnesses:* e. g. if there be any suspicion of their *derangement*, or if there be an evident *defect in bodily or mental faculties* which are necessary for examining the Miracle, as when the intellect or senses are impaired. *Number* in the witnesses refutes charges of this nature; for it is not conceivable that many should be deranged or mistaken at once, and in the same way.

Derangement.

Enthusiasm, or credulity.

Enthusiasm, ignorance, or *habitual credulity*, are defects which no number of witnesses removes. The Jansenist Miracles took place in the most ignorant and superstitious district of Paris.** Alexander Pseudomantis practised his arts among the Paphlagonians, a barbarous people. Popish Miracles and the juggles of the Heathen Priests have been most successful in times of ignorance.

Yet while we reasonably object to gross ignorance or besotted credulity in witnesses for a Miraculous story, we must guard against the opposite extreme of requiring the Testimony of men of Science and general knowledge. Men of Philosophical minds are often too fond of inquiring into the causes and mutual dependence of events, of arranging, theorizing, and refining, to be accurate and straightforward in their account of extraordinary occurrences. Instead of giving a plain statement of facts, they are insensibly led to *correct* the evidence of their senses with a view to account for the phenomenon; as Chinese painters, who, instead of drawing in perspective, give lights and shadows their supposed meaning, and depict the prospect as they think it *should be*, not as *it is*.* As Miracles differ from other events only when considered *relatively* to a general system, it is obvious that the same persons are competent to attest Miraculous facts who are suitable witnesses of corresponding natural ones. If a peasant's Testimony be admitted to the phenomenon of meteoric stones, he may evidence the fact of an unusual and unaccountable darkness. A Physician's certificate is not needed to assure us of the illness of a friend; nor is it necessary to attest the simple fact that he has instantaneously recovered. It is important to bear this in mind, for some writers argue as if there were something intrinsically defective in the Testimony given by ignorant persons to Miraculous occurrences.† To say, that unlearned persons are not judges of the fact of a Miraculous event, is only so far true as all Testimony is fallible and liable to be distorted by prejudice. Every one, not only superstitious persons, is apt to interpret facts his own way. If the superstitious see too many prodigies, men of Science may see too few. The facility with which the Japanese ascribed the ascent of a balloon, which they witnessed at St. Petersburgh, to the powers of Magic, (a circumstance which has been sometimes urged against the admission of unlearned Testimony,‡) is only the conduct of theorists accounting for a novel phenomenon on the principles of their own system.

Whether the Testimony of educated men is necessary.

It may be said, that ignorance prevents a witness from *discriminating* between natural and supernatural events, and thus weakens the authority of his *judgment* concerning the Miraculous nature of a fact. It is true: but if the fact be recorded, *we* may judge for *ourselves* on that point. Yet it may be safely said, that not even before persons in the lowest state of ignorance could any great variety of professed Miracles be displayed without their distinguishing rightly *on the whole* between the effects of nature and those of a power exterior to it; though in particular instances they doubtless might be mistaken. Much more would this be the case with the lower ranks of a *civilized* people. Practical intelligence is insensibly diffused from class to class; if the upper ranks are educated, numbers besides them, without any formal and systematic knowledge, almost instinctively

---

* Paley, *Evidences*, part i. prop. 2.

† The vagueness of the accounts of Miraculous interpositions related by the Fathers is pointed out by Middleton. (*Free Inquiry*, ii. p. 22.)

‡ Matt. ch. xi. v. 5. § Luke, ch. v. v. 14; ch. xvii. v. 14.

‖ Luke, ch. xxiv. v. 39, 40. ¶ Mark, ch. viii. v. 22—26.

** The Fauxbourg St. Marcel. Less.

* It is well known, that those persons are accounted the best transcribers of MSS. who are ignorant of the language transcribed; the habit of *correcting* being almost involuntary in men of letters.

† Hume, *on Miracles*, part ii. reason 1.

‡ Bentham, *Preuves Judiciaires*, liv. viii. ch. ii.

Biography.

discriminate between natural and supernatural events. Here Science has little advantage over common sense; a peasant is quite as certain that a resurrection from the dead is Miraculous as the most able physiologist.*

Character of the original witnesses of the Christian Miracles.

The original witnesses of our Saviour's Miracles were very far from a dull or ignorant race. The inhabitants of a maritime and border country, as Galilee was, engaged, moreover, in commerce, composed of natives of various countries, and therefore from the nature of the case acquainted with more than one language, have necessarily their intellects sharpened and their minds considerably enlarged, and are of all men least disposed to acquiesce in marvellous tales.† Such a people must have *examined* before they suffered themselves to be excited in the degree the Evangelists describe.‡ But even supposing that those among them who were in consequence *convinced* of the divine mission of Christ, were of a more superstitious turn of mind than the rest, still this is not sufficient to account for their conviction. For superstition, while it might facilitate the bare *admission* of Miraculous events, would at the same time weaken their *practical influence*. Miracles ceasing to be accounted *strange*, would cease to be *striking* also. Whereas the conviction wrought in the minds of these men was no bare and indolent *assent* to facts which they might have thought antecedently probable or not improbable, but a *conversion* in principles and mode of life, and a consequent sacrifice of all that nature holds dear, to which none would submit except after the fullest examination of the authority enjoining it. If additional evidence be required, appeal may be made to the multitude of Gentiles in Greece and Asia, in whose principles and mode of living, belief in the Miracles made a change even more striking and complete than was effected in the case of the Jews. In a word, then, the *conversion* which Christ and his Apostles *effected* invalidates the charge of blind *credulity* in the witnesses; the *practical* nature of the belief produced proving that it was founded on an *examination* of the Miracles.

Influence of superiors.

Again, it weakens the authority of the witnesses, if their belief can be shown to have been promoted by the *influence of superiors;* for then they virtually cease to be themselves witnesses, and report the facts on the authority (as it were) of their patrons. It is observable, that the national conversions of the middle Ages generally *began* with the Princes and *descended* to their subjects; those of the Apostolic Age obviously proceeded in the reverse order.§

Miracles wrought in support of an established Religion.

It is almost fatal to the validity of the Testimony, if the Miracle attested coincides with a *previous system*, or supports a *cause already embraced* by the witnesses. Men are always ready to believe what flatters their own opinions, and of all prepossessions those of Religion are the strongest. There is so much in the *principle* of all Religion that is true and good, so much conformable to the best feelings of our nature, which perceives itself to be weak and guilty, and looks out for an unseen and superior being for guidance and support; and the particular worship in which each individual is brought up, is so familiarized to him by habit, so endeared to his affections by the associations of place and the recollections of past years, so connected too with the ordinary transactions and most interesting events of life, that even should that form be irrational and degrading, still it will in most cases preserve a strong influence over his mind, and dispose him to credit upon slight examination any arguments adduced in its defence. Hence an account of Miracles in confirmation of their own Religion will always be favourably received by men whose creed has already lead them to expect such interpositions of superior beings. This consideration invalidates at once the testimony commonly offered for Pagan and Popish Miracles, and in no small degree that for the Miracles of the primitive Church. The professed cures of Vespasianus were performed in honour of Serapis in the midst of his worshippers; and the people of Saragossa, who attested the miracle wrought in the case of the door-keeper of the Cathedral, had previous faith in the virtues of holy oil.*

Apollonius Tyanæus.

Miracles.

No Miracles but those recorded in Scripture have introduced a Religion.

Here the evidence for the Scripture Miracles is unique. In other cases the previous system has supported the Miracles, but here the Miracles introduced and upheld the system. The Christian Miracles in particular† were received on their own merits; and the admission of them became the turning point in the creed and life of the witnesses, which thenceforth took a new and altogether different direction. But, moreover, as if their own belief in them were not enough, the Apostles went out of their way to debar any one from the Christian Church who did not believe them as well as themselves.‡ Not content that men should be converted on any ground, they fearlessly challenged refutation, by excluding from their fellowship of suffering any who did not formally assent, as a necessary condition of admittance and first article of faith, to one of the most stupendous of all the Miracles, their Master's Resurrection from the dead;—a procedure this, which at once evinces their own unqualified conviction of the fact, and associates, too, all their converts with them as believers in a Miracle contemporary with themselves. Nor is this all—a Religious creed necessarily *prejudices* the mind *against* admitting the Miracles of hostile Sects, in the very same proportion in which it

* It has been observed, that more suitable witnesses could not be selected of the fact of a Miraculous draught of fishes than the fishermen of the lake wherein it took place.

† See Less, *Opuscul.*

‡ If, on the other hand, we would see with how unmoved an unconcern men receive accounts of Miracles, when they believe them to be events of everyday occurrence, we may turn to the conduct of the African Christians in the Age of Austin, whom that Father in vain endeavoured to interest in Miraculous stories of relics, &c. by formal accounts and certificates of the cures wrought by them. See Middleton, p. 138. The *stir*, then, which the Miracles of Christ made in Galilee implies, that they were not received with an *indolent* belief. It must be noticed, moreover, in opposition to the statement of some unbelievers, that great numbers of the Jews were *converted*. *Acts*, ch. ii. v. 41; ch. iv. v. 4; ch. v. v. 13, 14; ch. vi. v. 7; ch. ix. v. 35; ch. xv. v. 5; ch. xxi. v. 20. On this subject, see Jenkin, *on the Christian Religion*, vol. ii. ch. xxxii.

§ Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* cent. vi. viii. ix.

* It has been noticed as a suspicious circumstance in the testimony to the reported Miracle wrought in the case of the Confessors in the persecution of the Arian Hunneric, that Victor Vitensis, one of the principal witnesses, though writing in Africa when it professedly took place, and where the individuals thus distinguished were then living, *yet* refers only to *one* of them, who was then living at the *Athanasian* Court at *Constantinople*, and held in particular honour by Zeno and the Empress.—"If any one doubt the fact, let him go—to *Constantinople*." See the whole evidence in Milner's *Church History*, cent. v. ch. xi.; who, however, strongly defends the Miracle. Gibbon pretends to do the same, with a view to provide a rival to the Gospel Miracles.

† Not to mention those of Moses and Elijah.

‡ Campbell, *on Miracles*, part ii. sec. 1.

leads it to *acquiesce* in such as support its own dogmas.* The Christian Miracles, then, have the strongest of conceivable attestations, in the conversion of many who at first were prejudiced against them, and in the extorted confession of enemies, who, by the embarrassment which the admission occasioned them, showed at least that they had not made it till after a full and accurate investigation of the extraordinary facts.

Whether the doctrine of a future life, and not the Miracles, induced the first converts to embrace Christianity.

It has been sometimes objected, that the minds of the first converts might be wrought upon by the doctrine of a future state which the Apostles preached, and be thus persuaded to admit the Miracles without a rigorous examination.† But, as Paley well replies, evidence of the *truth* of the promise would still be necessary; especially as men rather demand than dispense with proof when some great and unexpected good is reported to them. Yet it is more than doubtful, whether the promise of a future life would excite this interest: for the desire of immortality, though a natural, is no permanent or powerful feeling, and furnishes no principle of action. Most men, even in a Christian country, are too well satisfied with this world to look forward to another with any great and settled anxiety. Supposing immortality to be a good, it is one too distant to warm or influence. Much less are they disposed to sacrifice present comfort, and strip themselves of former opinions and habits, for the mere contingency of future happiness. The hope of another life, grateful as it is *under* affliction, will not induce a man to *rush into* affliction for the sake of it. The inconvenience of a severe complaint is not outbalanced by the pleasure of a remedy. On the other hand, though we know gratuitous declarations of coming judgments and divine wrath may for a time frighten weak minds, they will neither have effect upon strong ones, nor produce a *permanent* and *consistent* effect upon any. Persons who are thus wrought upon in the *present* day, believe the denunciations *because* they are in Scripture, not Christianity because it contains them. The authority of Revealed Religion is taken for granted both by the preacher and his hearers. On the whole, then, it seems inconceivable, that the promise or threat of a future life should have supplied the place of previous belief in Christianity, or have led the witnesses to admit the Miracles on a slight examination.

Love of the marvellous.

Lastly, *love of the marvellous, of novelty, &c.* may be mentioned as a principle influencing the mind to acquiesce in professed Miracles without full examination. Yet such feelings are more adapted to exaggerate and circulate a story than to invent it. We can trace their influence very clearly in the instances of Apollonius and the Abbé Paris, both of whom had excited attention by their eccentricities *before* they gained reputation for extraordinary power.‡ Such principles, moreover, are not in general practical, and have little power to sustain the mind under continued opposition and suffering.*

Observations on the foregoing tests.

These are some of the obvious points which will come into consideration in deciding upon the authority of Testimony offered for Miracles; and they enable us at once to discriminate the Christian story from all others which have been set up against it. With a view of simplifying the argument, the evidence for the Jewish Miracles has been left out of the question;† because, though strong and satisfactory, it is not at the present day so *directly* conclusive as that on which the Christian rest. Nor is it necessary, we conceive, to bring evidence for more than a fair proportion of the Miracles; supposing, that is, those which remain unproved are shown to be similar to them, and indissolubly connected with the same system. It may be even said, that if the single fact of the Resurrection be established, quite enough will have been proved for believing all the Miracles of Scripture.

View of the complete evidence for the Scripture Miracles.

Of course, however, the argument becomes far stronger when it is shown that there *is* evidence for the great bulk of the Miracles, though not equally strong for some as for others; and that the Jewish, sanctioned as they are by the New Testament, may also be established on distinct and peculiar grounds. Nor let it be forgotten, that the Christian story itself is supported, over and above the evidence that might fairly be required for it, by several bodies of Testimony quite independent of each other.‡ By *separate* processes of reasoning it may be shown, that if Christianity was established without Miracles, it was, to say the least, an altogether singular and unique event in the history of mankind; and the extreme improbability of so many distinct and striking peculiarities uniting (as it were) by chance in one and the same case, raises the proof of its divine origin to a moral certainty. In short, it is only by being made unnatural that the Christian narrative can be deprived of a supernatural character; and we may safely affirm, that the strongest evidence we possess for the most certain facts of other history, is weak compared to that on which we believe that the first preachers of the Gospel were gifted with Miraculous powers.

Union of testimony with antecedent probability.

And thus a case is established so strong, that even were there an antecedent improbability in the facts attested, in most judgments it would be sufficient to overcome it. On the contrary, we have already shown their intrinsic character to be exactly such as our pre-

* Campbell, *on Miracles*, part i. sec. 4.

† Gibbon particularly, ch. xv.

‡ See above, the memoir of Apollonius.—Of the Abbé, Mosheim says, "*Diem vix obierat*, voluntariis cruciatibus et pœnis exhaustus, *mirabilis iste homo, quum immensa hominum multitudo ad ejus corpus confluueret; quorum alii pedes ejus osculabantur, alii partem capillorum abscindebant, quam* sancti loco pignoris *ad mala quævis averruncanda servarent, alii libros et lintea quæ attulerant, cadaveri admovebant*, quod virtute quâdam divinâ plenum esse putabant. Et statim *vis illa mirifica, quâ omne, quod in terrâ hâc reliquit, præditum esse fertur, apparebat*," &c. *Inquisit. in verit. Miraculor. F. de Paris*, sec. 1.

* Paley, *Evidences*, part i. prop. 2.

† The truth of the Mosaic narrative is proved from the *genuineness* of the Pentateuch, as written to contemporaries and eye-witnesses of the Miracles; from the *predictions* contained in the Pentateuch; from the *very existence* of the Jewish system, (Sumner's *Records*;) and from the *declarations of the New Testament writers*. The Miracles of Elijah and Elisha are proved to us by the *authority of the Books* in which they are related, and by *means of the New Testament*.

‡ The fact of the Christian Miracles may be proved, first, by the sufferings and consistent story of the original witnesses; secondly, from the actual conversion of large bodies of men in the Age in which they are said to have been wrought; thirdly, from the institution, at the time, of a day commemorative of the Resurrection, which has been observed ever since; fourthly, by collateral considerations, such as the tacit assent given to the Miracles by the adversaries of Christianity, the Eclectic imitations of them, and the pretensions to Miraculous power in the primitive Church. These are *distinct* arguments, no one of them absolutely *presupposes* the genuineness of the Scripture narrative, though the force of the whole is much increased when it is proved.

Biography.

vious knowledge of the divine attributes and government would lead us to expect in works ascribed to him. Their grandeur, beauty, and consistency; the clear and unequivocal marks they bear of superhuman agency; the importance and desirableness of the object they propose to effect, are in correspondence to the variety and force of the evidence itself.

Such, then, is the contrast they present to all other professed Miracles, from those of Apollonius downwards—which have all been shown, more or less, to be improbable from the circumstances of the case; inconclusive when considered as marks of divine interference; and quite destitute of good evidence for their having really occurred.

Lastly, it must be observed, that the proof derived from interruptions in the course of nature, though a principal, is yet but *one* out of *many* proofs on which the cause of Revealed Religion rests; and that even supposing (for the sake of argument) it were altogether inconclusive at the present day, still the other evidences,* as they are called, would be fully equal to prove to us the divine origin of Christianity.

Apollonius Tyanæus. — Miracles. Conclusion.

* Such as, the system of doctrine, marks of design, gradual disclosure of unknown truths, &c. connecting together the whole Bible as the work of one mind:—Prophecy:—the character of Christ:—the Morality of the Gospel:—the wisdom of its doctrines, displaying at once knowledge of the human heart and skill in engaging its affections, &c.

M. C. NERVA AUGUSTUS.

FROM A. D. 96 TO 98.

Biography. From A. D. 96. to 98.

THE Flavian family, which expired with Domitianus, left the throne of Augustus to the descendant of a Cretan colonist. The ancestors of Nerva, who occupied a respectable rank at Rome, were repeatedly dignified with the Consular authority, and admitted to the confidence of several successive Emperors. He himself was born at Narni in Umbria, and rose at an early period of life to employments in the Capital, worthy of his talents and the integrity of his principles. He was found deserving, in the reign of Nero, of the Triumphal ornaments which were at that time usually conferred upon distinguished military services, and even of a statue in the palace, a still more unambiguous proof of personal favour and esteem. Pliny and Martial agree in ascribing to him a taste for Poetry; which accomplishment is said to have recommended him to the protection of Nero, who was never altogether insensible to the charms of the Muses, even while indulging in sensuality and bloodshed.*

Lineage of Nerva.

It has been already stated, that the conspirators against Domitianus, before the execution of their plot, had procured the consent of Nerva to succeed him in the government. The latter was accordingly proclaimed Emperor on the same day that the tyrant was destroyed, namely, the eighteenth day of September, in the ninety-sixth year of the Christian faith.

Difficulties of his situation.

The Sovereign who ascends a throne which has been rendered vacant by rebellion and murder, has always a difficult part to perform. He finds his partisans dyed with blood, and pursued by a multitude of avengers; who, either from regret and compassion towards the assassinated Prince, or from envy at the success of a conspiracy in which they had no share, are found eager in their endeavours to weaken the authority of the new Government, and to punish the crime from which it derived its origin.

Nerva had the misfortune to see himself surrounded with these difficulties and dangers. His principal supporters were Petronius Secundus, Commander of the Prætorian guards, whose influence with that powerful body of troops appears to have been the instrument employed for securing their connivance at the death of the late Emperor. Parthenius, the Chamberlain, likewise contributed the assistance of his weight and popularity to give credit to the new dynasty, and to gain in its favour the suffrages of the people. The Senators, indeed, required no solicitations to adopt the interests of Nerva, whom they justly regarded as being as much the friend of their Order as Domitianus had been its constant and deadly enemy.

Disaffection of the military.

But the hostile spirit of the army was only suppressed, not subdued. Since the accession of Vitellius, they had learned to regard no election valid which did not obtain their approbation, or purchase their fidelity; and, besides, Domitianus, who relied upon their affection, had left no means unemployed to bind them more and more firmly to his interests. For these reasons there was much ground to apprehend that the reign of Nerva would neither be long nor tranquil. We are told, accordingly, that Arius Antoninus, grandfather to one of the Emperors of that name, when congratulating the aged monarch on his high preferment, assured him, that the satisfaction which every good Roman felt at the recent change, respected the welfare of the Empire rather than the personal comfort of the meritorious chief who was called to preside over its destinies. He reminded him, that he had relinquished the tranquillity of a private condition for an office in which he would be exposed to contention, fatigue, and danger; wherein his life would be aimed at by the arm of treason, and his reputation, which had never yet received a stain, would be assailed by calumny and misrepresentation. He alluded to the uneasiness which would arise from the stratagems of his enemies, and from the insatiable demands and expectations of his friends; whom it would not be in his power to satisfy without injuring the public welfare, nor to refuse without converting their zeal into hatred.*

Mild government.

The beginning of Nerva's administration, according to Tacitus, proved that the exercise of sovereign power is not incompatible either with the liberty or the happiness of the People. The Romans were the more delighted with his mild and equitable government, because they had just escaped from the fiercest and most degrading tyranny that was ever supported by military despotism; and while they enjoyed the peace and security which the personal virtues of their ruler promised to render permanent, they willingly shut their eyes to the evils which his easy and timid disposition was not less likely to produce.†

Recals exiles and restores their property.

His first cares were employed in providing a remedy for the evils created by the suspicions and cruelty of Domitianus. He began by annulling all the laws relating to high treason; a crime so extremely vague and undefined, that prosecutions for it had at once become the principal instrument of tyranny and the terror of every man above the rank of a common soldier. He recalled, in like manner, the numerous exiles who had been driven from Rome during the latter years of his predecessor, and restored to them the estates and honours of which they were most unjustly deprived. Among these sufferers, the public eye was glad to recognise the determined patriot Arulænus Rusticus, Arria the widow of Thrasea, and the mother-in-law of Helvidius Priscus, the victim of Imperial rage. Unwilling that any class of men should continue to feel the pressure of the former despotism, he made haste to extend relief to the Christians, who at that period, under the name of Jews,

* Aur. Victor, *et* Vict. *Epit.* Eutrop. *Hist.* Dion Cassius, lib. lxvii. and lib. lxviii. Tacit. *Ann.* lib. xv. c. 72.

* Victor, *in Ner. Capit. T. Anton*

† Tacit. *in Vitâ Agricolæ*, c. 3. Plin. *Epist.* lib. ix. ep. 13.

Biography. From A. D. 96. to 98.

were exposed to very severe penalties, as enemies to the faith and constitution of Rome. On this occasion, if we follow the authority of Eusebius, the Apostle St. John was delivered from his banishment in Patmos, and allowed to resume, at Ephesus, the high duties of his divine commission.*

Enacts good laws.

To prevent such evils in future, he enacted severe laws against informers and public accusers; and in order to deter from this odious crime by an example of just severity, he gave orders to put to death all the slaves and freedmen whose evidence had been employed to condemn their masters. It was, in like manner, established by an Imperial ordinance, that no person in servile condition, or who had risen from the estate of slavery, should be listened to in a Court of justice against his owner or patron. Nor was his reformation confined to matters of judicial procedure. He repealed a law introduced by Augustus, which imposed a heavy duty on all successions and inheritances, except in cases of extreme poverty or the nearest degree of relationship. This tax, which amounted to a twentieth part of the whole property, was found excessively burdensome and disagreeable; for the exemption founded on proximity of kindred was in practice restricted to the ancient class of citizens, who thereby became entitled to an immunity which could not but wound the pride of all the more recent families. Nerva put an end at once to these distinctions, and prepared the way for the final abolition by the Emperor Trajan, of the financial expedient on which they were founded.†

His clemency.

The younger Pliny, who came into power during this reign, has related many particulars concerning Nerva; which, though they would serve better for illustrating a biographical memoir than for aiding the more extended views of general History, are yet not altogether undeserving of notice. Such anecdotes lay open the character of his administration, and admit the reader to a fuller knowledge of its principles than could be derived from the most minute survey of his foreign policy, or from the distribution of his armies in Europe and Asia. For example, we find that neither a feeling of resentment nor even the sense of justice could induce this lenient Sovereign to dip his hands in the blood of a Senator. It is related, that when Helvidius Priscus was denounced by Domitianus, an ancient Prætor, named Publicius Certus, showed himself so willing a minister of tyranny, that he rudely laid hands upon the accused, and assisted in dragging him to prison. Pliny, desirous to avenge the cause of virtue and of public decency, resolved to attack Certus in the Senate-house, and demand a condign punishment. The eloquence of the Philosopher was opposed at first by the caution of his hearers, who dreaded a renewal of the proscriptions and other evils from which they had so lately obtained deliverance; but he succeeded at length in rousing their indignation against the odious crimes with which Certus stood charged, and was about to receive an unanimous verdict expressive of his guilt, when the Consul adjourned the meeting.‡

Nerva could not be prevailed upon to allow the matter to proceed further, or to be brought again before the Senate: contenting himself with depriving Certus of the Consulate for which he had been designed by his patron Domitianus.

M. C. Nerva Augustus. From A. D. 96. to 98.

This facility was not allowed to pass without censure, by those especially who listened with greater readiness to the voice of their passions than to the dictates of prudence. Pliny informs us, that Junius Mauricus, a Senator who had been banished by Domitianus, was after his return invited to an entertainment at the table of Nerva, where he had the mortification to meet one of his bitterest enemies, Fabricius Vejento, a vile and subservient tool in the hand of tyranny. The conversation happened to turn upon Catullus Messalinus, a person whose memory was detested by every one, on account of his activity in the odious trade of a public accuser, as well as for the bloody measures which he was always the first to propose in the Senate. There was no one present who did not express abhorrence and contempt against so hateful a character: upon which Nerva addressed himself to the company and said, "What do you think would become of him were he alive now?" 'He would be at dinner with us, replied Mauricus.'*

His clemency censured.

The same spirit is breathed in the following stricture made by Marcus Julius Fronto, a man of Consular authority; who, observing certain symptoms of confusion and distrust arising from the passive temper of the aged Prince, could not refrain from saying, "It is without doubt a great calamity to be under a Sovereign who does not permit anybody to do anything, but it is not much better to be under one who allows everybody to do what he pleases."†

Apology for it.

The disorder in which he found the Empire is the best apology for the undue forbearance with which Nerva has been charged. He was desirous that the appetite for sanguinary punishment should no longer disgrace the Romans; and, for this humane purpose, he refused to gratify the vindictive feelings of those who had even just grounds of complaint. The motives which distinguished the character of his government are recorded in an edict preserved by Pliny; in which he declares, that he had uniformly preferred the public good to his own repose, and that his object in accepting the Imperial authority was, not to deprive the People of their privileges, but to acquire the power of confirming whatever they possessed, and to add to the benefactions granted by former Emperors, new favours originating with himself. He requested, that no one should imagine his possessions to be in danger, because they were connected with the memory of a Prince justly odious to the Roman name; for that he had no intention of resuming any grant made by his predecessor, merely that he might have the merit of bestowing it a second time. "The happiness of no one shall be diminished," said he, "by the necessity of approaching the throne with entreaties. It is my business to give; let every one who is in want, or has claims upon my liberality, make his case known without fear or hesitation."‡

His liberality

Nor did these prove empty words on the part of the Emperor. On the contrary, his actions in all circumstances vouched the sincerity of his professions, and the goodness of his heart. To place poor citizens in a more independent condition than they had enjoyed since the days of Augustus, he expended large sums of

* Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. Eusebii *Chron.* lib. iii. c. 20.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lv. Plin. *Paneg.* c. 67, 68.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. Plin. *Epist.* lib. ix. ep. 13, &c.

* Plin. *Epist.* lib. iv. ep. 22. Vict. *Epit.*
† Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. ‡ Plin. *Epist.* lib. x. ep. 66.

Biography. From A. D. 96. to 98.

money in the purchase of lands, which he divided among the most deserving. He likewise provided for the maintenance and education of orphan children, throughout all the Provinces of Italy; he extended his benevolence to the several towns which had suffered from disease or accident; and relieved from vindictive taxation those cities which had incurred the displeasure of Domitianus.*

Economy.

These generous actions were not more meritorious than the means which he used to enable him to perform them. He requested that a commission might be appointed by the Senate to examine into the expenses of the Government, and that all possible retrenchments might be made in the outlay and scale of his own household. He reduced his personal expenditure to the narrowest limits; disposed of jewels and other ornaments which he regarded as unnecessary for Imperial state; and even sold a portion of his paternal lands, in order to meet the claims on his liberality which he himself had created.†

The pattern which he kept constantly before his eyes was the mild and equitable administration of Titus. Like that merciful Prince, he solemnly swore that he never would put a Senator to death; a restriction on his prerogative to which the vindictive mind of Domitianus would never submit. So faithfully did Nerva adhere to this resolution, that when Calpurnius Crassus, with some other members of the Senate, conspired against him, he would not allow the laws to be enforced and their crime to be punished. The remonstrances of the Senate, who, with one voice, blamed his clemency as injudicious and dangerous, could not urge him to give his consent to a measure more severe than the banishment of Crassus to Tarentum.‡

Justice and moderation.

But in all other cases, in which the guilt of the parties did not so immediately affect his own interests and feelings, Nerva administered justice with equal impartiality and discernment. Indeed, the knowledge of law was in some degree hereditary in his family, which for several generations could boast of the greatest civilians that appeared in Rome. In a word, it was the unceasing endeavour of this good monarch, so to discharge the duties of his high office as that he might at any time, either render an account of all the proceedings to which he had given his sanction, or return to a private station without reproach, regret, or apprehension. It has been remarked, too, that he never laid aside the modesty which became his earlier fortunes; constantly refusing the honours which the persons who surrounded his throne were ever seeking to lavish upon the rank to which he had been elevated. He permitted no statues to be erected to him, either of gold or of silver; and so far, says Dion Cassius, was he from wishing to be exalted above other men, that he spent all the days of his short reign in labouring to raise the virtuous almost to an equality with himself.§

The Historians of this reign confine their reprehension to a single act, the recal of the Pantomimes or actors of low Comedy, whose performances, it would appear, were highly acceptable to the people of Rome. Pliny blames with great gentleness the facility of Nerva, which, on this occasion, made him yield to the entreaties of the multitude; insinuating, at the same time, as the ground of an apology, the remarkable fact, that the discontinuance of the amusement in question the only good thing which Domitianus had done, was held by the citizens as an intolerable stretch of power, merely because it was effected by the authority of a Prince so excessively unpopular.*

M. C. Nerva Augustus. From A. D. 96. to 98.

History of Virginius

The fortunes of the celebrated Virginius, a character worthy of Nerva's patriotic government, constitute an agreeable episode in the brief annals of the latter. History has not preserved any account of the distinguished General just named, from the time that he refused the Empire, on the defeat of Vindex, till he was honoured with a third Consulship, during the reign of the successor of Domitianus. Pliny, to whose early years he had discharged the duty of Guardian, speaks of him with enthusiasm and affection; assuring his readers, that the modesty of his conversation was only equalled by the fame of his exploits. He adds, that he never but on one occasion heard him mention the circumstance of his declining supreme power; and then he was compelled to speak of it, by a reference which was made to the propriety of his motives. A certain Historian, who had introduced into his pages a minute narrative of that occurrence, apologized to Virginius for the freedom he had used in weighing the merits of his conduct, when he rejected the high preferment offered to him by the victorious legions. "Know you not," replied the veteran, "that in the emergency to which you refer, I did what I did in such a manner that you writers might be free to speak of it in any way you chose!"†

His contemporary reputation:

The virtues of this great soldier conferred upon him immortality while he was yet alive. He survived the complete establishment of his fame more than thirty years; he read the history of his exploits in the Annals, and even in the Poetry, of his generation; and thus, exclaims Pliny, he mingled with a grateful and admiring posterity, and enjoyed, beforehand, a posthumous glory. He died in his third Consulate, while Nerva was yet on the throne; and his memory was honoured with a public funeral, and every other expression of esteem and regard. The same good fortune, says his friend, which accompanied him through life did not forsake him at his death; the oration over his grave being pronounced by Caius Cornelius Tacitus, at that time Consul, and one of the greatest scholars and most splendid speakers of his age.

His epitaph.

Virginius wrote his own epitaph, which Pliny found at Alsium, a country residence in which the warrior spent the latter part of his life, and which was afterwards occupied by the mother-in-law of the Panegyrist. It was expressed in these words:

Hic situs est Rufus, pulso qui Vindice quondam,
Imperium asseruit, non Sibi sed, Patriæ.

As the modesty of such personal appeals to the applause of posterity is extremely questionable, the curious reader may be pleased to turn to the opinions of two very clever ancients on this subject, recorded by Pliny.‡

Mutiny of the Prætorians.

The peaceful reign of Nerva could not prove agreeable to the rapacious and turbulent Prætorians. The plunder and increased pay which they enjoyed under the bloody rule of Domitianus, made them at first

* Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. Plin. *Epist.* lib. vii. ep. 31, and *Paneg. Trajan.*
† Plin. *Paneg.* c. 62.
‡ Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. Vict. *Epit.*
§ Dion Cassius, *ubi suprà.*

* Plin. *Paneg.* c. 46.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. Plin. *Epist.* lib. ix. ep. 19.
‡ Plin. *Epist.* lib. vi. ep. 10, lib ix. ep. 19.

Biography From A. D. 96. to 98.

regret the death of that Emperor, and afterwards carried them to the resolution of taking revenge upon his murderers. They were incited to this seditious measure by Casperius Ælianus, a Præfect of that Order; who, conducting their steps to the palace, taught them to demand, from the timid and placid Nerva, the authors of the revolution by which he had been raised to the throne. Finding remonstrance vain, he was at length compelled to deliver up to their fury the victims whom they named. Petronius Secundus, their own General, fell under their swords almost at the very moment in which he left the palace; but it pleased them to take away the life of Parthenius, the Chamberlain, by slower and more exquisite sufferings. The guards completed their treason by forcing the Emperor to sanction the atrocities which they had committed, and even to inform the citizens that the soldiers had acted by his authority and under his command.*

This violent proceeding convinced Nerva, that his feeble arm was not competent, alone, to guide the helm of affairs amidst the storms which threatened to arise. Sensible that he stood in need of support, he looked for a coadjutor, not among his relations or personal friends, but to a man of consummate talent and tried integrity. He resolved to adopt Trajan as his son, and place him by his side on the throne; a measure which at once checked the spirit of insurrection, and secured for the Roman world some happy years of prosperity and repose.

Adoption of Trajan.

It happened, that while his plans for this patriotic object were advancing towards maturity, news arrived that the army in Pannonia had gained a signal advantage over the Barbarians, who, from time to time, menaced the tranquillity of the frontiers. Nerva availed himself of this opportunity to make his design known to the People; and having ascended to the Capitol, to deposit in the Temple of Jupiter the branch of laurel which had been sent to him as a token of victory, he addressed the assembled multitude, and informed them that Trajan, then commanding an army on the Rhine, had been selected by him as his son and heir. He next proceeded to the Senate-house, and ratified the act of adoption; conferring upon the future Emperor the title of Cæsar, with the honourable addition of Germanicus, which he himself had just assumed.

M. C. Nerva Augustus. From A. D. 96. to 98.

This wise and popular step suppressed the rising hopes of sedition, and, at the same time, avenged the insulted majesty of the Empire. The vigour and decision of Trajan's character gave hope to the good, and inspired the bad with apprehension; and it is said, that Nerva, gentle and forgiving as he had approved himself, charged his successor with the duty of punishing the violence which had been inflicted upon him by Casperius and his mutinous Prætorians. The old Emperor is represented as having used on this occasion the well-known verse of Homer, in which the Priest of Apollo entreats his God not to forget the injuries which he had sustained at the hands of the Greeks:

Good effect of this measure.

*Τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσιν.**

Trajan admitted the justice and expediency of this appeal, and visited with death, or exile, the cruel constraint of which his patron complained.

The subsequent part of Nerva's reign presents no occurrence which Historians have deemed worthy of being handed down to posterity. He appears to have committed the burden of affairs to the more energetic wisdom and zeal of Trajan; claiming for his own age and infirmities the repose to which his services entitled him, and which he now valued more than ever. He died in the beginning of the year 98, having reigned a little more than sixteen months. His age has been variously estimated; but the best authorities concur in assigning to him about seventy-two years.† His body was conveyed by the Senate to the tomb of Augustus, and his spirit, according to the tenets of his country, was consoled with an Apotheosis. The gratitude of the Romans was due to him for many acts of benevolence and humanity; but his greatest merit, says Pliny, was his choice of Trajan to succeed him in the Empire.‡

Death of Nerva.

* Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. Vict. *Epit.* Plin. *Paneg.* c. 5, 6

* Hom. *Iliad.* lib. i. v. 42.
† Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. Eutrop. *in Nerv.* Euseb. *Chron.*
‡ Plin. *Paneg.* c. 10.

M. ULPIUS TRAJANUS CRINITUS.

FROM A. D. 98 TO 117.

Biography. From A. D. 98. to 117.

BETWEEN the close of the reign of Augustus Cæsar and the accession of Trajanus, there elapsed a period of eighty-four years. During this period the Roman Empire, notwithstanding the crimes of almost all its Sovereigns, and the disturbances to which it had been occasionally exposed, had consolidated its widely scattered possessions, and its different Provinces had learned to consider themselves as members of one great body. It was well prepared to feel the full blessing of an able and upright Government, and such a blessing it was now going to experience for a term of equal length with the period of tyranny which had preceded it. The first eighty years, then, of the IId century of the Christian æra may be regarded as the prime of manhood in the Roman Empire, during which its excellencies were most fully developed, while at the same time there were visible, even then, those evils which threw so dark a shade over its decline and fall. It is of this period that we wish to offer, not a picture, but such a sketch as our imperfect information will enable us to execute; connecting it with those particulars which we formerly gave of the state of the Empire under Augustus, in order to show more clearly the changes which it had undergone since the first establishment of the Imperial Government.

The reign of Trajanus is in one respect peculiarly well-fitted to be made the occasion of such a survey, as we are absolutely unable to offer a detailed account of its events. A few pages of an abridgement of the original History of Dion Cassius, and a few lines of Eutropius and Aurelius Victor, are all that we possess in the shape of a direct Historical narrative of it. Of these scanty materials, by far the greatest part relates to the military expeditions of the Emperor, and to those conquests of which he himself lived long enough to see the instability,—and which his successor quietly abandoned. It were indeed a waste of our own time and that of our readers to dwell upon the events of the Dacian war, or the triumphs of Trajanus over the Parthians and Armenians. Unprofitable as is the detail of almost every war, there is none more utterly worthless than that which relates to the contest between a Civilized and a Barbarian people,—which repeats the story of fancied provocations, of easy victories, and of sweeping conquests. Yet if we exclude the military operations of Trajanus from our account of his life, his Historians and Biographers furnish us with scarcely any materials. We shall first, therefore, give only a mere outline of the events of his reign in chronological order, and then, adopting a different arrangement, we shall regard the nature of the facts related, rather than the time of their occurrence.

ession of raj anus.

At the moment of Nerva's death, Trajanus was still with the army in Germany.* He had been named Consul the second time for that year, together with the Emperor; and as Nerva died about the 27th of January,* almost the whole term of his Consulship remained unexpired when he succeeded to the Sovereignty of the Empire. He did not return to Rome till the beginning of the following year, having passed his Consulship in Germany, where he was employed in confirming discipline among the soldiers, and in the Civil administration of those important Provinces. A third Consulship was offered him as soon as his second was expired; as the Emperors usually marked the first year of their reign by receiving that title and office; but Trajanus positively refused it. On his way home from Germany, he travelled in the quietest and most moderate manner;† his attendants were restrained from committing those excesses upon the persons and property of the people who lived near the line of his journey, which it seems were commonly practised by the train of the Emperors. The expenses of his table were defrayed by the inhabitants of the Provinces through which he travelled, according to the constant practice of the Roman Magistrates; but this tax of purveyance, which the Sovereigns of modern Europe exercised after the example of the Romans, was imposed by Trajanus with great moderation; and he could not forbear publishing a statement of the sums demanded by himself, contrasted with those which Domitianus had exacted, when he returned to Rome from the same part of the Empire. His entrance into his Capital‡ was in a similar spirit. Instead of being borne on a litter, according to the practice of former Emperors, it was remarked, that he walked behind his Lictors, surrounded not by guards, but by the flower of the Senate and the Equestrian Order; and that he bore with patience the frequent interruptions to his progress occasioned by the eagerness of the multitude thronging to behold him. He ascended the Capitol to offer his prayers in the Temple of the Capitoline Jupiter,—on the same spot whereon Nerva, a short time before, had solemnly adopted him as his son and successor in the Empire. Thence he retired to the Palace, which he entered in the same unostentatious manner that had marked his behaviour through the day. It is added by Dion Cassius,§ that his wife Plotina had displayed a like temper when she first entered the Imperial residence; for she stopped on the steps, and, turning round to the multitude, said aloud, "I go into this house with the same mind that I should wish to bear in leaving it."

M. Ulpius Trajanus Crinitus. From A. D. 98. to 117.

First measures of his Governmen

The popularity which Trajanus had gained by his former character, and by this fair commencement of his reign, was confirmed by some of his earliest measures,

* Pliny, *Panegyric.* 9, 56, 59. Sex. Aurel. Victor, *in Trajano.*

* Compare Suetonius, *Domitian.* c. 17, and Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. p. 771.

† Pliny, *Panegyric.* 20. ‡ Ibid. 22, *et seq.*

§ Lib. lxviii. p. 771. edit. Leunclav.

Biography. From A. D. 98. to 17.

when he took into his hands the administration of Government. His justice and firmness, his liberality, and his regard for the public morals, are all made the theme of his Panegyrist's admiration. Caspinus Ælianus,* the Præfect of the Prætorian guards, who had headed a mutiny of his soldiers in the reign of Nerva, and obliged the Emperor to give up to their vengeance the assassins of Domitianus, had been sent for by Trajanus, previously to his entrance into Rome, and had been put to death. The Delators, or informers, a race of men as numerous under the tyranny of the Roman Emperors as ever the Sycophants had been under that of the Athenian Democracy, were banished to different islands, and their property confiscated; and, if we may interpret literally the language of Pliny's *Panegyric*, they were sent off to their respective places of exile with so little delay, that the ships which carried them were obliged to put to sea before the end of the winter season, and the people enjoyed the thought that some of them were likely to perish on their voyage. On the other hand, the liberality of Trajanus was shown both by that which he gave, and by that which he resigned. The donative to the soldiers, and the *congiarium*, or largess to the people, as well as the shows of the Circus, which he exhibited on his accession, were so much according to the common practice of other Emperors, that they do not deserve any particular notice. But he obtained a peculiar and well-earned glory, by providing for the maintenance of nearly five thousand children of free parents,† in the different cities of Italy; and the example which he thus set was imitated by private individuals, as Pliny mentions‡ that he had settled an annual income of 300,000 *sestertii* on the town of Comum, for the maintenance of free-born children. The object of these liberalities was to encourage population amongst the free inhabitants of Italy; and there can be no better proof of the general corruption of manners, than that any such encouragement should have been needed. With these acts of munificence was combined, at the same time, the modification of one of the most obnoxious, but most productive taxes,§ the duty of five per cent. which was levied on all legacies, and even on the successions of the nearest relations, when entered upon by persons who had become Citizens of Rome otherwise than by the right of birth. By the decree of Trajanus, those nearest in consanguinity, whether in the direct or collateral line, were exempted altogether from this tax; and no person whatever was liable to it, if the property to which he had succeeded was below a certain value. And while he provided for the future, he endeavoured also to remedy the oppressions of past reigns, by enacting that no arrears should be demanded in those cases in which the parties would be exempted for the future under the law as now mitigated. But besides the direct taxes, the public Treasury and the Imperial *fiscus* had been long enriched by the irregular exactions of the officers of the Government, and by the frequent confiscations of the property of individuals condemned under the Imperial Law of Treasons. The first of these sources of unjust gain Trajanus stopped, by allowing justice to take its free course, and leaving the officers of the revenue to the punishments of the laws, if they exceeded the limits of their lawful authority; the other was destroyed by the banishment of the Delators, and by the discouragement shown to all prosecutions for Treasons, and particularly to the informations of slaves against their masters. These deductions from the revenue were made up for, partly by a severe economy, and partly by the sale of a great number of lands and villas,* which the rapacity and tyranny of former Emperors had annexed to the Imperial demesnes. By these means, Trajanus was enabled to promote the execution of many public works in different parts of the Empire, and to add to the magnificence of Rome, and to the comforts or pleasures of its inhabitants, by completing the *Forum*† which Domitianus had begun, and by erecting or finishing several other buildings, a *Circus*, some Temples, and a Colonnade or *Porticus*. But while thus gratifying some of the prevailing tastes of the people, there were others which he strove to repress as became him. The exhibition of the Pantomimes was prohibited;‡ an entertainment very different from that which is now known by the same name, and an outrage upon all decency, more shameless than any thing to be found in the obscurest scenes of profligacy in the Capitals of modern Europe. According to Pliny, this prohibition was highly popular; and so it was, doubtless, with the most respectable part of the community: but there was always a vast multitude at Rome who forgave the cruelties of the most tyrannical Emperors, in consideration of their toleration of licentiousness, and to whom no Government was so unwelcome, as that which attempted to reform their vices.

M. Ulpius Trajanus Crinitus. From A. D. 99. to 117.

But whatever were the virtues of Trajanus, he had not learnt to appreciate the misery and wickedness of war, nor to shrink with disgust from the reputation of a conqueror. Since the reign of Augustus, the conquests of the Romans in Dalmatia and Pannonia had made them acquainted with the name of the Dacians, a people who occupied both banks of the Danube, in that part of its course where it forms at present the southern boundary of Hungary. They were reputed to be of the same stock with the Tribes who lived nearer the mouth of that river, and who, under the name of *Getæ*, were known to the earliest of the Greek Historians. But the more inland situation of the Dacians kept them longer in obscurity; nor do we find them mentioned by any writer earlier than those of the Augustan Age. It is said, indeed, by Suetonius,§ that C. Julius Cæsar had projected an expedition against them, among those vast schemes of conquest which were cut short by his assassination; but however this be, in the reign of Augustus they first became engaged in actual hostilities with Rome; and their incursions across the Danube into the Roman territory, under the conduct of their King, Cotiso, were of sufficient importance to attract the notice of the Court Poets of the day,‖ and to confer that renown, which flattery is so ready to offer upon the efforts by which they were repulsed. At a later period, when the troops which defended the frontiers were drawn off to other quarters

The Dacian war.

* Dion Cassius, lxviii. p. 771.
† Pliny, *Panegyric.* 26, 28.
‡ *Epist.* vii. 18. § *Panegyric.* 37.

* *Panegyric.* 36.
† Sex. Aurel. Victor, *de Cæsaribus in Trajano.* Pliny, *Panegyric.* 51.
‡ *Panegyric.* 46.
§ *In Julio Cæsare*, c. 44, and *in Augusto*, c 8.
‖ Horace, *Carmen*, ii. 20, iii. 6, 8. Florus, iv. 12. Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 21.

in the Civil war between Vitellius and Vespasianus, the Dacians* again crossed the Danube, and committed hostilities on the Roman territory. More recently still, Domitianus† had claimed a Triumph for his victories over them; but his pretended successes were an inadequate compensation for the defeats which they were intended to revenge; those of Appius, Sabinus, and of Cornelius Fuscus, the last of whom, after having materially contributed to the elevation of the Flavian family to the Throne, perished in Dacia with the greater part of his army in the reign of Domitianus. Thus, when Trajanus succeeded to the Empire, he judged, in the usual spirit of ambition and national pride, that the dignity of Rome required the chastisement of the Dacians. Grounds of hostility can never, in fact, be wanting between an ambitious, civilized nation, and the Barbarian Tribes who border on its frontiers, and whose rude habits of plunder continually lead them to offer some real provocation; while, on the other side, self-defence is pleaded as an excuse for conquest; and injury is seldom repelled without being also retaliated. The Dacians were commanded by a Chief whom the Romans called Decebalus, and who is represented as a man of ability and courage; but no personal qualities, however brilliant, could enable a Barbarian leader to resist the power of the Roman Empire when steadily and skilfully directed against him. Accordingly, he was soon driven to sue for Peace,‡ which he obtained on such conditions as were likely soon to lead to another War; for his people were obliged to surrender up their arms, to give up all deserters or fugitives who had fled to them from the Romans; to pull down their fortresses; to cede a portion of territory; and to become the dependent allies of Rome. These terms were observed as long as the impression of their defeats retained its original force; but in a very short time the Romans began to complain that they were collecting arms, and rebuilding their fortresses, and harbouring fugitives from the Roman territory; and Trajanus prepared to attack them again, glad, perhaps, that he was now furnished with a pretext, according to the usual policy of Rome, for completing the conquest of their country.

Bridge over the Danube.

At the outset of his expedition, he indicated by his conduct that he meditated more than a temporary inroad into the enemy's territory. Hitherto the Danube had been regarded as the limit of the Empire; but Trajanus proposed to create a Roman Province to the north of that river, and a permanent bridge over it became a necessary work to facilitate the communication with this remote portion of his dominions. Accordingly, he completed one on a scale of magnificence, if we may believe Dion Cassius, superior to that of all his other works. He tells us,§ that there were twenty piers of stone, at intervals of 170 feet from each other, and that each of these was in height 150 feet above the foundations, and 60 feet wide. The arches which connected them were probably made of wood, and could thus be taken down with the greater facility; which we are told was done by the Emperor Hadrianus, who took away all the upper part of the bridge, and left merely the piers standing. We believe that the exact site of this famous work has not been ascertained; nor are we aware that any researches have been made to determine it, or to learn what is the extent of the actual remains; but according to D'Anville, it was built at a spot called Ram, about four leagues above Orsova, and about a hundred miles below Belgrade.

As soon as the bridge was finished, the conquest of Dacia was speedily effected. Decebalus,* seeing all his efforts useless, and his Palace in the hands of the enemy, killed himself; and his treasures, which he is said to have concealed under the bed of the river Sargetias, were betrayed to the Romans by one of his officers, and by turning the course of the stream, were discovered and carried off. Dacia was reduced to the form of a Province, and some Roman colonies were settled in it, the principal of which was called *Ulpia Trajana*, and was established at *Zamisegethusa*, the ancient Capital of the country, on one of the streams which flow from the east into the Theyss.

Final conquest of Dacia.

Return of Trajanus to Rome.

After the conclusion of this war, Trajanus returned to Rome, and gratified the people by rejoicings celebrated on the most magnificent scale; for, according to Dion Cassius,† the different shows that were exhibited lasted for four months, in the course of which no fewer than ten thousand gladiators are said to have fought for the amusement of the multitude. It was in commemoration also of the conquest of Dacia, that the famous Pillar in the *Forum* of Trajanus was erected; although it was not completed till the seventeenth year of his reign. The height of this Pillar is 128 Roman feet,‡ and the whole shaft is covered with bas-reliefs, representing the exploits of the Emperor in both his Dacian expeditions. But the most remarkable circumstance connected with it, is the excavation of the ground, which was effected preparatory to its erection; for the inscription upon its base declares, that the hill had been cut away from the height of the Pillar, to form the level space on which the *Forum* of Trajanus was built. These great changes in the appearance of the ground on which Rome is built, should always be borne in mind when we attempt to reconcile its present condition with the descriptions of ancient writers.

His Forum and Pillar.

Dispute with Parthia concerning the investiture of the Kings of Armenia.

Whilst Trajanus remained at Rome, he is said§ to have commenced the work of making roads or causeways through the Pomptine marshes, to have issued a new coinage, and to have founded several public libraries. But his military ardour had been influenced by his late conquests, and he was ambitious of winning triumphs over the Parthians, and other Eastern nations, as he had already been victorious over the enemies of Rome in Europe. The pretext for this new war was an alleged affront offered to the dignity of the Empire by Chosroes, the King of Parthia, who had conferred the Crown of Armenia, by his own authority, on a Prince named Exedares, instead of allowing him to receive the diadem from the Sovereign of Rome. Ever since the victories of Lucullus and Cn. Pompeius, the Romans pretended to regard Armenia as one of their dependent Kingdoms; and this claim had given rise to various contests between them and the Parthians, who viewed it, on the other hand, as a kind of appanage of the Crown of Parthia. The neighbourhood of the Parthians, and the unwarlike

* Tacitus, *Hist.* iii. 46.

† Suetonius, *in Domitiano*, c. 6. Dion Cassius, lxvii. p. 763. edit. Leunclav.

‡ Dion Cassius, lxviii. p. 773.

§ Lib. lxviii. p. 776.

* Dion Cassius, lxviii. p. 777.

† P. 777.

‡ Burton, *Antiquities of Rome*, p. 171, *et seq.*

§ Dion Cassius, lxviii. p 777.

Biography. From A. D. 98. to 117.

character of several of the Roman Emperors, had made the Parthian influence in Armenia really predominant; but the right of the Romans had never been relinquished, and was likely to be enforced by any ambitious Prince who thirsted for the glory of Eastern conquests. Accordingly, it was now insisted on by Trajanus, and preparations were made on a great scale to maintain it by force of arms. The Parthian King, unwilling to involve himself in war, deposed Exedares, and nominated Parthamasiris, his own brother, as his successor; at the same time, sending an embassy with presents to Trajanus announcing this act, and requesting him to bestow the diadem, according to the right of investiture which he claimed as Emperor of Rome, on the Prince whom he had just placed on the throne. For it seems, that the right of the Romans was little more than a form, and that they only installed the Sovereign whom the Parthians had previously nominated; as in the reign of Nero, when Vologeses, King of Parthia, had seated his brother Tiridates on the throne of Armenia, it was agreed that Tiridates should go to Rome to receive his investiture at the hands of the Emperor. But now Trajanus, bent upon conquest, rejected the presents brought him by the Ambassadors, and replied to their communication with the characteristic haughtiness of a Roman General, saying, that the King of Parthia should manifest his friendly disposition rather by deeds than by words, and that when he should have arrived in Syria, the Romans would then do that which was fitting to be done.

Story of Parthamasiris.

The narrative of Dion Cassius becomes here only a collection of disjointed fragments, preserved by his abbreviators; so that it does not appear whether the negociation was renewed on the arrival of Trajanus in Syria. It was at all events ineffectual; and the Roman army advanced into Armenia, where they were met by the Satraps and petty Princes of the neighbouring districts, who came to make their submissions and to offer presents. Meantime, Parthamasiris had laid aside the style and title of King, and had written to request that M. Junius, the Governor of Cappadocia, might be sent to him, as if he wished, through his intercession with the Emperor, to obtain some favourable terms. His request was refused; but the son of Junius was sent to him, and he was probably given to understand, that he must present himself in person before Trajanus. The Emperor was now at Elegia, a town of Armenia, having as yet not experienced any opposition; and hither Parthamasiris repaired,* in order, as he supposed, to go through the ceremony of investiture; which he the less doubted that he should obtain, as the public humiliation thus imposed upon him, seemed at least a sufficient atonement for any offence which the Romans might pretend to have received. Accordingly, when Trajanus was seated on his tribunal in the midst of his camp, Parthamasiris appeared before him, and, having saluted him, took off the diadem from his own head, and laid it at the Emperor's feet. When he had done this, he stood silent for a few moments, expecting that Trajanus, as a matter of course, would desire him to resume it; but when he said nothing, and the soldiers with loud shouts addressed their Sovereign as *Imperator*, considering that the act which they had just witnessed was equivalent to the absolute surrender of Armenia to the Roman dominions, Parthamasiris started, and apprehending some attempt upon his person or liberty, turned in order to leave the camp. But when the soldiers opposed his passage, he requested a private interview with Trajanus, and went with the Emperor into his tent. Their conference was unsatisfactory; and Parthamasiris left the tent in great indignation; but he was again detained by the Emperor's order, and was desired, with the usual indelicacy of the Romans, to state his cause publicly in the hearing of the whole army. Coarse and insolent as was this proposal, Parthamasiris did not decline it; but standing before the Emperor's tribunal, he indignantly asserted, that he was betrayed, and not conquered; that he had come freely into the Roman camp, in the confidence that when he had gone through the ceremony of homage, his right to the Crown of Armenia would be instantly allowed. Trajanus, who perceived himself now strong enough to avow his injustice without scruple, replied, that Armenia belonged to the Romans, and should obey none but a Roman Sovereign; that the Armenian followers of Parthamasiris must, therefore, remain with the Roman army, but that he himself and his Parthians were at liberty to depart whithersoever they thought proper. The disgraceful conclusion of this scene we learn from one of the newly discovered fragments of the works of M. Cornelius Fronto the Orator.* Parthamasiris refused to submit to this treacherous outrage, and, with a courage that heeded not his unequal condition, attempted to force his way out of the camp. In this attempt he was naturally unsuccessful, and being taken prisoner, to crown the atrocity of the conduct of Trajanus, he was put to death.

M. Ulpius Trajanus Crinitus. From A. D. 98. to 117.

Armenia having been thus surprised rather than conquered, Trajanus left garrisons in its principal fortresses, and marching southwards from Elegia arrived at Edessa. Here he was hospitably received by Abgarus, Prince of that district, who now thought it his best policy to propitiate the Romans to the utmost. Some others also of the petty Sovereigns who lived on the outskirts of the Parthian Empire, expressed their readiness to receive his commands; and he thus made himself master of the town of Singara, and some other places in Upper Mesopotamia, without any opposition. At this point, the narrative of Dion Cassius breaks off abruptly, and the next remaining fragment of his work belongs to a period nearly ten years later. But it is certain, from the evidence of inscriptions, that Trajanus did not gain further conquests at this time; and we may suppose, that after his occupation of Armenia he had no longer any pretence of hostility against the King of Parthia, and that, as that Monarch was content to abandon Armenia to him, he led back his army, and returned to Rome.

Closing of the reign of Trajanus.

The events which we have just recorded seem to have taken place about the tenth year of the reign of Trajanus; and it was probably for his triumph over Parthamasiris that he assumed the title of *Imperator* for the sixth time. In the inscription on the famous bridge over the Tagus at Alcantara,† which bears date the ninth year of his reign, he is styled *Imperator* for the fifth time; and Dion Cassius tells us, that he received that

* Dion Cassius, lxviii. p. 779.

* *Principia Historiæ, Fragment.* iv. "*Trajano cædes Parthamasiris regis haud satis excusata. Tametsi ultro ille vim captans, tumultu orto, merito interfectus est, meliore tamen Romanorum fide impunè supplex abisset, quam jure supplicium luisset.*"

† Gruter, *Corpus Inscription.* tom. i. p. 162.

Biography. From A. D. 98. to 117.

title again from the acclamations of his soldiers, when they beheld the unfortunate Parthamasiris surrendering to him his crown. But in the inscription on the Pillar erected in the middle of his *Forum* at Rome, and which is dated in the seventeenth year of his reign, he is described as *Imperator* only for the sixth time;* so that a decisive proof is thus obtained, that during seven years he gained no signal victories; and as his wars were nothing but a succession of victories, we may fairly conclude, that from the tenth to the seventeenth year of his reign he remained at peace, and employed himself in the Civil administration of his Empire. Between the completion of his Pillar and his death, the rapidity of his conquests is marked by the accumulation of his titles of *Imperator;* for on the column, as we have seen, he is described only as *Imperator* for the sixth time, but inscriptions of a date two years later,† in the nineteenth year of his reign, call him *Imperator* for the eleventh time. We shall avail ourselves then of this peaceful period of nearly seven years, the events of which we are unable to relate chronologically, from the total want of all regular annals of this reign, to offer a general view of the state of the Empire, and of the character of the Emperor's Government.

Of the external relations of Rome.

Adopting the same arrangement which we formerly pursued in our life of Augustus, the foreign relations of Rome will first claim our notice. And here the picture which we gave of the state of affairs under Augustus will require little alteration. Some acquisitions of territory had indeed been made previous to the recent conquests of Trajanus in Dacia. Our own Island, after having been first conquered in the reign of Claudius, and subsequently held with a doubtful grasp during the last years of Nero, and the Civil wars which followed his death, had been finally subdued and settled by Cn. Agricola, whose merits have been transmitted to posterity, perhaps with some exaggeration, by the affection and eloquence of his son-in-law, Tacitus. In the other extremity of the Empire, Jerusalem had been destroyed, after a resistance such as the Romans had seldom experienced from an enemy so unequal. Some changes had taken place also, rather in the nominal than in the real condition of countries‡ already in fact subject to the authority of Rome, but retaining the form of an independent Government; and some Barbarous Tribes had in the lapse of years been more effectually subdued, or had gradually become more familiarized to the Roman dominion. But still, as in the reign of Augustus, the Parthians and Germans were the only nations whom the Romans found capable of maintaining a contest with them almost on equal terms. The Parthian power was indeed somewhat on the decline, and it was destined to receive from Trajanus severer blows than it had ever yet sustained. But the Germans were as unbroken as ever; nor had the Romans again ventured since the defeat of Varus to extend their frontier beyond the Rhine. The title of *Germanicus*, fondly assumed by so many Emperors, was the best proof that none had fully deserved it; and that the conqueror of Germany was as yet unborn.

M. Ulpius Trajanus Crinitus. From A. D. 98. to 117.

Nothing then remains to divert our attention from the internal state of the Empire. In our life of Augustus, we attempted to mark the easy steps by which the old Constitution had been converted into a Monarchy, by showing that it contained within it all the elements of despotic power,—while there was enough of servility and helplessness in the people at large to make them almost welcome as a relief, their exclusion from all share in the Government. Our business will now be to delineate the Imperial Constitution in its matured state, and to notice some of those points in which the forms of freedom which still subsisted in the days of Augustus had been since overthrown. The Government was now become an acknowledged Monarchy. In the time of Augustus, it was but a sort of perpetual Dictatorship, bestowed by the Senate and People on the most distinguished Citizen of the Commonwealth, as a remedy for the disorders occasioned by so many years of Civil war. But the adoption first of the sons of Agrippa, and afterwards of Tib. Claudius Nero, into the Julian family, made it evident that the new state of things was designed to be perpetual; and so natural is the notion of hereditary right, that even while the Monarchy was thus recent, the succession was thought to belong to the family of the actual Sovereign; and in the failure of his immediate descendants, he was allowed to adopt whomsoever he thought proper, as the presumptive heir to the Imperial power. On the death of Augustus, the Senate, by conferring all his extraordinary prerogatives on Tiberius, decreed in fact the final extinction of the Commonwealth. The temporary reason before assigned, for vesting the government in the hands of a single person, was now exchanged for one of general and lasting application; the disorders of the Civil wars had been long since repaired by the peaceful administration of Augustus; but it was now discovered, that the Empire was too vast to be governed by the Senate and People, and required the vigour and unity of a Monarchy; and thus, until the Provinces should be dismembered, the Roman People seemed to resign for ever its old authority. The feeble attempt made by the Senate to resume the Government, after the murder of Caligula, did not last longer than two days; and from that time, even when the succession to the Imperial power was most disputed, yet none ever proposed the restoration of the Commonwealth.

Its internal state.

1. Of the Government.

We have said, that even Augustus, when he adopted Tiberius as his son, designed to make him his successor in the Empire. But the Throne was never considered as actually hereditary, so that the natural or adopted son ascended it by the right of his birth whenever the death of his father had left it vacant. By the theory of the Constitution, if we may apply so noble a term to the Imperial Government of Rome, the Emperor was still intrusted by the Senate with the management of the Republic, and each succeeding Sovereign derived his power according to law solely from their authority. It is difficult to say, whether the consent of the Army was legally necessary to the validity of an election, although in reality it determined the whole transaction. The new Emperor was saluted as such by the soldiers, and he promised them a donative in return; and the opposition of the Senate to their choice must have been

It was far more Monarchical than in the time of Augustus.

---

* Gruter, *Corpus Inscription.* tom. i. p. 247. Burton's *Antiquities of Rome*, p. 172.

† Gruter, tom. i. p. 248, and an inscription on a bridge over the river Metaurus, on the old Flaminian road, between Furlo and Fossombrone, which we copied on the spot in 1825.

‡ Cappadocia from a dependent Kingdom had been reduced to a Province as early as the reign of Tiberius. Tacitus, *Annal.* ii. 42. A part of Pontus, which still was governed by a King of its own, shared the same fate in the reign of Nero. Tacitus, *Hist.* iii. 47; Eutropius, *in Nerone.* Rhodes, Lycia, and some other places, were in like manner made Provinces by Vespasianus. Suetonius, *in Vespasian.* c. 8; Eutropius, *in Vespasian.*

Biography. From A. D. 98. to 117.

necessarily fruitless. It is possible, too, that the Army may have been regarded in some measure as the representative of the People, and their voice may have been esteemed the sole remnant of the popular part of the old Constitution. The *Comitia* no longer assembled for the election of Magistrates after the accession of Tiberius;* and although statutes, (*Leges*,) and decrees of the Commons, (*Plebiscita*,) are acknowledged among the sources of the Roman law, even in the time of T. Antoninus and M. Aurelius, yet the votes of the Tribes in enacting laws as well as in appointing Magistrates had become no more than an empty form.† In their place the *Constitutions* of the Emperor were allowed to have the force of laws,‡ and these gradually became more frequent, as the remembrance of free institutions became in every successive generation fainter and fainter. It may be noticed also, as a mark of the more avowed monarchical character which the Government assumed within a century after the death of the first Emperor, that the title of *Dominus*, or Master, as opposed to Slave, which Augustus disclaimed with indignation,§ is familiarly bestowed on Trajanus by his friend Pliny, even in his private correspondence with him.

Of the Imperial Law of Treasons.

But the instrument by which the Emperors had perpetrated the worst acts of their tyranny was provided by the new Imperial Law of Treasons. Under the Commonwealth, the crime of *Majestas læsa vel imminuta* was held to extend not only to those actions which our Law regards as treasonable, such as conspiring to levy war against the State, or joining the enemy in war, but to a great variety of other offences of less magnitude, such as rioting, or gross misconduct in the management of a war, or the usurpation of the state and authority of a Magistrate by any private person. Nor were even words always exempted from its operation, if the story told of Claudia be deserving of credit,—who was tried, during the first Punic war, for a passionate expression uttered against the People, when her carriage was stopped in the streets by the pressure of the crowd. Whilst the Commonwealth lasted, however, the severity of the Laws was not amongst the prevailing evils; and although many individuals who ought to have been punished were never brought to justice, no innocent man, probably, was ever a sufferer from the Law of Treason as it was then established. With the Imperial Government new maxims and a new spirit of criminal jurisprudence were introduced: the Emperor was invested with all the majesty of the Commonwealth, and to attempt his life,‖ or to levy war against his authority, were naturally, as in every Monarchy, regarded as acts of Treason. But the jealousy of Augustus, and still more of Tiberius, extended the same appellation to every thing that could be construed into disrespect to the person or dignity of the Emperor. Not only were libels punishable with death,¶ and expressions adjudged to be libellous, which the worst despotism of modern times would never have attempted to question; but even words spoken in private society were liable to the same penalty; and it was treasonable to consult Astrologers as to the fate of the Emperor,* to melt down or sell a statue of an Emperor who had been deified,† to take the head off from it,‡ to scourge a slave or to undress close to it, with some other things so monstrous, that if they did not rest on good contemporary testimony we should reject them as utterly incredible. The offence was proceeded against in the same spirit of tyranny by which it was defined: for persons held to be infamous,§ and whose evidence was not admissible in other cases, were in these received as accusers; freed men might impeach their Patrons, and slaves their own masters; both of which acts the Romans regarded in general with the utmost horror; and persons of the highest rank, at least, in the reign of Severus, might be examined by torture.‖ If condemned, criminals of all ranks were punished with death, and those of humble condition, by one of those atrocious distinctions characteristic of the vilest tyranny, were either thrown to wild beasts or burned alive. The property of the victim was forfeited; and if the charge extended to the act of levying war against the Emperor,¶ the forfeiture took place even when the accused died before his trial, unless his heirs could prove his innocence.

M. Ulpius Trajanus Crinitus. From A. D. 98. to 117.

A Law so odious bred a race of informers well-fitted to pander to its cruelty. Under the worst Emperors they swelled accordingly into a numerous and formidable body, composed of the vilest individuals of every rank, who abused the confidence of private society to report some word or action which the Imperial Law of Treason rendered criminal. Such a system rendered the very name of justice unpopular; and real crimes sometimes escaped with impunity, or were undeservedly pardoned at the accession of a better Emperor, from the universal hatred felt towards all prosecutions,** and the indiscriminate compassion entertained for all who had incurred the penalties of the Laws. Nor is it amongst the least evils of a tyrannical code, that even after it has been mitigated by a virtuous Sovereign, there is perpetually danger of its being again revived in all its horrors in some succeeding reign. The precedent of a bad example is far more effectual in countenancing wickedness, than that of a good one in restraining it; and thus, although Trajanus banished the informers, and suspended the operation of the Law of Treason, yet the race of the one soon sprang up again, and the enactments of the other remained in existence to be again called into action by a Commodus or a Caracalla.

The excellence of the Roman Law in other respects.

It were unjust, however, to estimate the general character of the Roman law from the provisions of the *Lex Majestatis*; or to receive our impression of the political

* We have said, "for the *election* of Magistrates," because the *Comitia* even in the reign of Trajanus assembled in the *Campus Martius*, to go through the form of nominating those persons Consuls, Prætors, &c. who had been previously chosen by the Senate. See Heineccius, lib. i. Append. sec. 65, and Creuzer, *Romisch. Antiquitat.* sec. 126.

† See Hugo, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Römischen Rechts* p. 611, 612. Edit. 1824.

‡ Gaius, *Institution.* i. sec. 5. *Nec unquam dubitatum est, quin id (sc. Constitutio Principis) legis vicem obtineat.*

§ Suetonius, *in Augusto*, c. 53.

‖ *Digest.* xlviii. *Tit.* 4. Paullus, *Sentent. Recipt. Tit.* 29.

¶ Tacitus, *Annal.* iv. 34, xiv. 48.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* iii 22.

† *Digest.* xlviii. *Tit.* 4. The atrocity of the Law of Treason may be estimated by the nature of those acts which the lawyers thought proper to specify as exempted from its penalties. *Non contrahit crimen Majestatis qui statuas Cæsaris vetustate corruptas refixit. Nec qui lapide jactato incerto, fortuito statuarum altigerit, crimen Majestatis commisit. Digest.* xlviii. *Tit.* 4.

‡ Suetonius, *in Tiberio*, c. 58.

§ *Digest. ubi suprà.* ‖ Paullus, *ubi suprà.*

¶ *Digest. ubi suprà.*

** Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 77. *Placuit ignoscentibus, verso nomine, quod avaritia fuerat videri Majestatem; cujus tunc odio etiam bona leges peribant.*

Biography. From A. D. 98. to 117.

condition of the Roman people from those tragical details with which the Histories of these times are chiefly filled. The Imperial system had been engrafted upon a free Constitution, and upon the laws of a free People; both of which it entirely overturned, wherever they interfered with its own immediate interests; but as the principles of a corrupt system will survive many partial reforms of particular institutions, so although the principles of liberty and wisdom at Rome had been crippled in many most important points in their practical application, still their existence was not extinguished, and their influence was even yet plainly perceptible. The great Lawyers of the age of the Antonines passed hastily over the odious page which contained the Law of Treason, and delighted to fix their attention on those wise and liberal provisions which concerned the persons and properties of citizens in their dealings with one another, wherever the Government did not interfere. From the excellence of the Roman Law in these points arose the eminent fame, so justly earned by its professors amidst the general decline of all other studies. It was here only that the wisdom of better times was still practically useful, and might be profitably emulated: so that talents and integrity naturally turned themselves to that field which alone was open to their exertions; and when the higher duties of a Statesman were inaccessible or neglected, those of a Lawyer were fulfilled in an enlightened spirit which later times have been far from imitating.

The Imperial tyranny was most felt at Rome, and by the higher orders.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Imperial tyranny which deluged Rome with blood, affected but little the condition of the Provinces; and that even at Rome itself, its victims were principally chosen from the highest classes, while the mass of the community suffered from it comparatively nothing. It was indeed a bitter change for the Patricians and the Equestrian order, to have their proud and luxurious security invaded by executioners, and to be exposed every hour, at the caprice of their tyrant, to banishment or death. But to the Plebeians, to the inhabitants of the Provinces, and to the slaves, the spirit of the Monarchy was certainly not more insolent and oppressive than that of the old Aristocracy; nor did the worst excesses of the Cæsars ever produce such wide-spreading misery as the triumph of the Aristocratical party under Sylla. Even Cicero had regarded the grant of the *jus Latii*, conferred by Cæsar on the inhabitants of Sicily,* as an intolerable affront to the dignity of Rome. But now the rights of Latin citizenship were enjoyed by all the inhabitants of Spain;† while the Gauls had received the higher privilege of becoming Citizens of Rome,‡ and were thus admissible to the highest offices in the Empire. These two great countries were fast acquiring those marks of intimate union with Italy, which all the revolutions of after ages were unable to efface. Gaul, in particular, began to take a principal part in the Civil wars, and entered into them more with the zeal of an integral portion of the State, than like a Province contending merely for the choice of masters. When Julius Vindex revolted against Nero, his main support was in the devotion of the people of Gaul to his cause; and their efforts were rewarded by Galba with the gift of Roman Citizenship, and the reduction of a fourth part of their taxation for ever.

M. Ulpius Trajanus Crinitus. From A. D. 98. to 117.

But although the Monarchy did not increase the evils to which the greatest part of the subjects of the Empire were liable, yet we must confess that it did little to remove them. That hateful pride which made the Romans so careless of the sufferings of those whom they considered their inferiors, was an effectual bar to any attempts to ameliorate the condition of the Slaves, or to check the abuses of power when exercised only against the poor and ignoble. When in the reign of Nero,* Pedanius Secundus was murdered by one of his slaves, his whole household, consisting of four hundred slaves of both sexes and of all ages, were ordered, according to ancient practice, to be put to death. The populace of Rome, whose natural humanity had not been quite extinguished by the callousness of rank and wealth, rose in tumult to resist the execution. Upon this, the case was debated in the Senate, and C. Cassius, the most celebrated lawyer of his day, strongly urged the expediency of enforcing the sentence. His opinion was approved by a large majority; and to prevent the possibility of a rescue, Nero lined the streets with troops, while these four hundred human beings, most of whom were undoubtedly innocent, and amongst whose number were old men, women, and children, were led to an indiscriminate butchery. So also in the reign of Tiberius, four thousand freed men,† mostly Jews and Egyptians, and guilty of no other crime than that of practising the religious rites of their respective countries, were expelled from Rome, and sent into Sardinia to repress the banditti of that island; a service which, from the unhealthiness of the climate, was almost equivalent to a sentence of death; "but if they perished," says Tacitus, "their loss was of no consequence." The same pride showed itself in more trifling matters, in the behaviour of the great to the humbler classes of society. The door of a wealthy and noble Roman was crowded before day-break by visitors who came to pay their court to him;‡ and who, after undergoing the most insolent treatment from his porter, were seldom admitted to an interview with himself, but were answered by one of his servants; or if he did condescend to see them, they bent down to the ground before him, and kissed his hand with Oriental servility. Hence, a number of subordinate oppressions were practised in the Provinces, and especially in the more inconsiderable towns; so that we read of a request preferred by the people of Juliopolis in Bithynia,§ in the reign of Trajanus, to have a centurion resident among them to protect them from injury. The same feeling also tended to encourage the insolence of the army towards the people, wherever they were quartered. Since Marius first changed the character of the legions by filling them with citizens of the poorest classes, and still more since the Civil wars of the two first Cæsars, the soldiers had learnt to regard themselves as a distinct body in the nation, to whose superior merit and importance all other citizens should pay deference. Then all who did not belong to the army were designated by the term *Pagani*, which soon became used contemptuously, and thus in itself afforded a proof of the undue supremacy

But it did not remove the evils of the old Constitution.

* *Epist. ad Atticum*, xiv. 12. *Multa illis (Siculis) Cæsar, neque me invito: etsi Latinitas erat non ferenda; verumtamen.*
† Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* iii. 3.
‡ Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 8; iv. 74.

* Tacitus, *Annal.* xiv. 42, *et seq.*
† Ibid. ii. 85.
‡ Lucian, *de Moribus Philosophorum*, p. 20, edit. 1615.
§ Pliny, *Epist.* x. 81.

Biography. From A. D. 98. to 117.

of those who could venture to stigmatize all other members of the community. But their offensive behaviour was not confined to words; and we learn from History, no less than from the lively picture of the Satirist,* that the soldiers were in the habit of using personal violence to the Provincials and to the Roman citizens of humble condition; nor did the injured party dare to seek for redress, lest he should provoke the resentment of the offender's comrades.

Helplessness of the People encouraged by Government.

The worst effect however of the Imperial dominion as of that of the Commonwealth, was the helplessness of mind which a cowardly policy taught it to encourage amongst the people of the Provinces. It was maintained by Aristotle,† that a state could not consist of so great a number as a hundred thousand citizens; and although we may smile at the exaggeration of this doctrine, yet it was founded on the justest notions of the duties of a political society, where all should have a common interest, and should be keenly alive to the welfare of each other, and of the whole body. The Greeks, therefore, distinguished between a State and a Dominion; and it was by the latter name, that they characterised that vast mass of countries yoked together at the time of which we are treating under the sovereignty of Rome. The inhabitants then of the greatest part of the Empire were subjects, and not citizens; and that activity and attention to public affairs which is the great virtue of a citizen, is most unwelcome to a Sovereign when he sees it in his subjects. An enlightened despot, like Trajanus, is frequently desirous of promoting the good of his People; but he dreads to see them able and zealous to promote their own; not considering that wealth and security lose half their value when they are passively received from another; and that men will dwindle into children in understanding and energy, when they are obliged to depend in childlike helplessness on the protection of their rulers. It is remarkable, with what exceeding suspicion Trajanus regarded every thing like a principle of internal organization and self-dependence in the People of his Empire. A destructive fire had broken out at Nicomedia in Bithynia,‡ and had been greatly aggravated by the apathy of the people, who looked on without attempting to extinguish it. To prevent the recurrence of such accidents, Pliny, who was then Proconsul of the Province, recommended the institution of a company of engineers, to consist of a hundred and fifty persons, who were to have, we may suppose, a monopoly of the business of firemen, and would know how to act with effect whenever their services were wanted. But Trajanus objected to the proposal, on the express ground, that he did not like the principle of association, as it might lead to factions. On another occasion, the people of Amisus begged to be allowed, according to their own laws,§ to give their ἔρανοι, or public entertainments to the poorer classes, furnished by the subscriptions of the rich. Trajanus consented, as Amisus was a free and confederate city, and was governed by its own laws; but he expressed his hope, that the entertainments might not be abused for purposes of tumult or unlawful assemblies, and he strictly forbade them in all the cities of the Province which were more immediately subject to the Roman jurisdiction. In the same spirit, Pliny, in a letter to the Emperor, expresses his fears lest a practice prevalent in his Province, of the richer inhabitants assembling on certain joyful occasions a great number of the common people, and giving them a largess of one or two *denarii* a man, should grow into a means of political influence. Nor should we omit to mention, the constant reference made by the people of the Provinces to the Government, when they wished to execute any public works of ornament or utility. Sometimes, pecuniary assistance is requested, at other times permission is asked to devote a part of the revenue of a Corporation to such purposes; or the Emperor is applied to to send surveyors and engineers to direct the operations. It seems as if the People had in themselves no principle of activity, but were taught on every occasion to look for aid or for permission to the Government. In the reign of Trajanus certainly, the Government was sufficiently ready to promote any scheme of improvement that promised to be beneficial; but when other Emperors succeeded, who had neither the ability nor the disposition to forward such plans, the evil of encouraging helplessness in the People became apparent, and when the Provinces were neglected by their rulers, they had lost the energy to act for themselves.

M. Ulpius Trajanus Crinitus. From A. D. 98. to 117.

We have been led insensibly to encroach upon a topic which belongs more properly to a subsequent part of this sketch. But the transition, from considering the nature of the Imperial Government to an inquiry into the state of the People, is so faintly marked, that it is difficult when speaking of the one to forbear all mention of the other. We now, however, propose to proceed expressly to this second division of our subject; and to illustrate the physical and moral condition of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire by some notices on each of these following points: 1st, the amount of the national wealth, its distribution, security, and the degree and manner in which it was affected by the Government. 2nd, the state of Literature and general knowledge; and 3rd, that of Morality, in the highest sense of the term, including our duties to God as well as to man.

Of the state of agriculture.

1. It is probable that Agriculture, at least in the western Provinces, had made considerable progress since the reign of Augustus. We do not mean that it was better understood than formerly in those countries where it had been long since practised; but that the gradual establishment of the Roman power had diffused a knowledge of it amongst people to whom it had been hitherto very imperfectly known, and from the union of so many parts of the world under one Government, the natural productions of one country were introduced into another,* and a benefit was thus conferred on mankind which survived the devastations of after ages. The wealth and fertility of Gaul are spoken of in high terms;† its corn and flax were particularly noted;‡ and different methods of manuring the land were practised,§ which argue a state of considerable civilisation. Even Britain, which had been so much more recently conquered, bore marks of the benefits which it derived from its connection with the Roman Empire. There, too, the use of marl for manure was familiarly known, and the cherry had been already introduced,‖ a fact deserving of notice, as it shows that not only the most necessary

* St. Luke, iii. 14. Juvenal, *Sat.* xvi.
† *Ethic. Nicomach.* ix. 10. ‡ Pliny, *Epist.* x. 42, 43.
§ Ibid. x. 93, 94.

* Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxvii. 1.
† Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 73, 74.
‡ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xviii. 8, 9; xix. 1.
§ Ibid. xvii. 6—8. ‖ Ibid. xv. 25.

articles of food, but fruits and vegetables, for comfort and luxury, found their way into the Provinces very soon after their conquest. The whole coast of Spain is pronounced by Pliny,* to be the finest country except Italy, with which he was acquainted; and the list of towns which he has given us in Lusitania, and the northern part of Spain, marks the advances made by those Provinces since the time of Strabo. We hear much, it is true, of the decay of Agriculture in Italy itself, and the greater part of that country seems to have been no more than a pleasure-ground for the wealthy Romans, while their farms for profit were in the Provinces; but the north of Italy must probably be excepted from this description, as its towns were more numerous and flourishing than those of the south and centre, and its inhabitants were said to retain a simpler and purer character.† It was probably owing to the increased resources of the western Provinces, that Rome was enabled, on one memorable occasion in the reign of Trajanus,‡ to send large supplies of corn to Egypt, when, owing to an extraordinary drought, the Nile had not afforded its usual salutary inundation. This peaceful triumph of Italy is celebrated by Pliny, as one of the greatest glories of the age of Trajanus; and he extols the happy effects of civilisation, which had now connected the most remote countries together, and had obviated the evils of an accidental scarcity in one Province, by enabling it instantly to be relieved by the superfluous plenty of another.

Of commerce.

To what extent internal commerce was carried between the different parts of the Empire, it is scarcely possible to form an accurate judgment. The more general expressions of Historians are of little value, because they speak comparatively rather than absolutely; and no one can doubt, that the activity of trade under the Emperors must have appeared exceedingly great, when compared with any former period of History. As to the foreign commerce which was mostly carried on with India, the principal articles thus imported were silks and other luxuries, for which there was a great demand among persons of the highest fortune, but they were not used by the mass of the people.

Condition of the People at large.

It is sufficiently clear, that a wealthy Roman could command many comforts and luxuries; but how far comforts or even necessaries were within the reach of the majority of the inhabitants of the Empire, is a much more difficult and a more important question. The place of our labourers and operative manufacturers being almost entirely supplied by slaves, we have no opportunity of comparing the price of labour with that of provision, the surest criterion of public prosperity, if the welfare of the majority be justly regarded as the welfare of the nation. But it seems probable, that the free population of the Roman Empire was small in proportion to the extent of its territory; and thus, that there was little of that severe distress which visits more thickly-peopled countries, even where their Moral and Political institutions are far superior to those of Rome. In Italy itself, several laws were enacted to discourage celibacy, and peculiar privileges were conferred on the father of a numerous family. That these provisions were not dictated by a mere undistinguishing desire of multiplying the number of citizens, is proved not only by the general complaints which we meet with of the decay of the free population, but by the remark of Pliny that most * persons thought even one child an inconvenience; and by the number of instances in which a successor to the Imperial dignity was obtained by adoption, because the Emperor had no natural heir. We may suppose that the eastern Provinces were in this respect similarly circumstanced; for their morals in general were sufficiently licentious; and the unnatural indifference of parents to the fate of their children appears from one † of Pliny's letters, in which he describes the foundlings in his Province of Bithynia as forming a numerous body, and states that many of them when exposed were picked up by persons who made a profit of selling them for slaves. In the western Provinces, where the physical and moral character of the people was more favourable to population, their situation was that of new countries, where the inhabitants have not yet had time to multiply in proportion to the means of subsistence. We must consider too, when calculating the comforts of the Roman People, that the climate under which they lived enabled them to dispense with many things, the want of which in the north of Europe is a sensible privation. Well-built houses, a plentiful supply of fuel, and a large quantity of substantial food, were not to them objects of the first necessity. As amongst their descendants at this day, their principal enjoyments were not to be found at home; and if public buildings and places of public amusement were more numerous and more magnificent than with us, it was only because the fewer wants of the people obliged them to a less unremitting industry, and while the stimulus of diversion was more easily procured in the Amphitheatre or the Colonnade, the neglected state of their individual dwellings could be endured without any sensation of wretchedness.

Of the security of property.

Of the security of property in the Roman Empire we should judge unfavourably, if we compared it with the unrivalled protection which it actually enjoys in most countries of modern Europe. Yet our ancestors, less than a century ago, would have had little reason to exult over the Romans; when Johnson might apply with justice to London, the picture drawn by Juvenal of the outrages nightly committed in the streets of Rome, when highway robbery was constantly expected and often experienced by every traveller, and a still more audacious system of rapine was yet unscrupulously practised in the Highlands of Scotland. Even at that period, however, we should have been surprised to hear of such acts as those noticed in one of Pliny's Letters;‡ where he mentions the total disappearance of a distinguished individual of the Equestrian order in the neighbourhood of Ocriculum, that is in the very heart of Italy, about seventy miles from Rome. No traces of his fate were to be discovered, and the same thing had happened a short time before to a citizen of Comum, when travelling homewards with a large sum of money from Rome. To these dangers of travelling must be added, at least in the Provinces, the oppressions and vexations which poor and humble men often suffered from their more powerful neighbours, and for which under most of the Provincial Governors they

* Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxvii. 13.
† Ibid. *Epist.* i. 14. ‡ Ibid. *Panegyric.* 30. *et seq.*

* *Epist.* iv. 15. † Ibid. x. 71. ‡ Ibid. vi. 25.

could find no redress. Hence Columella * advises those who were purchasing estates to make themselves first acquainted with the characters of their neighbours; and he confirms his precept by his own experience, as one of his neighbours was continually felling his trees, robbing his plantations, and carrying off his cattle.

Of the revenue.

We have spoken at some length of the Roman revenue in our survey of the Empire during the reign of Augustus. To the account of it there given we have little to add, except to observe, that its amount varied largely under different Emperors; that Galba for example lightened considerably the public burdens, † while Vespasianus ‡ again imposed the taxes which had been taken off, and carried the exactions of the Treasury to the highest pitch. The most fruitful sources of revenue, as far as Roman citizens were concerned, were to be found in the Julian and Papian Laws, and in the legacy duty of five per cent., which, as we have seen, Trajanus considerably moderated. By the former, unmarried men between twenty and sixty, § and even married men between twenty-five and sixty if they had never had any children, were incapable of inheriting from any but their nearest relations, and the property bequeathed to them devolved upon the Treasury. The Provincials were subject to a land tax and poll tax, and to those other impositions which we have formerly noticed when speaking of this subject. They were besides burdened with the maintenance of the Roman Magistrates by whom they were governed; and if the ordinary expenses of the *Proconsul* or *Procurator* were provided for by a fixed sum raised for the purpose, yet when they travelled through the Province, they demanded what they thought proper, for the support of themselves ‖ and their domestic establishment, from the inhabitants of the district wherein they happened to stop. Sometimes, too, the Provincial cities were expected to send a deputation to Rome ¶ every year with a loyal address to the Emperor, or to welcome their *Proconsul* on his first arrival amongst them. To this must be added, the various exactions which they often suffered from the oppression of their Governors; although in the reign of Trajanus offenders of this kind were frequently brought to trial, and sometimes to punishment.

State of Literature.

2. We have already expressed our opinion, that the merits of Roman Literature even in its most flourishing period have been greatly overrated; and we believe that a review of its condition at the end of the Ist century of the Christian era, might tend to lessen our wonder at the ignorance which afterwards prevailed throughout Europe. Our first impression would probably be highly favourable: we meet with the names of a great many writers, whose reputation is even now eminent; we know that Learning was not only held in honour in the eastern Provinces, where it had been long since cultivated, but that Gaul, and Spain, and Africa abounded with schools and orators, and that a taste for literary studies had been introduced even into Britain. The names of the most distinguished Orators at Rome were familiarly known in the remotest parts of the Empire,** and any splendid passages in their speeches were copied out by the Provincial students, and sent down to their friends at home to excite their admiration, and serve as models for their imitation. Even the Roman Laws, once so cold and so disdainful of Literature and the Fine Arts, had in some points adopted a more conciliating language; and the profession of a Sophist * was a legal exemption from the duties of a juryman in the *Conventus* or circuits of the Provincial Judges. The Age of Trajanus then had greatly the advantage over that of Augustus in the more general diffusion of Knowledge, while in the comparison of individual writers the eminence which Virgil and Horace attained in Poetry was at least equalled by the Historical fame of Tacitus. But although Knowledge was more common than it had been a century before, still its range was necessarily confined; nor before the invention of printing could it possibly be otherwise. Pliny expresses † his surprise at hearing that there was a bookseller's shop to be found at *Lugdunum* or Lyons; yet this very city had been for a long time the scene of public recitations in Greek and Latin, in which the orators of Gaul contended for the prize of eloquence. Thus, instead of the various clubs, reading-rooms, circulating libraries, and book-societies, which make so many thousands in our day acquainted with every new publication worthy of notice, it was the practice of authors at Rome to read aloud their compositions to a large audience of their friends and acquaintance; and not only Poetry and Orations were thus recited, but also works of History. ‡ To attend these readings was often naturally enough considered rather an irksome civility; they who went at first reluctantly were apt to be but languid auditors; and we all know, that even to those most fond of Literature, it is no agreeable task to sit hour after hour the unemployed and constrained listeners alike to the eloquence or dulness, to the sense or folly of another. The weariness then of the audience was to be relieved by the selection of brilliant and forcible passages; their feelings were to be gratified rather than their understandings; and amidst the excitement of a crowded hall, and an impassioned recitation, there was no room for that silent exercise of judgment and reflection which alone leads to wisdom. From this habit then of *hearing* books rather than *reading* them, it was natural that Poetry and Oratory should be the most popular kinds of Literature; and that History, as we have observed in our notice of the Roman Historians, should be tempted to assume the charms of Oratory, in order to procure for itself an audience. A detail of facts cannot be remembered by being once heard; and many of the most useful inquiries or discussions in History, however valuable to the thoughtful student, are not the best calculated to win the attention of a mixed audience, when orally delivered. The scarcity of books therefore, inducing the practice of reading them aloud to many hearers, instead of reserving them for hours of solitude and undisturbed thought, may be considered as one of the chief causes of the false luxuriance of Literature at Rome in the reigns of the first Emperors, and of its early and complete decay. We have already noticed the unworthy ideas which the Romans entertained of its nature, and

* *De Re Rustică*, i. 2.
† Suetonius, *in Galba*, 15.
‡ Ibid. *in Vespasiano*, 16.
§ Hugo, *Geschichte de Romischen Rechts*, p. 623, *et seq.*
‖ Pliny, *Epist.* ix. 33.
¶ Ibid. x. 52.
** *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, 8.

* Pliny, *Epist.* x. 66.
† Ibid. *Epist.* ix. 11.
‡ Ibid. *Epist.* vii. 17; ix. 27. Compare also i. 13; vi. 15; viii. 12.

how completely they degraded it into a mere plaything of men's prosperous hours, an elegant amusement, and an embellishment of life; not a matter of serious use to individuals and to the State. Works of Physical Science, and much more such as tend to illustrate the useful Arts, were therefore almost unknown; so also were books of Travels, details of Statistics, and every thing relating to Political Economy. Had books of this description been numerous, it would indeed have been strange if the Roman Empire had afterwards relapsed into ignorance. The nations by whom it was overrun would readily have appreciated the benefits of a knowledge which daily made life more comfortable, and nations more enlightened and more prosperous: and the advantages of cultivating the understanding would have been as obvious to men of every condition in Rome, as they are actually at the present time in England, Germany, and America. As a proof of this we may observe, that the only two kinds of really valuable knowledge which the Romans had to communicate to their northern conquerors, were both adopted by them with eagerness; we mean their Law, and their Religion, The Roman Code found its way, or rather retained much of its authority in the Kingdoms founded upon the ruins of the Empire, and its wisdom imperceptibly influenced the Law of those countries which affected most to regard it with jealousy and aversion. And the Christian Religion, in like manner, survived the confusion of the IVth and Vth centuries, and continually exercised its beneficent power in ensuring individual happiness, and lessening the amount of public misery. If together with these Rome could have offered to her conquerors an enlarged knowledge of Nature and of the useful Arts, and clear views of the principles of Political economy, and the higher Science of Legislation in general, we need not doubt that they would have accepted these gifts also, and that thus the corruption to which her Law and Religion were exposed, would have been in a great measure obviated. For it is a most important truth, and one which requires at this day to be most earnestly enforced, that it is b the study of facts, whether relating to Nature or to Man, and not by any pretended cultivation of the mind by Poetry, Oratory, and Moral or Critical dissertations, that the understandings of mankind in general will be most improved, and their views of things rendered most accurate. And the reason of this is, that every man has a fondness for knowledge of some kind; and by acquainting himself with those facts or truths which are most suited to his taste, he finds himself gaining something, the value of which he can appreciate, and in the pursuit of which, therefore, all his natural faculties will be best developed. From the mass of varied knowledge thus possessed by the several members of the community, arises the great characteristic of a really enlightened Age, a sound and sensible judgment; a quality which can only be formed by the habit of regarding things in different lights, as they appear to intelligent men of different pursuits and in different classes of society, and by thus correcting the limited notions to which the greatest minds are liable, when left to indulge without a corrective in their own peculiar train of opinions. Want of judgment, therefore, is the prevailing defect in all periods of imperfect civilisation, and in those wherein the showy branches of Literature have been forced by patronage, while the more beneficial parts of Knowledge have been neglected. Nor is it to the purpose to say, that the study of facts is of no benefit, unless we form from them some general conclusions. The disease of the human mind is impatiently to anticipate conclusions; so little danger is there that it will be slow in deducing them, when it is once in possession of premises from which they may justly be derived. But, on the other hand, wherever words and striking images are mainly studied, as was the case in ancient Rome, Man's natural indolence is encouraged, and he proceeds at once to reason without taking the trouble of providing himself with the necessary materials. Eloquence, indeed, and great natural ability, may, in the most favourable instances, disguise to the vulgar the shallowness which lurks beneath them; but with the mass of mankind this system is altogether fatal:—Learning, in the only shape in which it presents itself to their eyes, is to them utterly useless; they have no desire to pursue it, and, if they had such, their pursuit would be fruitless. They remain therefore in their natural ignorance; not partaking in the pretended cultivation of their Age, and feeling no deprivation when the ill-rooted Literature which was the mere amusement of the great and wealthy is swept away by the first considerable revolution in the state of society.

The decay of Learning then, which we are called to account for is of all things the most readily explained. Unsubstantial as it was, it would have worn out of itself, as it did at Constantinople, even if no external violence had overwhelmed it. Facts indeed, whether Physical or Moral, are a food which will not only preserve the mind in vigour, but increasing in number with every successive century, furnish it with the means of an almost infinite progress. But the changes on words and sentiments are soon capable of being exhausted; the earliest writers seize their best and happiest combinations, and nothing is left for their successors but imitation or necessary inferiority. Poetry had fallen sufficiently low in the hands of Silius Italicus, and History in those of Appian and Dion Cassius; the Romans themselves in the reign of Trajanus acknowledged their inferiority to their ancestors in Oratory, and in a few centuries more the vessel was drained out to the dregs. The great excellence of Tacitus is a mere individual instance, and we might as well ask, why Rome had produced no Historian of equal merit before him, as why she produced none such after him. One other great man had died only a few years before the accession of Trajanus, whose example, had it been imitated, might have produced a great revolution in the intellectual state of the Roman Empire. We speak of the elder Pliny, the Natural Historian. The particulars of his life and death recorded by his nephew, no less than the contents of his own work, display a thirst after real knowledge, and an active spirit in searching for it, by a personal study of the great book of nature, which rose far above the false views, and the Literary indolence of his contemporaries. But he was a splendid exception to the spirit of his Age, and there arose none to tread in his steps. Posterity were contented to read his writings, rather than improve upon them by imitating his example; and his authority continued to be quoted with reverence on all points of Natural History, even down to a period when errors, which in him were unavoidable, could no longer be repeated without disgrace.

It may be asked, however, why the example of Pliny was not followed, and why the most valuable parts of human knowledge were so unhappily neglected. In addition to the cause which we have already mentioned, namely, the scarcity of books, the practice of recitations, and the consequent discouragement of any compositions that were not lively and eloquent, there are several other circumstances which tended to produce the same effect. The natural indolence of mankind and their attachment to the old beaten track were powerful obstacles to the improvements that were most required; and if so many centuries elapsed in later times before the birth of Bacon, we need not wonder that no man of equal powers with Pliny arose at Rome between the age of Trajanus and the fall of the Western Empire. We must consider also the general helplessness of mind produced by such a Government as that of Rome; which, while it deprived men of the noblest field for their exertions,—a participation direct or indirect in the management of the affairs of the nation,—did not, like some modern Despotisms, encourage activity of another kind, by its patronage of manufactures and commerce. If we ask, further, why commerce did not thrive of itself without the aid of the Government, and why the internal trade kept up between the different parts of an Empire so admirably supplied with the means of mutual intercourse was not on a scale of the greatest magnitude, the answer is to be found partly in the habits of the nations of the south of Europe, which, with some exceptions, have never been addicted to much commercial enterprise, and much more to the want of capital amongst private individuals, and the absence of a demand for distant commodities amongst the People at large, owing to their general poverty. The enormous sums lavished by the Emperors and possessed by some of the Nobility, or by fortunate individuals of the inferior classes, have provoked the scepticism of many modern readers, as implying a mass of wealth in the Roman Empire utterly incredible. They rather show how unequally property was distributed; an evil of very long standing at Rome, and aggravated probably by the merciless exactions of many of the Emperors, who seemed literally unsatisfied so long as any of their subjects possessed any thing. The Indian trade, which furnished articles of luxury for the consumption of the Great, was therefore in a flourishing condition; but not so that internal commerce in articles of ordinary comfort, which in most countries of modern Europe is carried on with such incessant activity. Where trade is at a low ebb, the means of communication between different countries are always defective; and hence there exists undisturbed a large amount of inactivity and ignorance, and a necessarily low state of Physical Science and the study of Nature. So that from all these causes together, there would result that effect on the intellectual condition of the Roman Empire, which we have described as so unfavourable.

Of the moral state of the Empire.

From this unsatisfactory picture we turn with delight to the contemplation of a promise and of a partial beginning of Moral improvement, such as Rome had never seen before. We need not dwell upon the need that there was for such a reform, except to observe, that there can be no better proof of a degraded state of Morals, than the want of natural affection in parents towards their offspring; and that the practice of infanticide,* or that of exposing children soon after their birth, together with the fact that Trajanus found it necessary to provide for five thousand children at the public expense, and that Pliny imitated his example on a smaller scale in his own town of Comum, sufficiently show how greatly parents neglected their most natural duty. It is remarkable, also, that the younger Pliny, a man by no means destitute of virtue, could not only write and circulate indecent verses, but deliberately justify himself for having done so.† Yet, with all this, the writings of Epictetus and M. Aurelius Antoninus, if we may include the latter in a review of the reign of Trajanus, present a far purer and truer Morality than the Romans had yet been acquainted with from any Heathen pen. The Providence of God, the gratitude which we owe him for all his gifts, and the duty of submission to his will, are prominently brought forward; while the duties of man to man, the claims which our neighbours have upon our constant exertions to do them service, and the excellence of abstaining from revenge or uncharitable feelings, are enforced with far greater earnestness than in the writings of the older Philosophers. We cannot, indeed, refuse to admire the noble effort of the Stoic Philosophy to release mankind from the pressure of Physical Evil, and to direct their minds with undivided affection to the pursuit of Moral Good. When the prospect beyond the grave was all darkness, the apparently confused scene of human life could not but perplex the best and wisest; sickness, loss of friends, poverty, slavery, or an untimely death, might visit him who had laboured most steadily in the practice of Virtue; and even Aristotle himself‡ is forced with his own hands to destroy the theory of happiness which he had so elaborately formed, by the confession that the purest virtue might be so assailed with external evils that it could only preserve its possessor from absolute misery. The Stoics assumed a bolder language, and strove with admirable firmness to convince reluctant nature of its truth. Happiness, as they taught, was neither unattainable by Man, nor dependent on external circumstances; the Providence of God had not,§ according to the vulgar complaint, scattered Good and Evil indiscriminately upon the virtuous and the wicked; the gifts and the deprivations of fortune were neither good nor evil; and all that was really good was Virtue, all that was really bad was Vice, which were respectively chosen by men at their own will, and so chosen that the distribution of happiness and misery to each was in exact proportion to his own deservings. But as it was not possible to attain to this estimate of external things without the most severe discipline, the Stoics taught their disciples to desire nothing at all,‖ till they had so changed their nature as to desire nothing but what was really good. In the same way, they inculcated an absence of all feelings, in order to avoid sub-

M. Ulpius Trajanus Crinitus. From A. D. 98. to 117.

Of the Stoic Philosophy.

In excellencies.

* Is not the prevalence of infanticide among the Romans indicated by the observation which Tacitus makes concerning the Jews? *Hist.* v. 5,—*Augendæ multitudini consulitur. Nam necare quemquam ex agnatis, nefas.* And, again, he says the same thing of the Germans, *German.* 19,—*Numerum liberorum finire, aut quemquam ex agnatis necare, flagitium habetur.*

† *Epist.* iv. 14; v. 3.

‡ *Ethic. Nicomach.* l. 10,—Ἄθλιος μὲν οὐδέποτε γένοιτ' ἂν ὁ σπουδαῖος, οὐ μὴν μακάριός γε, ἂν Πριαμικαῖς τύχαις περιπέσῃ.

§ Epictetus, *Enchiridion*, 38. ‖ Ibid. 7.

jecting ourselves to any other power than that of Reason. When our friends were in distress,* we might appear outwardly to sympathize with their sorrow, but we were by no means to grieve with them in heart; a parent should not be roused to punish his son,† for it was better that the son should turn out ill, than that the father should be diverted from the care of his own mind by his interest for another. Death was to be regarded as the common lot of all,‡ and the frailty of our nature should accustom us to view it without surprise and alarm. In itself it must be an extinction of being,§ or a translation to another state, still equally under the government of a wise and good Providence; it could not then be justly an object of fear, and our only care should be to wait for its coming without anxiety, and to improve the time allotted to us before its arrival, whether it were but a day or half a century.

Its imperfections.

Such were the doctrines of the Stoic Philosophers of the Age of Trajanus; and assuredly it must be a strange blindness or uncharitableness that can refuse to admire them. He can entertain but unworthy notions of the wisdom of God, who is afraid lest the wisdom of Man should rival it. The Stoic Philosophy was unfitted for the weakness of human nature; its contempt of Physical Evil was revolting to the common sense of mankind, and was absolutely unattainable by persons of delicate bodily constitutions; and thus, generally speaking, by one-half of the human race, and particularly by that sex which under a wiser discipline has been found capable of attaining to such high excellence. Above all, it could not represent God to Man under those peculiar characters, in which every affection and faculty of our nature finds its proper object and guide. There are many passages in the works of Epictetus and M. Antoninus, in which His general Providence and our duties towards Him are forcibly declared; still He seems to be at the most no more than a part of their system, and that neither the most striking, nor the most fully developed. But in order to make us like Him, it was necessary that in all our views of life, in our motives, in our hopes, and in our affections, God should be all in all; that he should be represented to us, not as He is in Himself, but as he stands related *to us*,—as our Father, and our Saviour, and the Author of all our goodness; in those characters, in short, under which the otherwise incomprehensible Deity has so revealed himself as to be known and loved, not only by the strongest and wisest of his creatures, but also by the weak and the ignorant.

One great defect in the ancient systems of Philosophy was their want of authority. It was Opinion opposed to Opinion, and thus the disputes of the several Sects seemed incapable of ever arriving at a decision. Plain men, therefore, were bewildered by the conflicting pretensions of their teachers, when they turned to seek some relief from the utter folly and worthlessness of the popular Religion. So that a large portion of mankind were likely to adopt the advice of Lucian,‖ to regard with contempt all the high discussions of the Philosophers relating to the end and principle of our being, and to think only of the present, bestowing serious thoughts upon nothing, and endeavouring to pass through life laughingly. Something, too, must be ascribed not only to the discordant opinions of the Philosophers, but to their reputed dishonesty; and the suspicion which attached to them of turning Morality into a trade. Their temptations were strong, and such as we have seen even the teachers of Christianity unable often to resist. In an Age of ignorance, just made conscious of its own deficiencies, any Moral and intellectual superiority is regarded with veneration; and when the Sophists professed to teach men the true business of life, they found many who were eager to listen to them. Then followed an aggravation of the evils of popular preaching under another name: the Sophists aspired to be Orators as well as Moralists; and their success would depend as much on their eloquence and impressive delivery, as on the soundness of their doctrines. In the eastern part of the Empire their ascendency was great; and if the story of Philostratus be true,* the Philosophers in Egypt formed as considerable a body, and, during the stay of Vespasianus at Alexandria, claimed the right of advising Princes as boldly, as the Romish Clergy of a later period have done. With these means of influence, and the consequent temptation to abuse it, the Sophists were without that organization and discipline, which in the Christian Church preserved the purity, or checked the excesses of individual teachers; and not being responsible to any one for their conduct, they were less scrupulous in avoiding censure. The same want of organization prevented them from acting in concert in the several parts of the Empire, and from directing their attention on a regular system to all classes of the community from the highest to the lowest. The Sophists were no Missionaries, and poor or remote districts, which could tempt neither their cupidity nor their ambition, derived little advantage from their knowledge.

The Sophists.

Under these circumstances, the Christian Religion had grown with surprising rapidity, and must have produced effects on the character and happiness of individuals, far greater than the common details of History will allow us to estimate. If our sole information were derived from Pliny's famous Letter, we must yet be struck with the first instance in Roman History of a society for the encouragement of the highest virtues, those of piety, integrity, and purity, and embracing persons of both sexes and of all conditions. Such a project was indeed a complete remedy for the prevailing faults of the times: it promised not only to *teach* goodness, but actively to disseminate it; and to do away those degrading distinctions between slaves and freemen, and even between men and women, which had so limited the views of the Philosophers in their plans for the improvement of mankind. Of all subjects for History none would be so profitable as the fortunes of the Christian society; to trace the various causes which impeded or corrupted its operations, and to bring at the same time fully into view, that vast amount of good which its inherent excellence enabled it still to effect, amidst all external obstacles and internal corruptions. We think that its friends have not rightly understood the several elements which have led to its partial failure, while we are certain that its enemies can never appreciate its benefits. But we must

* Epictetus, *Enchirid.* 22. † Ibid. 16.
‡ M. Antoninus, iii. 3; iv. 32. 43. § Ibid. vii 32.
‖ *Necyomanteia*, p. 166.

* *In vitâ Apollonii Tyanei*, v. 27, *et seq.*

not enter upon this most inviting field at present; and from the long, but very imperfect survey which we have attempted to give of the state of the Empire, we must at last return to the History of Trajanus, and hasten to conclude this memoir, after we have briefly noticed the character of his individual Government, and his expedition into the East.

Of the Government of Trajanus.

The highest spirit of a Sovereign is to labour to bring his Government, in every point of view, as nearly as possible to a state of absolute perfection; his next highest praise, is to administer the system which he finds established, with the greatest purity and liberality. This glory was certainly deserved by Trajanus; and although he never thought of amending some of the greatest evils of the times, yet, as far as his people had suffered from the direct tyranny and wastefulness of former Governments, his reign was a complete relief; and we can easily account for the warm affection with which his memory was so long regarded in after ages. He pleased the Romans by observing many of the forms of a free Constitution; nor ought we to suspect that in so doing he was actuated by Policy only, for he was quite capable of feeling the superior dignity of the Magistrate of a free people to that of a Tyrant; and he most probably spoke from his heart, when on presenting the sword to the Præfect of the Prætorian guards, he desired him to use that weapon in his service so long as he governed well, but to turn it against him if ever he should abuse his power.* There is the same spirit observable in his conduct during his third Consulship: as soon as he had been elected, he walked up to the chair of the *Consul* who presided at the *Comitia;* and whilst he stood before it, the *Consul*, without rising from his seat,† administered to him the usual Consular oath, that he would discharge his office faithfully. And when his Consulship had expired, he again took an oath,‡ that he had done nothing, during the time that he had held it, which was contrary to Law. These professions of regard to the welfare of his People were well verified by his actions. His suppression of the informers; his discouraging prosecutions under the *Leges Majestatis;* his relaxation of the tax on inheritances; and the impartiality with which he suffered the law to take its course against his own Procurators, when they were guilty of any abuse of power, were all real proofs of his sincerity; and they were not belied by any subsequent measures at a later period of his reign. The causes which were brought before himself immediately, he tried with fairness and attention;§ and it was on an occasion of this kind, when Eurythmus, one of his freedmen and Procurators, was implicated in a charge of tampering with a Will, and the prosecutors seemed reluctant to press their accusation against a person so connected with the Emperor, that he observed to them, "Eurythmus is not a Polycletus," (one of the most powerful of Nero's freedmen and favourites,) "nor am I a Nero." In his care of the Provinces, and in his answers to the questions to him by the younger Pliny when *Proconsul* of Bithynia, he manifested a love of justice, an attention to the comforts of the People, and a minute knowledge of the details of the administration, which are most highly creditable to him. It is mentioned, too, that he was very careful in noticing the good conduct of the officers employed in the Provinces;* and considered the testimonials of regard given by a Province to its Governor, as affording him a just title to higher distinctions at Rome. The materials for the History of this reign are indeed so scanty, that we know scarcely any thing of the lives and characters of the men who were most distinguished under it, nor can we enliven our narrative with many of those Biographical sketches, which by bringing out individuals in a clear and strong light, illustrate most happily the general picture of the age. But C. Plinius Secundus, whom Trajanus made *Proconsul* of Bithynia, affords one memorable exception; and we gladly seize this opportunity to bestow some particular notice on one of the most distinguished persons who lived in these times.

Pliny the Younger.

C. Plinius Cæcilius Secundus was born at or near Comum, about the sixth year of the reign of Nero, or A. D. 61. His mother was a sister of C. Plinius, the Natural Historian; and as he lost his father at an early period, he removed with her to the house of his uncle, with whom he resided for some years, and was adopted by him, and, consequently, assumed his name in addition to his parental one, Cæcilius. He appears to have been of a delicate constitution, and even in his youth to have possessed little personal activity and enterprise; for at the time of the famous eruption of Vesuvius, when he was between seventeen and eighteen, he continued his studies at home, and allowed his uncle to set out to the mountain without him. In Literature, however, he made considerable progress, according to the estimate of those times: he composed a Greek Tragedy when he was only fourteen,† and wrote Latin verses on several occasions throughout his life; he attended the Lectures of Quinctilianus,‡ and some other eminent Rhetoricians, and assiduously cultivated his style as an elegant writer and an Orator. In this latter capacity he acquired great credit, and to this cause he was probably indebted for his Political advancement. He went through the whole succession of public offices from that of *Quæstor* to the high dignities of *Consul* and *Augur*, and was so esteemed by Trajanus as to be selected by him for the Government of Bithynia, because there were many abuses in that Province, which required a man of ability and integrity to remove them.§ The trust so honourably committed to him he seems to have discharged with great fidelity; and the attention to every branch of his duties, which his Letters to Trajanus display, is peculiarly praiseworthy in a man of sedentary habits, and accustomed to the enjoyments of his villas, and the stimulants of Literary glory at Rome. His character as a husband, a master, and a friend, was affectionate, kind, and generous; he displayed also a noble liberality towards his native town Comum, by forming a public library there, and devoting a yearly sum of 300,000 sesterces for ever to the maintenance of children born of free parents who were Citizens of Comum. A man like Plinius, of considerable talents and learning, possessed of great wealth, and of an amiable and generous disposition, was sure to meet with many friends, and with still more who would gratify his vanity by their praises and apparent admiration of his abilities. But as a writer he has done nothing to entitle him to a very high

* Dion Cassius, lxviii. 778. Sex. Aur. Victor. *in Trajano.*
† Pliny, *Panegyric.* 64. ‡ Ibid. 65.
§ Pliny, *Epist.* vi. 31.

* Pliny, *Panegyric.* 70. † Ibid. vii. 4.
‡ Ibid. ii. 14. § Ibid. x. 41.

place in the judgment of posterity. His *Panegyric* of Trajanus belongs to a class of compositions, the whole object of which was to produce a striking effect, and it must not aspire to any greater reward. It is ingenious and eloquent, but by its very nature it gives no room for the exercise of the highest faculties of the mind, nor will its readers derive from it any more substantial benefit than the pleasure which a mere elegant composition can afford. His *Letters* are valuable to us, as all original Letters of other times must be, because they necessarily throw much light on the period at which they were written. But many of them are ridiculously studied, and leave the impression, so fatal to our interest in the perusal of such compositions, that they were written for the express purpose of publication. In short, the works of Plinius, compared with the reputation which he enjoyed among his contemporaries, seem to us greatly to confirm the view which we have taken of the inferiority of the Literature of this period, and of the unworthy notions which were entertained of its proper excellence.

The Eastern expedition of Trajanus.

It was in the seventeenth year of the reign of Trajanus, after a peaceful period of seven or eight years, that war again broke out in the East, and the Roman and Parthian Empires became involved in direct hostilities with each other. We are neither acquainted with the causes of the quarrel, nor with the precise period of its commencement; but we are merely told, that the chief operations of the first campaign consisted in the capture of *Nisibis* and *Batnæ** towns of Mesopotamia, and that for these successes, the Senate bestowed on the Emperor the title of *Parthicus*. *Nisibis* is a name which often occurs in the history of the subsequent wars between Rome and Persia; and *Batnæ* was a Macedonian colony,† and the seat of a celebrated fair, held annually in the month of September, to which there was a general resort of merchants for the purchase of commodities of India, China, and other parts of the East. On the approach of winter, Trajanus returned to Antioch, and during his stay in that city it was visited by a most fatal earthquake, which lasted for several days, and destroyed a vast multitude of persons of every condition; Trajanus himself, it is said, escaping with difficulty from the ruin of the house in which he was residing.‡ The next campaign presents us with a series of rapid and short-lived conquests, such as the East has often witnessed. It appears that the moment was happily chosen, for the Parthian Monarchy was torn by intestine contests, and was unable to offer any resistance; so that the advance of the Roman troops was a triumphant progress, and they crossed the Tigris, overran *Adiabene*, were gratified by visiting Babylon as conquerors, and finally took *Ctesiphon*, the Capital of the Parthian Empire. Trajanus, elated with these successes, and emulating the glory of Alexander while he traversed the countries which had been the scene of his exploits, descended the Tigris to its mouth, to behold the Persian Gulf; and it is said, that seeing there a vessel ready to sail for India, he exclaimed that if he were a younger man he would carry his arms against the Indians. But on his return from the sea coast to Babylon, he learned how sudden are the vicissitudes of Asiatic warfare. While he had been dreaming of the invasion of India, his conquests of the preceding year were vanishing from his grasp. As soon as the immediate terror of his army was withdrawn, the countries which he had overrun shook off the yoke, and *Nisibis*, amongst other places, either drove out or reduced the Roman garrison, and recovered its independence. Nor were the efforts of Trajanus as successful as they had been in the preceding summer. *Nisibis*, indeed, was retaken, and the Emperor enjoyed the empty glory of giving away the Crown of Parthia to a Prince whom Dion Cassius calls Parthamaspates, and whose reign was likely to last no longer than whilst the Romans were at hand to protect him. But Maximus, a man of Consular rank, on whom Trajanus had bestowed the command of a separate army, was defeated and slain in Mesopotamia; and Trajanus himself closed the campaign with disgrace, after having lost a great number of men in a fruitless siege of *Hatra*,* a small town of Mesopotamia, standing in the midst of a desert, and protected by the utter barrenness of the country around it, and the scarcity of fresh water. At the end of the season the Romans fell back into Syria, with the hope of renewing their invasion of Mesopotamia in the following Spring; but Trajanus was seized with a lingering illness, which obliged him to resign all thoughts of taking the command in person; and he wished, therefore, to return himself to Rome, leaving the army to the care of Ælius Hadrianus, a native of the Spanish town of *Italica* in which he had himself been born, and who had married his niece. As he had no children, the state of his health excited great anxiety as to the person whom he would adopt as his successor, and his wife Plotina is said to have used all her influence in favour of Hadrianus; but it was generally believed that she could never persuade her husband to adopt him, and that the instrument which she produced, and sent to Hadrianus at Antioch immediately before the death of Trajanus, was, in reality, a forgery of her own. It was known, at least, that she was present with the Emperor when he died, and that she took care that no particulars of his illness should transpire, but such as she chose herself to circulate. Trajanus died at *Selinus* in Cilicia,† in the month of August, A. D. 117, after a reign of nineteen years, and a little more than six months.

His sickness.

And death.

In addition to what we have said of his public character, we may add, that he was an affectionate husband and brother; and that the cordiality which subsisted between his wife Plotina and his sister Mariana‡ was thought to reflect honour, not only on themselves, but on him. It is said by Sex. Victor, that he was addicted to intemperance in drinking; and the circumstance of his being dropsical in his last illness agrees with this imputation. But as a Sovereign, his popularity during his lifetime was equalled by the regard entertained for his memory by posterity; and his claim to the title of *Optimus*, which the Senate solemnly bestowed on him, was confirmed by the voice of succeeding times; inasmuch as for two hundred years after his death the Senate,§ in pouring forth their prayers for the happiness of a new Emperor, were accustomed to wish, that he might surpass the prosperity of Augustus, and the goodness of Trajanus.

* Dion Cassius, lxviii. 781.
† Ammian. Marcel. xiv. 7. edit. Vales. ‡ Dion Cassius, *ubi supra*.

* See Ammian. Marcel. xxv. 301.
† Dion Cassius, lxviii. 786. ‡ Pliny, *Panegyric.* 83, 84.
§ Eutropius, *in Trajano*, lib. viii.

ÆLIANUS HADRIANUS.

FROM A. D. 117 TO 138.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

TRAJANUS left the Roman Empire at the zenith of its power. The precept of Augustus had been forgotten. Not only Britain and the extensive Province of Dacia, but vast countries in the East, had been added to it. The whole civilized world, and most of the barbarous nations at that time known, bowed beneath the Roman yoke. But after the death of the Conqueror, and indeed from the commencement of the disorder which terminated his life, this overgrown, unwieldy power began gradually to sink under its own weight. The wisdom, however, of his three immediate successors, Hadrianus and the two Antonines, arrested for a while the progress of decay; and their reigns present, with little interruption, a prospect of general peace, and a system of good government.

Hadrianus's accession and letter to the Senate. A. D. 117. U. C. 868.

Hadrianus, who was Commander in Chief of the forces in Syria, received at Antioch, on the eleventh of August, the news of the decease of his royal master, who left no heir natural or adopted.* It appears that this important event was not divulged until measures had been taken for Hadrianus's succession. The legions of Syria readily proclaimed him Emperor, and he wrote himself to the Senate to request its confirmation of their election. In this letter he apologized for having assumed the Imperial dignity without the previous consent of the Senate; pleading, in his excuse, the impatience of the army to give a head to the Republic. He professed his unwillingness that the customary honours should be decreed him, on this or any other occasion, unless he should himself first ask for them; declared that the public good should be the primary object of his administration, and pledged himself that no Senator should be put to death, unless by sentence of his peers. He concluded with the pious request (to use the language of the age) that they would rank his adoptive father among the Gods.

Forgery of the Empress Plotina.

Dion Cassius† asserts, on the authority of his father, Apronianus, who was Præfect of Cilicia, that Plotina, the widow of Trajanus, in order to ensure the imperial crown to Hadrianus, forged,‡ with the assistance of Tatianus, who was one of his guardians, a letter of adoption from her Royal consort to the Senate. We are told, too, that she had previously concealed in the chamber of the dying Emperor a man, who counterfeited his voice, and proclaimed his adoption of Hadrianus as his successor. The fact of the forgery seems established; and yet it may be thought extraordinary that the Empress should have given herself this trouble; since it appears improbable, that in the case of Hadrianus, himself related to Trajanus, husband of his next heiress, and holding at the time the chief military command, the Senate would have departed from their accustomed complacency to the legions. She might, perhaps, have apprehended an objection to Hadrianus, arising from a suspicion, that Trajanus must have had some good reason for neglecting to make so natural a choice.

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

The Senate confirms Hadrianus.

The circumstanee of Plotina's signature* being attached to the letter of adoption, instead of the Emperor's, as had in all former instances been customary, gave rise to a suspicion of its authenticity. But the Senate did not think proper to notice this informality; and, in their reply to Hadrianus's letter, it confirmed the election of the army, agreed to all he had proposed, and offered him, in spite of his injunction to the contrary, the title of *Pater Patriæ*, and the honours of a Triumph, which it had been proposed to decree to Trajanus, for the victories in the East. The former he modestly declined to assume for the present; and the latter, although as he had had considerable commands both in the Dacian and Parthian campaigns, there was some pretence for the substitution, he positively refused, and directed that they should be given to the ashes of the deceased Conqueror, who was thus the only man who triumphed after he was dead.

Hadrianus's dream.

The approaching exaltation of Hadrianus was announced to him, in a dream, the day before the intelligence of the death of Trajanus reached him.† A flame of fire descended from the heavens, which were beautifully serene, upon the left side of his throat, and crept innocently round to the right, without either injuring or alarming him. This was, of course, considered as a fortunate presage of his reign.

His birth and parentage.

Ælianus Hadrianus was born‡ in January, A. D. 76, U. C. 827. His grandfather, Marullinus, was the first Senator of his family, which came from *Italica*, in Spain, the native country of Trajanus. His father, Ælius Hadrianus Afer, dying after he had attained the rank of Prætor, appointed Trajan by his will, conjointly with the Roman Knight Cælius Tatianus, guardian to his son, who was then only ten years of age. Afer was first cousin§ to Trajanus. Hadrianus was therefore a near kinsman of that Prince; and being, moreover, connected with him by marriage,‖ might, with better title than most of his predecessors, aspire to the Empire; if indeed it could be, in any degree, considered as hereditary.

His relationship to Trajanus.

* Dion Cassius, *Hadrian.* 255. † Ibid. 256.

‡ Dion Cassius, says Crevier, is positive that Plotina sacrificed her virtue to Hadrianus. Crev. 18, 2. But we cannot understand the expression ἡ Πλωτῖνα ἐξ ἐρωτικῆς φιλίας πλησίον τι ὄντα, etc. as a positive assertion of the fact of criminal intercourse. Hadrianus had always been a favourite with her, and she had made the match between him and her niece, Sabina; whom, having no children, she may have considered as a daughter. Hadrianus, as Dion observes, was in the neighbourhood, and a man of great power; Tatianus was at her elbow; and there were sufficient reasons for her anxiety to promote Hadrianus's interests.

* Dion Cassius, *Hadrian.* † Ibid.

‡ Spart. *Hadrian.* 1. says at Rome, Eutropius in Spain.

§ Spart. 2. Echard supposes Hadrianus to have been Trajan's nephew by his mother Domitia Paulina; others say, by the father. But Afer was certainly not brother to Trajan; and Hadrianus's being his nephew by marriage, has, probably, given rise to the confusion which historians have made on this subject.

‖ Dion Cassius.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

We do not find any further mention made of Hadrianus, except that he spent the years of adolescence with his family in Spain, until the adoption of Trajanus by Nerva. He was then serving as Tribune in the army in Lower Mysia, and was deputed by those legions to carry their congratulations to his cousin and guardian on the choice of the reigning Cæsar. He obtained on his arrival an appointment in the army on the Rhine; and, on Nerva's death, he was the bearer of the intelligence to Trajanus, then in Lower Germany, and the first to salute him Emperor. This advantage he gained by pursuing his journey on foot, when his carriage broke down; an accident contrived by his brother-in-law Servianus, who wished* to ensure the prior arrival of a creature of his own, employed on the same errand. When Trajanus entered upon his fourth Consulship, he appointed Hadrianus his *Quæstor;* and at the expiration of his Quæstorship† he was employed to digest the acts of the Senate; and not long after followed his Sovereign to the Dacian war, where, in command of a legion, he distinguished himself so much that Trajanus made him a present of the diamond‡ which had been given him by Nerva. He was Tribune of the people U. C. 836, four years after his Quæstorship, *Prætor* in 858, and substituted *Consul* in 860. In the interval between his Prætorship and Consulship, he was Governor of Lower Pannonia,§ and discharged the Civil and military duties of his office with great credit to himself. He kept the Sarmatians in subjection, and maintained the strictest discipline in his army; but permitted no abuse of authority on the part of the Emperor's intendants. The Consulship was the reward of his good conduct. He accompanied Trajanus in most of his expeditions; and in the last year of that Prince's reign, we find him *Consul* in ordinary, and Commander in Chief in Syria.

His early life.

He marries Sabina.

Notwithstanding Hadrianus's acknowledged merit, it is asserted that he was unsuccessful in his exertions to recommend himself to Trajanus, who could not be prevailed upon to adopt him.‖ Difference of temper and disposition may, perhaps, account for the Emperor's repugnance. Hadrianus's literary acquirements were no recommendation in the eyes of Trajanus. The taste of the one for the Arts and Sciences disposed him to prefer peace, while the other delighted in camps, and loved "the pomp and circumstance of glorious war." Hadrianus became, however, a favourite of the Empress Plotina, and it was by her management, with the assistance of Licinius Sura,¶ who possessed the Emperor's confidence, that he obtained the hand of Sabina,** daughter of Matidia, and grandaughter of Mariana, sister of Trajanus.

His popularity and accomplishments.

Hadrianus was extremely popular at the time of his accession, and began his reign under the happiest auspices. He had filled with great honour the highest Civil and military situations, and was the best scholar and most accomplished man of his day. The mortification he experienced, when in reading the speeches of Trajanus to the Senate, by virtue of his office of Emperor's *Quæstor*, he observed that his rustic accent†† was ridiculed, is said to have led him to cultivate his natural abilities; and he became afterwards the first orator of the age, and remarkable for the purity of his language and pronunciation. He was perfect master of Greek,* a ready linguist,† an excellent Mathematician, an adept in Physic and Mineralogy, an admirable Musician, and a Statuary; and he excelled in Painting, which was in early life his favourite amusement.‡ His memory was so extraordinary that we are assured he could retain the names even of the private soldiers of his army; and his self-possession such (with no small apparent contradiction) that he could write, dictate, and converse at the same time. But Hadrianus was not less remarkable for bodily prowess. He was an expert huntsman, able in arms on foot and on horseback, and foremost in all manly exercises. When he succeeded to the Empire, he was forty years of age. He was tall,§ of manly form, and, if we may judge by the ancient busts of him, which have been found in great number, very handsome. He was the first Roman Emperor who wore his beard.‖

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

The state of affairs in the East not permitting Hadrianus to leave the country, he went to *Selinunte*, in Cilicia, to pay a last tribute of respect to the ashes of his predecessor, and returned to Antioch. He consigned the sepulchral urn to the care of Plotina,¶ his mother-in-law, Matidia, and Tatianus, upon whom he conferred the dignity of Prætorian Præfect. He directed that it should be conveyed to Rome by sea; brought into the city, upon its arrival, in a triumphal chariot, with all the pageantry of a Triumph, and placed beneath the Conqueror's magnificent Pillar, which is still one of the principal ornaments of Rome. He instituted also Parthian Games, in memory of the victories of Trajanus; of which an anniversary celebration was observed for many years afterwards.**

He remains in the East.

The God Terminus, who had resisted the will of Jupiter, yielded to the command of Hadrianus.†† The first important measure of his reign was to withdraw the troops from Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria; and make the Euphrates once more the eastern boundary of the Empire. This conduct has been attributed by some writers to pusillanimity, and by others to envy of the fame of Trajanus; but Hadrianus, with all his faults, certainly had the good of his subjects at heart; and had, probably, projected improvements, and formed plans, of which he foresaw the disappointment, if he should involve himself in distant wars. The news of the disorder of Trajanus had already awakened among the newly-conquered nations the hope of escape from foreign thraldom. The Moors,‡‡ in the remote parts of Africa, the fierce nations of Britain, the Sarmatians upon the Teisse and the Danube were already in commotion. Egypt, Libya, and Palestine had scarce forgotten the general revolt of the Jews. Judging, therefore, the extreme Provinces beyond the Euphrates to be rather an incumbrance§§ to the Empire than an advantage, he was perhaps only prudent in deciding to relinquish them at once with a good grace, and to acknowledge Chosroës as their King. He is said to have cited the example‖‖ of Cato, who restored to the Macedonians their liberty,

A. D. 117. U. C. 868. Euphrates again the boundary of the Empire.

* Spart. 2. † Ibid. 3. ‡ Ibid. 14.
§ Ibid. 16. ‖ Eutrop. ¶ Spart. 3.
** Casaub. *not. ad Spart.* †† Spart. 4.

* Eutrop. † Dion Cassius.
‡ Ibid. § Spart. 11.
‖ Dion Cassius, *Trajan.* 248. All the ancient busts of Hadrianus at Rome have a short bushy beard, while those of his predecessors are smooth-chinned. See also *Rec. de Têtes par de Cîylus d'après les Pierres Grav. Antiq.* p. 41, 51, 88, 97.
¶ Spart. 5.
** Dion Cassius, *Hadrian.* 256.
†† Gibbon, Spart., Eutrop.
‡‡ Crev. 19, 1. Spart. 5.
§§ Echard, *Hadrian.* ‖‖ Spart. 5.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

because he could not keep them in subjection; and to have been only deterred* from abandoning Dacia by the representation of his ministers, that the lives and property of the Roman Citizens, who had been induced by Trajanus to settle in that Province, would be in such case at the mercy of the Barbarians.

Hadrianus provides for the tranquillity of the East, and returns to Rome.

Hadrianus appears to have distrusted Lusius Quietus,† a distinguished General and favourite of Trajanus, who was Governor of Palestine at the death of that Prince. He was superseded in his government, and removed from the command of the Moorish troops.‡ Martius Turbo, who succeeded him, effected the complete subjection of the Jews, and quelled the disturbances in Mauritania. Catilius Severus was appointed Præfect of Syria. The tranquillity of the East being thus secured, Hadrianus visited the Province of Dacia, which was in a very unsettled state; and proceeded, by way of Illyria,§ to Rome.

A. D. 118. U. C. 869.

His liberality.

His first entrance, as Emperor, into the Capital, was marked by abundant largesses to the people, and by many acts of generosity, the good effects of which were felt throughout the Empire. He lessened the customary contributions‖ on his accession, forgave all debts to the Treasury and Exchequer, remitted the arrears of taxes due from the Provinces, and burnt the Public accounts in the *Forum*,¶ as a pledge that his claims should never be renewed. He increased the funds set apart by Trajanus for the maintenance and education of destitute children, and extended his bounty, according to the size of their families, to many decayed Patricians, whose poverty was not the consequence of debauchery. The travelling expenses of the Præfects and Magistrates, which had hitherto been at their own cost, were carried by his order to the account of his Exchequer;** and he directed that the forfeited estates of condemned persons should no longer be considered the private property of the Emperor, but should belong to the Public Treasury.

On his birthday he entertained the populace with spectacles and public Games, in which a hundred lions,†† and as many lionesses were baited; and he expended vast sums in presents of money which were distributed in the Theatres to the men and women separately. It was not, therefore, without reason that a monument‡‡ was erected to record his liberality, nor without fair pretext that he accepted in the second year of his reign the title of *Pater Patriæ*, which was again offered to him by the Senate.

His respect for the Senate.

Hadrianus lost no opportunity of marking his respect for the Senate. When at Rome, he made a point of attending its meetings, and consulted it in all affairs of importance; and he imitated the example of Augustus in forming a Privy Council, composed of its principal members.

The Senatorial dignity was preserved by the importance he attached to it, and by the unfrequency of new creations. He often spoke of such of his predecessors as had shown a contempt for it in terms of unqualified indignation; and he observed, when he conferred it upon Tatianus,* that he had no power to advance him further.

Ælius Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

He would not allow Roman Knights to sit in judgment upon Senators, and for this reason he took care to appoint Prætorian† Præfects of Senatorial rank. He lived on terms of social intercourse with the principal Senators;‡ not only inviting them to his own table, but accepting their invitations in his turn, and visiting frequently such as were confined to their houses by illness. He accepted presents from them, and was fond of making some unexpected return.

His affability.

He did not, however, confine these attentions to persons of this class only, but extended them occasionally to Knights, and even to freemen. Towards the people his manner was always kind, and he courted popularity by going with them to the Baths. On one of these occasions, seeing an old soldier, whom he had known on service, rubbing his back against a marble slab, he inquired the cause of so unwonted a proceeding; and, being informed that it was because he had no servant to rub him dry, he made him a present of slaves and money. Some veterans§ of a less deserving character, scrubbing themselves against the wall, in expectation of a similar result, were, however, reminded by the Emperor, that there were enough of them to help one another.

On another occasion, he was followed by a woman,‖ who insisted upon speaking to him; and cried, in reply to his assurance that he had no time to attend to her, *Noli igitur regere*, "Cease then to rule us." Hadrianus immediately turned, and gave her his attention.

A. D. 118. U. C. 870.

Hadrianus's passage the preceding year, through Dacia and Illyria, had no lasting effect in intimidating the *Sarmatæ* and the *Roxolani*, who complained of the nonpayment of a pension¶ that had been promised them. The disturbed state of the frontier, and their incursions into Mysia, obliged the Emperor to march against them with a considerable army.

Expedition against the Sarmatæ and Roxolani.

This was the only campaign in which he was personally engaged, after his accession to the Empire. The Romans had the advantage in battle;** and it was, perhaps, then that the Batavian cavalry swam across the Danube in complete armour,†† to the inexpressible astonishment of the barbarians, who showed no further desire to contend with such daring enemies.

Hadrianus does not seem to have been satisfied that their panic would survive the departure of his formidable Batavians, for we find that he complied with their demands,‡‡ and directed the arches §§ of Trajan's celebrated

* Eutrop. † Spart. 6.

‡ *Sublatis gentibus Mauris*; meaning, evidently, the native Moors in the Roman service, who were under his immediate command, and not the Roman legions serving in Mauritania.

§ Spart. 6.

‖ *Aurum coronarium*. This was a tax or contribution levied in Italy and the Provinces on an accession, adoption, the gaining an important victory, and similar occasions. Casaub. *not. ad Spart.* 5.

¶ Spart. 8.

** See Casaub., Salmas., Grot. *not. ad Spart.* 7.

†† Dion Cassius.

‡‡ The inscription of this monument is preserved in Scalig. *not. Euseb. Chron.*

* Spart. 8. † Lamprid.

‡ Dion Cassius, *Spart.* 8. § Spart. 17.

‖ Dion Cassius. A similar story is told of Philip of Macedon; both Dion Cassius and Spartianus relate it of Hadrianus.

¶ The Roman Emperors had frequently, under the name of pension, bought off the inroads of the barbarians. The complaint of the Sarmatians was default of promised payment. Crevier, 19, 1, thinks it impossible that Trajanus would have consented to so degrading a measure, and lays it to the charge of Hadrianus. Dion Cassius says nothing on the subject.

** Euseb. *Chron.* †† Dion Cassius. ‡‡ Spart. 7

§§ Crevier attributes this order of Hadrianus to his envy of Trajan. We have followed Dion Cassius, *Trajan.* 246,—Αλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐκεῖνόν γε φοβηθεὶς μὴ καὶ τοῖς βαρβάροις τοῖς ἐρυμνοῖς αὐτῆς βιαζόμενος ῥᾳδίαν διάβασιν ἐς τὴν Μοισίαν ποιήσῃ, κ. τ. λ.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

bridge over the Danube to be broken down, in order to impede their incursions into Mysia. And that he might have no further anxiety for the tranquillity of the frontier, he appointed Martius Turbo, a man of approved talent, whom, as we have before stated, he had left in Syria, Governor of Dacia and Pannonia, with all the honours and privileges that the Præfect of Egypt enjoyed under Augustus.

Conspiracy against Hadrianus.

While he was upon this expedition, four men of Consular dignity, Domitius Nigrinus, Lusius Quietus, the ex-governor of Palestine, Palma, and Celsus, entered into a conspiracy* to assassinate him during the chase. In the two preceding years Hadrianus had given many proofs of clemency. He had refused to punish, at the instigation of Tatianus, the disaffection of Bibius Macer,† Laberius Maximus, and Crassus Frugi; he had pardoned many offences, and shown a forgetfulness of past injuries. But, on the discovery of this conspiracy, he determined that the culprits should pay the penalty of their offence; and they were accordingly executed, pursuant to the sentence of the Senate.‡

Execution of four Consular persons.

Apprehensive that his popularity would suffer by this instance of severity to four principal Senators, three of whom, and particularly Lusius Quietus, had been favourites of Trajanus, and distinguished servants of the Public, he afterwards denied § that he had ordered their execution, which he attributed to the hasty zeal of Tatianus, who about this time was superseded as Prætorian Præfect by Martius Turbo.

Renewed largesses of Hadrianus.

Before he returned to Rome he ordered a largesse of three pieces of gold to each citizen; and on his arrival, he directed a distribution to be made of wine, meat, and corn, to double that amount. He amused the populace for six successive days with Games,‖ chariot races, and combats of gladiators, which were conducted with unusual splendour. The lobbies of the Amphitheatre were strewed with balm and saffron, and refreshments and precious spices were presented to the spectators.

A. D. 120. U. C. 871. Hadrianus's voyages.

After a short residence in Rome, during which he had paid great attention to public business, and secured the affection of the Senate by his courtesy, and that of the people by his liberality, Hadrianus visited Campania, and then set out upon a tour through the Empire. In the Province of Gaul,¶ into which he passed on leaving Italy, his progress was marked by munificence, and by attention to the public institutions; he inspected personally and minutely the state of the fortresses, arsenals, and military stores, and then proceeded into Germany, where he was occupied some time in reviving the discipline of the army, and in establishing between his dominions and the barbarous nations of the north, as he afterwards did also in other frontiers of the Empire, a boundary line, which, where there were no natural defences, such as heights, or rivers, was marked by a sort of rude though substantial picket-fence.** To the stations along this line many of the Burgs of southern Germany owe* their origin. He checked the lascivious effeminacy into which the troops had relapsed during long inaction, more by his example than by sudden severity, and informed himself of the moral conduct,† date of service, and occupations of the soldiers as well as the officers. Wherever he went he pursued this system; dined often amongst them on ration bread, pork, and cheese, with sour wine‡ and water; and generally travelled on foot, sometimes on horseback, but never in a carriage, and invariably bare-headed,§ whether he were traversing the snows of the Alps, or marching under the scorching sun of Egypt.

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

Military reform in Germany.

From Germany he passed through Belgium to England, but not with the intention of recovering the territory, which, since Agricola's conquests, had been surrendered to the natives. It was his object to promote a good understanding between them and the Roman settlers. Nevertheless, to impede the inroads of the northern barbarians, he constructed a wall with a ditch,‖ or line of rampart, which extended from the mouth of the Tyne,¶ near Newcastle, to the Solway Frith, and divided the unconquered country from the Roman Province.

Wall built in Britain.

On his return to Gaul, he received despatches with accounts of disturbances in Egypt, occasioned by the discovery of an Ox, entitled, by the marks** upon his person, to succeed to their deceased God, Apis,†† and which the different cities were anxious to obtain the honour of possessing. We are not told what means Hadrianus adopted to restore peace, or to what city he awarded the prize, but the commotion was not sufficiently alarming to divert him from his design of travelling into Spain. At Terragona, where he spent the winter, he rebuilt the Temple of Augustus, which was in a state of decay, and called a meeting of the Provincial Deputies. The wisdom of his ordinances promoted the prosperity of the country, and his dexterous policy appeased the discontents, to which the conscription had given rise. During his stay at this place, as he was walking in the garden of his residence, a slave ran at him, with a drawn sword, which he wrested from him with difficulty; his attendants ran to his assistance, and secured the criminal; but, on being informed that he laboured under a temporary fit of insanity, the Emperor sent him a physician, instead of the executioner.

Hadrianus in Spain.

Before he left Spain, Hadrianus made a tour of the country, and left many marks of his munificence behind him; but it is remarkable, that although he granted peculiar privileges and immunities to *Italica* and Seville, he did not revisit these scenes of his early youth. From Spain he passed into Mauritania, where he quelled some revolt,‡‡ for which the Senate ordered a

He returns to the East.

* Dion Cassius, Spart. The former leaves the guilt of these persons rather in doubt; but Spartianus, who gives more details, speaks of the conspiracy as certain.

† Spart. 5. ‡ Ibid. 7. § Dion Cassius. ‖ Spart. 8. ¶ Ibid. 10.

** Crevier calls this "a line faced with a rampart, where they stuck great boughs of trees, the branches of which were wrapt together." Echard, "a line marked by stones, trees, and pillars." The obvious meaning of the passage, Spart. 12,—*Stipitibus magnis in modum muralis sepis fundibus jactis atque connexis*, seems to be a stout picket-fence, which (probably formed of the raw material on the spot) was something between a wall and a hedge.

* Casaub. *not. ad Spart.*

† Dion Cassius.

‡ Vinegar and water, according to Echard; but Spartianus, probably, means the *vin ordinaire* drank by the soldiers, which was of a sourish quality.

§ Dion Cassius.

‖ Not to be confounded with the wall, commonly called the Roman wall, built by Severus. This wall, or rampart, was built of wood and earth, but partly also of stone See Cellar. *Geog. Ant.* l. 11. c. 4.

¶ Crevier says it was eighty miles long. Echard says it ran from the river Eden in Northumberland to the Tyne, and was only eight miles in length. Spartian says eighty. See Casaub. *not. ad Spart.*

** Rollin's *An. Hist.* †† Spart. 12. ‡‡ Ibid. 13.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

solemn thanksgiving to the Gods, and thence penetrated to the eastern frontier. Having visited all the Asiatic Provinces, he embarked for Greece, and spent a winter in Athens. In this city, to which he was much attached, he accepted the office of *Archon*, which he had already once filled* before he was Emperor, and was initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries. In his office of chief Magistrate, he wore the dress of the country,† and celebrated with great magnificence the Dionysian Games. He embellished Athens so much, that one quarter of it bore his name, and it was said to be rather the city of Hadrianus‡ than of Theseus; and he made the Athenians an annual present of corn and money, gave them the Island of Cephalonia, and enabled them to establish a colony in Delos, which was called Hadrianus's new Athens. But he conferred upon them a more important benefit, in forming a new code of laws compiled from those of Draco, Solon, and other ancient lawgivers; in enforcing an impartial administration of justice, and in forbidding the Senators from farming the Public Revenue, either in their own names or by proxy.

He becomes Archon at Athens.

It was, probably, during his residence at Athens, that St. Quadratus, the Christian Bishop of that city, and Aristides, a Philosopher of the same persuasion, drew up an apology for the Christian faith, which they presented to him, backed by a statement from Serenus Granianus, the *Proconsul* of Asia, of the unjust persecution of the Christians in the East. Hadrianus's zeal in the discharge of his duties of Sovereign Pontiff,§ and his notorious fondness for the revelry of Pagan worship, had emboldened the enemies of Christianity; but he now issued a rescript,‖ in which he blamed the fury of the multitude, forbade that any Christian should be punished unless convicted of a legal offence, and directed that the punishment should fall upon their accusers, if the accusation was proved to be malicious; and we do not find that the Christians suffered any molestation during his reign, under the sanction of his authority. Lampridius asserts, that he intended to number the Messiah among the Gods;¶ Temples were actually built in several Asiatic and Egyptian cities, and left without statue or dedication. Others suppose that they were intended for his own worship; but this is matter of conjecture.

A. D. 126. U. C. 877.

He visits Etna and returns to Rome.

On his way back to Italy, he visited Sicily; where he ascended Mount Etna to witness from its summit the rising of the sun, and then returned to Rome after an absence of nearly seven years. After a residence of two years in the capital, he yielded to his love of wandering; or it is, perhaps, more just to say, prosecuted his comprehensive plan for promoting the prosperity of his subjects, by judging with his own eyes of their respective situations. His gallies** conveyed him into his African dominions, where he was received with much display of loyalty and attachment; and the general rejoicing was rendered more sincere by a circumstance, that, even in our more enlightened days, the people would be prone to connect with the first visit of a Sovereign. The earth had been parched by drought for five successive years; but the arrival of the Emperor was attended by abundant rain, which was attributed to his influence with the Gods. Not content, however, with the honour which he owed to accident, he remained some time in the country, gave directions for different public works, and rebuilt a part of old Carthage, to which he gave the name of *Adrianopolis*.

He goes into Africa. A. D. 128. U. C. 879.

Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

From Africa Hadrianus returned again to Rome, but only remained there to make preparations for his journey into the East. Having traversed the Asiatic Provinces anew, and attended to the execution of the ordinances he had made, and to the prosecution of the public works he had begun, during his first visit, he passed into Syria, whither he had previously sent messengers to invite not only his own Præfects, but the Chiefs of the neighbouring Powers, to meet him. On this occasion he restored to Chosroës, who was amongst the number of Potentates that paid their court to him, his captive daughter,* and promised to send him the golden throne of the Parthian Monarchs, which had been taken by Trajanus. This act, his conciliatory manner, and not less, perhaps, the state of military preparation in which they found him, sobered the restlessness of Chosroës, and confirmed the pacific inclinations of the other Chieftains. After visiting Palestine and Arabia, Hadrianus went into Egypt, of which country he expressed in strong terms, and somewhat humorously, his dislike and contempt in a letter† to his brother-in-law, which Vopiscus has preserved.

He returns to Rome and departs again for the East.

The ruins of Egypt were objects of wonder and antiquarian research, even in those days. Hadrianus indulged his curiosity in exploring, and, on seeing the remains of Pompey's monument, is said to have exclaimed,‡

He goes into Egypt.

Τῷ ναοῖς βριθοντι πόση σπάνις ἔνλετο τύμβου,

He performed some rites § for the repose of his soul, and built a mausoleum on the spot. It was during his stay in Egypt, that his favourite, Antinous,‖ a Bithynian by birth, was, according to the Emperor's own account, accidentally drowned in the Nile. But it was believed that Antinous had become a voluntary sacrifice¶ to some diabolical superstition, in his zeal for his master's service. Hadrianus wept for the fate of his favourite, and was lavish of homage to his memory. He restored the city of *Besa*, wherein he died, and called it after him, *Antinopolis*; and the strologers** having discovered a new star, and hinted, in order to flatter him and divert his grief, that it was the soul of Antinous, which had found a place amongst the Gods, he named it the *Sidus Antinoi*, and built a Temple in honour of him, in which an Oracle was delivered; dictated,†† it was said, by the Emperor himself, and which excited, even in that age of credulity, more ridicule than reverence. Hadrianus placed statues of Antinous in all parts of his dominions, some of which are at this day among the most admired specimens of ancient sculpture.

Death of Antinous.

In his journey through Syria, Hadrianus had visited

Revolt of the Jews.

* This was in the fourteenth year of Trajan's reign, during the Consulship of that Emperor and Sextius Africanus. Salmas. *not. ad Spart.* 19.
† Dion Cassius.
‡ Spart., Dion Cassius, Euseb. *Chron.*, and Scalig.
§ Spart. 22. ‖ Euseb. *Chron.* ¶ Alex. c. 43.
** Spart. 13.

* Spart. 13.
† *Saturninus*, 8. Crevier has inserted the whole of this letter, book 19, sec. 2.
‡ Dion Cassius. § *Pompeio parentavit.*
‖ Dion Cassius.
¶ The speculations of Salmasius and Casaubonus, as to the cause of Antinous's death, are founded only on the passage of Dion Cassius, which we have translated literally.
** Casaub. *not. ad Spart.* †† Spart. 14.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

Jerusalem, and given orders for its restoration; calling it *Ælia Capitolina*, from his own family name and a Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, which he built upon the site of the Jewish Temple. The Jews, who had long been impatient of the Roman yoke, and had been, as has been noticed, only reduced to subjection in the first year of Hadrianus's reign, by the military skill of Martius Turbo, were incensed at the introduction of Roman colonists into their Capital, and of Pagan worship upon sacred ground. An edict for the suppression* of the rite of Circumcision increased the general disaffection. They kept quiet for a while, until the Emperor had passed through their country on his return from Egypt; but they were purposely negligent in the manufacture of the arms required of them, in the hope† that the Romans would be dissatisfied with the execution of their order, and leave them on their hands. But as soon as Hadrianus was at a distance, their defection avowed itself. Upon receipt of the intelligence at Athens, where he again remained some time, Hadrianus sent immediate reinforcements to Tinnius Rufus, who commanded the Roman troops in Judea, and ordered Julius Severus from Britain to take the command in chief of the army; but he returned himself before the conclusion of the war to Rome, where he arrived, after a second absence of nearly seven years, having accomplished his design of travelling through the Empire, and seeing in person‡ all of which he had read.

Hadrianus having completed his voyages returns to Rome. A. D. 135. U. C. 886.

Jewish war.

The Jews,§ now in open rebellion, were headed by an impostor, called Barcochebas, which signifies in Hebrew, Son of a star. This bandit, who, by putting burning tow in his mouth, pretended to vomit fire, imposed himself upon his credulous countrymen as the promised Messiah. The rebels did not begin with offensive operations on a large scale, but encamped themselves in the most commanding positions in the country; and built forts, connected by subterraneous passages, from which they made sudden sallies, and succeeded in surprising small parties of the Romans. These trifling successes, together with the hope of plunder, attached to their cause great numbers, both of natives and foreigners; and they ravaged Syria and Judea, showing no mercy to such as refused to join them, and especially to the Christians.

Severus, well aware of the force and desperation of the enemy, avoided coming to a general action; but disposed his army so as to cut off their supplies, attack their divisions separately, and reduce their strong holds in succession. The siege and capture of Bithera, in which Barcochebas perished, was the most remarkable event of the war, and hastened its conclusion. In the course of about three years, which it lasted, the Jews lost fifty cities, and nine hundred and eighty principal towns. Five hundred and eighty thousand men were killed in action, and an incalculable number perished by want, disease, or fire; so that the population of Judea was nearly exterminated.

Loss of the Jews.

Loss of the Romans.

The loss of the Romans, though not stated by any Historian, is supposed to have been considerable; for Hadrianus, in a letter to the Senate, written, probably, before he left the East, omitted ‖ the customary exordium: *Si vos liberique vestri valetis, bene est; ego quidem et exercitus valemus.*

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

Little mention is made of Jerusalem during this war, but if it was among the number of the cities that were laid waste, it was restored after the peace under its new name of *Ælia Capitolina*. Its walls enclosed Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, but did not take in Mount Sion. The Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus still existed, a marble swine was placed upon the gate of Bethlehem, and heathen divinities occupied the sacred places. An edict of Hadrianus forbad the Jews from entering the city,* or even from turning their eyes towards it, unless once a year, on the anniversary of its overthrow.

Jerusalem under the new name of Ælia Capitolina.

Prodigies which foretold the destruction of the Jews.

The total destruction of the Jews, as a nation, under Hadrianus, was foretold, we are informed, by the spontaneous falling asunder† of Solomon's sepulchre, which they held in great reverence, and by the unwonted boldness of the wolves and hyænas, who penetrated in herds into the heart of the city, and ran howling about the streets. Severus, who had done such good service as a General, after he had established the tranquillity of Judea, obtained the Præfecture of Bithynia, where the wisdom and integrity‡ of his administration were proverbial in the days of Dion Cassius.

Irruption of the Alani. A. D. 136. U. C. 887.

About this time there was an irruption of the Alani,§ one of the Scythian tribes, who committed great depredations in Media and Armenia, and threatened Cappadocia; but finding Flavius Arrianus, the Roman Præfect of that Province, better prepared for their reception than they had anticipated, they retreated, and in this quarter also peace was soon restored.

Hadrianus's villa at Tivoli.

When in Italy, the Emperor Hadrianus was fond of retiring, like other wealthy individuals,‖ to his country villa; which was beautifully situated at the foot of the heights of Tivoli, and in adorning which nothing had been spared that money and labour could produce, or art and luxury devise. It had been his object to form a delightful retreat for the decline of life, which should revive the recollection of such remarkable places as had most interested him in earlier years, and most struck his imagination during his travels. His Tiburtine villa occupied a circumference of ten miles,¶ and contained exact models (the traces of which are still discernible) of the Lyceum, Academy, Prytaneum, and Pœcile of Athens, the Canopus of Egypt, and the Vale of Tempe in Thessaly.** The fictions too of the Poets were here represented in miniature; part of the pleasure grounds were laid out in imitation of the descriptions of Tartarus and the Elysian fields. The Imperial Palace, Baths, Temples, Theatres, Libraries, and Barracks for the body guard, occupied the remainder of the space. The exquisite basso-relievo of Antinous in the villa Albani, the Flora, the Egyptian Antinous, the two Centaurs, and the two Fauns of red marble, in the Museum on the Capitol, and in the Vatican, which were dug up from among these ruins, vouch for the surpassing excellence of the sculpture that decorated these

---

* Spart. 14. † Dion Cassius.
‡ Spart. 17.
§ Dion Cassius, and Euseb. *Eccles.* and *Hist.* iv. 6, and *Chron.*
‖ Dion Cassius.

* Hieronym. *in Sophon.* c. 2.
† Dion Cassius. ‡ Ibid.
‡ Crevier, in what he terms his Annals of Hadrianus, places this irruption of the *Alani* before the conclusion of the Jewish war; but Dion Cassius says expressly, ἐ μεν τῶν Ἰουδαίων πόλεμος ἐς τοῦτο ἐτελεύτησεν ἔτεσι δὲ ὕστερον Ἀλανοὶ ἐσέβαλον, κ. τ. λ.
§ Aurel. *Vict.*
‖ Ribby, *Viag. Antiquar.* ** Spart. 23.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

buildings; the vast number of mutilated statues which have been discovered testify its profusion. Though none of the more perishable paintings have been spared by Time, we know that there was no lack* of them; and we may conclude from the celebrated mosaic of the Capitoline Doves, which was also found here, that the Art in those days was cultivated with great success. Antiquaries have been enabled, from the different ruins, to conjecture with great probability the situation of all the buildings mentioned by Spartianus; but that of the Canopus has been placed beyond a doubt by the discovery of many Egyptian images, and of the statue of the God himself, now preserved in the Capitol. This Canopus was an imitation, on a small scale, of the Temple of Serapis,† at Canopus in Egypt, near the canal‡ which ran from that place to Alexandria, and was the scene of the Bacchanalian rites of the divinity.

His public works.

If Hadrianus indulged his taste in the decoration of his own villa, he did not allow his predilection for this delightful, though somewhat eccentric, creation of his fancy to engross too much of his time, or interfere with the projection of works of public usefulness. He is acknowledged to have surpassed all Princes, whether of ancient or modern times, in the number and magnificence of his undertakings of this description. In Rome he restored or rebuilt all the public edifices§ that had been injured or destroyed by Time or accident; and with singular modesty he forebore to take the credit to himself, and directed that they should only bear the names of their original founders. The Pantheon, the Julian Parks, the Palace of Augustus, the Baths of Agrippa, and a variety of Temples, are amongst the number of these. The Athenæum,‖ an institution for the encouragement of Literature, the bridge¶ over the Tiber, (now called *Ponte St. Angelo*,) and the Temple of Trajanus, were exclusively his own offspring; and on these he allowed his name to be placed. The superb mausoleum, which he designed as a last resting-place for his own ashes, was one of the proudest ornaments of the city, and no less remarkable for the massive solidity of the masonry, than for the magnificence of its decorations. It was surrounded by a double tier of marble columns, and by innumerable statues, placed in niches in the intercolumniations, and on the cornices. It is now the citadel of modern Rome, under the title of *Castel St. Angelo*.**

The removal of Nero's colossal obelisk, a work in which four and twenty elephants†† were employed, must not be forgotten in the number of Hadrianus's works. There was scarcely a city or town of any note in his dominions which could not boast of substantial proofs of his munificence and attention to the welfare of his subjects. He informed himself of their wants with his own eyes, and supplied them accordingly with Baths, Aqueducts, Harbours, and other works of public utility;‡‡ and provided for their enjoyments, by erecting Theatres, and instituting Games. To some towns he sent supplies of grain; to others he granted immunities, or made donations of money. Nice and Nicodemia,* both nearly destroyed by an earthquake in the year of Rome 871, were rebuilt by his liberality; and he restored several other cities, which were called after him, in Spain, Egypt, and Greece, for which last country he showed great partiality.† At Athens he built a Temple to Juno, another to Jupiter Panellenion,‡ and a Pantheon; and he completed, upon a grand scale, the Temple of Jupiter Olympus, left unfinished by Antiochus Epiphanes, and styled, *Unum in terris inchoatum pro magnitudine Dei*.§

Ælius Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

He was fond, too, of visiting the tombs of celebrated men of past Ages, and perpetuating their memory by the erection of some new monument. Beside that of Pompey, which we have mentioned, he inspected that of Epaminondas at Mantinea,‖ and raised a pillar upon it, for which he himself wrote the inscription.

When Spartianus affirms that Hadrianus made a passage for the waters of the Lake *Fucinus*,¶ he can only mean that he cleared the canal which Claudius had carried through the heart of the mountain to drain its waters into the river Lyris, at an enormous expense, and such labour of nearly twelve years continuance, as Pliny assures us, can only be conceived by eye-witnesses,** and is beyond the power of language to describe. Whatever Hadrianus did, was, if it had the same object, equally ineffectual; for the lake still washes its wonted shores, and continues to deserve its ancient reputation:††

Vitreâ te Fucinus undâ,
Te liquidi flevêre lacus.‡‡

Prætorian edict.

Hadrianus made an essential improvement in the administration of justice at Rome. The Prætorian edict, which was the rule of the Tribunals, was merely an annual law which did not survive the authority of the existing *Prætor*,§§ and could be altered at the pleasure of his successor; but, by the Emperor's desire, Salvius Julianus, an eminent lawyer, drew up an edict, digested from those of the ancient Prætors, which was established as perpetual. At Rome, and in the other cities of the Empire, wherein he made temporary residence, he frequently administered justice in person.

Hadrianus's Laws.

Hadrianus's Laws reflect more lasting honour upon his memory than even the sumptuousness of his public works. Although he considered it one of the first duties of a Sovereign to settle disputes by equitable decisions, he did not trust entirely to his own knowledge, or his own natural feeling of right and wrong. Wherever he was, he made a point of consulting the most eminent Lawyers within his reach. Julius Celsus, Salvius Julianus,‖‖ the compiler of the perpetual edict;

---

* Aurel. Vict. † Strabo, 17, 551. ‡ Spart. 19.
§ Ribby, *Viag. Antiquar.* ‖ Aurel. Vict.
¶ This bridge, repaired by different Popes, was last restored by the architect Bernini, under Clement IX., and adorned with the balustrade and statues as it stands at present. Vasi, *Guid. di Rom.*
** The Greeks and Romans, in the Gothic wars, according to Procopius, used this mausoleum as a fortress, and broke down the statues and columns to hurl them at the besiegers. Constantine the Great found, however, many beautiful columns remaining, which became the ornaments of his Christian churches.
†† Spart. 19. ‡‡ Dion Cassius.

* Euseb. *Chron.* † Pausan.
‡ Dion Cassius. § Liv. 41, 20.
‖ Pausan. 8. ¶ Spart. 22.
** Plin. 15, 36.
†† *Le sue acque sono limpidissime. Anzi quella stessa chiarezza e bontà del Lago di Fucino, etc.* Ribby, *Viag. Antiquar.* Crevier says this lake is now called Celano. There is a small town of the Abruzzi near it, so called; but the lake is more generally known by its ancient name, and called Lago di Fucino.
‡‡ Virg. *Æn.* vii. 759.
§§ Gravina, *de Orig. Juris.*
‖‖ Some suppose this person to be rather Juventius Celsus. See Crev. 19, 1.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

and Neratius Priscus, all persons approved by the Senate,* were those at Rome to whom he was in the habit of recurring. The whole of Italy was, before his time, under the immediate control of the Consuls and the Senate. The local Magistrates decided in all ordinary causes, but referred affairs of importance to the Consuls, who, in their turn, laid them before the Senate. Hadrianus changed this system; he divided Italy into four districts, to each of which he appointed a man of Consular dignity, who had in his own department the same authority that the Proconsuls exercised in the Provinces.

Jurisdiction of four Consular persons in Italy.

Laws respecting slaves.

His code, as it ameliorated the condition of an unhappy and hitherto neglected,† though numerous class of his subjects, would alone entitle him to a place amongst the best Princes of antiquity. He abolished the sanguinary and preposterous law, by which all the Slaves, without distinction, of a master who had been assassinated in his own domain, (no matter by whom,) if the assassin was not discovered, were condemned to death, or to the torture, and ordered that the punishment should extend only to such as might have foreseen the danger, or who had neglected to afford assistance at the time. He deprived the masters of the arbitrary power of life and death over their slaves, who, in cases of great delinquency, were to be brought before a Magistrate for their sentence; and he forbade the use of private prisons,‡ in which their owners had previously confined them at discretion, in chains, or to hard labour, and which had too often afforded a facility for the surreptitious detention of free persons. He made it illegal also to sell them to the bagnio-keepers and fencing masters, for the purposes of prostitution, or gladiatorial combat, as had been before the custom, without judicial authority.

Laws respecting bankrupts, and treasure found.

Hadrianus's rigour to fraudulent bankrupts had a wholesome effect in preventing the frequency of failures. He not only took from them whatever property they had secreted for their private enjoyment, but ordered them to be publicly whipped. He passed an equitable law, which is renewed in the Institutes of Justinian, respecting treasure discovered in the earth. If found by the proprietor of the soil, it became his exclusive property; if the ground belonged to another, the finder had a right to half the profits; and if discovered upon public ground, he was obliged to share it with the Imperial Treasury.

Hadrianus's attention to manners.

Hadrianus prohibited the promiscuous bathing of the sexes in the Public Baths;§ but this prohibition had no durable effect in restraining the attachment of the Roman ladies to this indecent practice, for Marcus Aurelius had occasion to renew the edict. He directed also that the Baths should not be opened, unless for invalids, until the eighth hour of the day (two hours after noon.)

One of his laws allowed to the children of proscribed persons, whose estates had formerly been confiscated, one-twelfth of the property of their parents. He sequestered the estates of idiots, unless they had children, in which case they retained them under proper guardianship. He appointed tutors to minors whose fathers died intestate,* and in many instances took that office upon himself. Persons who reduced their families to distress by squandering their possessions were condemned by one of his ordinances to a punishment which resembles, in milder form, the modern pillory, —they were exposed to shame in the Amphitheatre. But the minor regulations of Police did not escape his attention; for the convenience of foot passengers, he forbade the custom of riding on horseback in the streets, and prohibited the driving of heavy loaded carriages into Rome.† He revived certain sumptuary laws, and was rigid in prohibiting the Knights and Senators from appearing in public without the insignia of their respective ranks.

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

His military regulations.

Hadrianus, although a strenuous disciplinarian, was much beloved by his soldiers,‡ to whom he was extremely liberal. He doubled the usual largesse to them,§ on his accession to the Empire; never omitted to confer some mark of his favour upon those who had distinguished themselves; was always ready to assist the distressed; provided for such as were worn out in the service, and visited the sick in hospital.

It was no doubt principally owing to the well disciplined state of his army, which kept the barbarous nations upon the frontiers of the Empire in awe, and to his personal attention to the fortifications, depots of arms, and military stores of all descriptions, that he owed the preservation of peace. He has been accused of sacrificing the dignity of the Roman arms, by making large presents to foreign Kings, to secure their friendly disposition, and by paying a pension to the Sarmatians to restrain their attacks upon his frontier. But degrading as such a system might be, the precedent had been established by Domitianus, and his best apology for not departing from it, is the fact of his having employed the peace, which he was unwilling to break, in ameliorating the internal Government of the Empire, and restoring the ancient discipline of the army, which, after a series of easy conquests, had become luxurious and insubordinate.

Hadrianus was an innovator, but he reformed abuses and introduced new regulations gradually and with judgment; and he only grafted them upon the ordinances of Trajanus, none of which he permitted himself to rescind. It is the best praise of his alterations, whether in the general polity of the Empire, in the conduct of the Imperial household, or in the military service,‖ that they were confirmed by his immediate successors, and continued in force till the reign of Constantine. And it is the most striking proof of his popularity, and the wisdom of his administration, that during an absence of nearly fourteen years from the seat of Government, spent principally in remote parts of his dominions, there was no commotion in Italy; and, that amongst the Romans, however fickle and inclined to sedition, there was no conspiracy against him during his reign, if we except that of the four Consular men, soon after his accession. One of these sought revenge for the loss of his command in Syria, and two others, Palma and Celsus, were his early enemies, and had been instrumental in preventing his adoption by Trajanus.¶

* Spart. 18. † Ibid. 18, 22.

‡ A law, abolishing so great a convenience for gratifying vengeance, and securing the success of clandestine intrigues, did not long survive its author. See Crevier.

§ Dion Cassius.

* Spart. 22.

† Ibid. 22. The width of the streets, if we may judge by those of Pompeii, made such a regulation very necessary.

‡ Spart. 21. § Ibid. 5.

‖ Dion Cassius. ¶ Spart. 4.

Biography. From A. D. 117 to 138.

Hadrianus was scrupulously observant of respect to the constituted authorities. At his entertainments he always rose to receive the Senators,* and placed himself fourth at table;† he waited upon the Prætors and Consuls at their installation, and on their public days as a private individual; to the latter he often acted as assessor, and assisted them in their judicial proceedings. But he disliked the irksome etiquette of the Imperial Court, and dispensed with the observance of it in others. He was accessible to all; polite in manner to the meanest;‡ affectionate to his friends; and he showed a contempt for the mistaken pride of those Princes who, under the apprehension of lowering their dignity, deprive themselves of the pleasures of social intercourse.

His urbanity and love of simplicity.

His private life.

It would be difficult to bestow upon the private life of an absolute Sovereign higher praise than is conveyed in the observation of Dion Cassius, that though he was kind to his associates, visited them when they were sick, attended their family festivities, and made himself at home in their houses; though he honoured the memory of many of them with statues in the *Forum*,§ and paid the same compliment to others during their lifetime, they were yet never known to presume upon these distinctions, to become insolent to others, or receive bribes, as had been customary under former Emperors, to give information of what passed in the Palace. We may infer from this that he was happy in the choice of his friends, and that he was respected by them; and we find by other testimony that he was a judicious and careful master of his own household. To detect the roguery of the purveyors of his entertainments,‖ and to prevent their providing coarser and cheaper fare for the meaner guests, he would often order dishes to be brought from the furthest tables to his own;¶ and he resisted the encroaching spirit of his servants, and kept them in their proper sphere. Seeing once a servant of his walking familiarly between two Senators,** he immediately sent an attendant to give him a box on the ear, and say to him, "*Noli inter eos ambulare quorum esse adhuc potes servus.*"††

Well aware of the mischiefs arising from a system of favouritism, and attributing many of the abuses of former reigns to the undue influence of the Imperial freed men, who held the principal offices of the household, and assumed the management of public affairs, he was desirous that his own should not be supposed to have any power over him,‡‡ and he punished them if he discovered that they had boasted of being in his favour. He never appointed any of them secretary or auditor of petitions; and he was the first Emperor who gave these important employments to Roman Knights.§§

His disinterestedness.

It is only negative praise that the rich and powerful did not suffer under his government from forfeiture and unjust confiscation of their property,‖‖ so frequent under former Emperors, but he showed his disinterestedness in discountenancing the unnatural custom of making the Emperor heir to private property;* by which, to gratify the servile vanity of the testators, many families were impoverished or ruined. He refused the inheritance of persons not known to him; and would only accept that of his friends, when they died childless.

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

It is a remarkable trace of the Republican Constitution still subsisting in the Government, and a no less striking instance of Hadrianus's respect for the Aristocracy, and of moderation in an absolute Monarch, that the Ambassadors of Vologesus and the Jazyges were introduced by him to the Senate, and that he was then by the resolution of that body commissioned to reply to them. Careful not to shock the prejudices of the Romans, the maxim which he often repeated in the assembly of the people, and in the Senate, was very flattering, That in his government of the Commonwealth he would recollect that it was the property of the people, not his own.† He was not fond of pomp, and, satisfied with the reality of power, was indifferent to titles. That of *Imperator* he took but twice, and he assumed the Consulship but three times during his reign, though he granted a third Consulate to several distinguished Senators, who were thus upon a footing with himself, in this respect, and he conferred the honour of a second upon a great number. To avoid the restraint of a long train of attendants, he was frequently carried in a litter into the city,‡ and he refused to give his consent to a decree, which appointed the celebration of his name, and acts of munificence with Games in the Circus,§ besides those already observed in honour of his birth.

His modesty.

He acts as chief Magistrate in various cities of the Empire.

In his own third Consulate he acted only during four months, but he was attentive, during that period, to the duties of the office. Though he would not engross at Rome honours, which were an object of ambition to the principal and most respectable Senators, he always paid the other cities of the Empire, in which he prolonged his visit, the compliment of assuming the title, and personally discharging the functions of chief Magistrate He acted as *Prætor* in Etruria; as *Dictator*, *Ædilis*, and *Triumvir* in different cities of Latium; as *Archon* at Athens; as first civil officer at Adoia in Picenum, whence his family took its origin, and in his own country.‖

His encouragement of the Arts and Sciences.

Hadrianus was a generous patron of the Arts and Sciences, in all of which he was himself a proficient, and which flourished during his reign. He delighted in the society of learned men, and admitted also to his intimacy the first artists of the age; and at his table intellectual enjoyment took place of the gross and sensual indulgence for which so many of his predecessors had been notorious. His Biographers have thought it worth while to record the only dish for which he showed a preference, a pheasant-pie.¶ In general, he did not drink any wine at dinner,** but he was no Cynic, and promoted cheerful conversation.

His jealousy of men of eminence.

But Hadrianus's bane was his ambition of passing for an universal genius, his desire of being preeminent in

---

* Spart. 22.
† Τέτραστος ἐκκλίνων. Dion Cassius.
‡ Spart. 20.
§ Dion Cassius.
‖ Spart. 17.
¶ These entertainments were probably supplied by contract; and as the guests reclined round a number of small tables, it was easy for the purveyors to furnish scantily those who were least conspicuous.
** The middle place in sitting or walking was the post of honour Casaub. *not. ad Spart.*
†† Spart. 21.
‡‡ Ibid.
§§ Ibid. 22.
‖‖ Dion Cassius

* Spart. 18.
† *Et in senatu et in concione sæpe dixit: ita se remp̃ublicam gesturum, ut sciret Populi rem esse, non propriam.* Spart. 8.
‡ Dion Cassius.
§ Spart. 8.
‖ Spart. 19. If Spartianus means *Italica*, this does not argue with Dion's assurance that he did not revisit his own country. He may perhaps, however, have taken the office in absence; probably, in this case, during his residence at *Tarragona*.
¶ *Tetrapharmacum de faziano, tumine, pernâ et crustulo.* Spart. 21.
** Dion Cassius.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

every branch of knowledge, and every accomplishment. He encouraged learning, and promoted merit; he was fond of engaging men of talent in argument, of contending with them in composition on Poetical or Scientific subjects, and of propounding questions, as for example, in the college of Alexandria, and on other more private occasions; and he delighted in solving those proposed to him;* he was unwilling to retain Professors in situations for which they had not sufficient capacity;† yet he was peevishly impatient of the reputation even of those whom he had himself brought forward, if it came in competition with his own. Amongst several whom Spartianus mentions as having felt the effects of his displeasure, was Favorinus, whom he had particularly distinguished; a Gaul by birth, but, by his own account, a Greek in acquirements, and one of the first Philosophers and Orators of his time. How he fell into disgrace we are not informed, unless it was on account of his reputation of Astrology,‡ a science to which Hadrianus was partial. The author just quoted has preserved an anecdote of him, which shows that he was something of a courtier. To some of his friends, who upbraided him with yielding to the Emperor in argument, when he had the best of it, he replied, "You deceive yourselves, my friends, would you not have me believe in the superior learning of a man who is backed by thirty legions?"§ This Favorinus had sufficient address to escape punishment also; he had refused to discharge some public trust at Arles, his native place, and the matter was carried before Hadrianus, who was little disposed to acknowledge his exemption. Favorinus came into Court, and protesting that his master Dion Chrysostom had appeared to him in a dream, and commanded him to serve his country like a good citizen, withdrew his suit, and promised to obey.‖ The Emperor was much displeased, but was obliged to pardon him. When the Athenians, aware that Favorinus was in discredit with Hadrianus, threw down his brazen statue, which had been erected in their city, he exclaimed with great unconcern, "Socrates would have been glad to get off as cheaply." Dionysius of Miletum was less discreet.¶ Hadrianus had made him a Roman Knight, given him the government of a Province, and procured his admission into the Academy of Alexandria; but having afterwards patronised his rival Heliodorus, and made him his principal secretary, Dionysius could not conceal his pique and mortification, and observed to him, "Cæsar may bestow honours and favours upon you, but he can never make you an Orator;" a remark which Hadrianus did not forgive. This unfortunate jealousy, so unworthy of a great mind, made Hadrianus act inconsistently, and tarnished the glory which his magnanimity otherwise would have deserved. He forgot as Emperor the injuries he had received as a private man;** he gave no ear to the accusations of treason which had been pardoned by Trajanus; but the same Prince, who on his accession to absolute dominion had generously met his bitterest enemy with a reassuring salutation, was not proof against the taunt of a rival in knowledge. Apollodorus, the celebrated architect, who had planned most of the public buildings of Trajanus, was conversing with that Prince on architectural subjects, when Hadrianus joined in the conversation, and made some not very sapient observation: "Go, and paint thy gourds, for thou truly art ignorant of these matters,"* cried the petulant architect. Hadrianus was at that time in the habit of amusing himself with this style of painting. When afterwards he had the power in his own hands, he passed sentence of banishment on the unsuspecting Apollodorus for some trifling offence, and still bearing in mind the contempt he had shown for his skill in architecture, and desirous to prove to him that a beautiful edifice could be raised without his assistance, he sent to him in his exile a plan of the Temple of Venus and of Rome, which he had built himself. It was a noble building, and was one of the objects which attracted the admiration of the Emperor Constans, when he came to Rome; but it had great faults. Hadrianus desired Apollodorus's opinion, and the architect, not intimidated by disgrace, gave it sincerely. He wrote word to his Imperial rival, that he should have made his Temple loftier and larger, that it might have been a more conspicuous object from the *Via Sacra*, which it overlooked, and have served as a receptacle for machinery which, secretly concealed there, might have been suddenly introduced with great effect into the adjacent Amphitheatre.† The statues too, which were in a sitting posture, were too large in proportion to the Temple; "for," added he, "if the Goddesses should rise and wish to take the air,‡ they could not get out." Hadrianus could not forgive the boldness of a rival architect, who had opened his eyes, and those of the world, to a mistake which it was too late to correct, and Apollodorus paid for his triumph with his life. This Temple, of which part of the vault remains, has stood amid the wreck of the ancient city, as a monument of Hadrianus's weakness; its ruins crown an eminence by the side of the *Via Sacra*, close to the Coliseum, and every Roman Cicerone, in pointing it out to the stranger as the work of a Royal architect, relates the luckless fate of Apollodorus.

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

Hadrianus was not above aiming at singularity in Criticism, for we can hardly suppose in so finished a scholar, as he is proved to have been by the united testimony of all his Biographers,§ a perverse and vitiated taste. Not content with affecting an obscure and antiquated style in his own writings and conversation, he pretended to prefer Antiochus of Colophon, a Poet not much known even in those days, (though mentioned with some commendation by Horace, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Quinctilian,) to Homer; Cato the elder to Cicero; Ennius to Virgil; Celius the Historian to Sallust; and he spoke slightingly of Plato. Spartianus affirms, that he was possessed of considerable humour, but the only traces of it which are preserved, are a

His humour.

---

* We have followed M. de Tillemont's interpretation of the text, Spart. 20,—"*Propositas dissolvit*;" which Crevier understands, 'solved his own problems."

† Crevier pretends that he rewarded them for their incapacity, to spite men of greater eminence. But the passage, Spart. 16, evidently means that he got rid of them in a handsome way.

‡ Preserved in Aulus Gellius.

§ Spart. 16.

‖ Dion Cassius.

¶ Philostr. Dion Cassius.

** Spart. 17.

* Dion Cassius.

† Xiphilin's translation has "*Templum Veneris, quod Romæ fecit*," but in the original the passage stands "τῇ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης τῆς τε Ῥώμης ναῷ τὸ διάγραμμα," *s. v. λ.* and it is called at this day the "*Tempio di Venere è Roma.*

‡ Crevier says, the niches were so small, that if they rose they would break their heads; we translate literally from Dion Cassius "αἱ γὰρ αἱ θεαὶ, ἔφη, ἐξαναστήσεσθαί τε καὶ ἐξελθεῖν ἐθελήσουσιν οὐ δυνήσονται."

§ Dion Cassius, Spart., Eutrop., Aurel. Vict.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

parody on some lines of the Poet Florus,* and his reply to a man who presented himself again with dyed hair, to make a request which his grey locks had failed to obtain. Hadrianus, instantly recognising his petitioner, disappointed him by observing, "*Jam hoc tuo patri negavi.*"†

His curiosity.

If Hadrianus's inquisitive disposition had only sought gratification in visiting all the spots of the Globe which he had found mentioned in books ;‡ if it had only been indulged in scrutinizing the conduct of the public functionaries, and the integrity of his immediate officers, it had added to his fame. But his curiosity extended to the transactions of common life, and encouraged a system of *espionage* amongst his attendants. Having heard that a wealthy Roman had received a letter from his wife in the country, complaining of his forgetting her amid the gaiety and dissipation of the city, he took occasion to reproach the tardy husband with his bachelor revelries: "What," cried the astonished citizen, "has my wife written to you, as well as to me?"§ But we may attribute much more serious consequences to this weakness, of which his newsmongers doubtless took advantage, by poisoning his mind against those who were high in his favour. Tatianus, whose bloody counsels we have noticed, does not inspire much pity, but he had been his guardian ; and we cannot otherwise account for the decreased favour of his successor, Martius Turbo, of Similis, of Catilius Severus.

Turbo, who had done such signal service in the field against the Jews and the Moors, was no less indefatigable in his command of the Household troops; he was courteous, but firm; and attended day and night upon the Emperor, to whose request that he would spare himself, he replied, "*τον ἔπαρχον ἑστῶντα ἀποθνήσκειν δεῖ.*"‖ Similis, venerable in years and character, who, when a Centurion had reproached Trajanus for giving him the precedence of the Præfects who were also waiting for an audience, had accepted the office of Prætorian Præfect unwillingly, and resigned it voluntarily. Having spent the intervening seven years between his retreat and his last illness in the country, he wrote an epitaph for his tomb, by which it does not appear that he recollected his residence at Court with much satisfaction: "Here lies Similis, who existed many years, and lived but seven." To Catilius Severus¶ Hadrianus had intrusted the Præfecture of Syria, when he left that country to return as Emperor to Rome.

His want of affection for Sabina.

Septicius Clarus, the successor of Similis, and Suetonius Tranquillus, his principal secretary, were not dismissed without just cause. These sycophants thought to curry favour with their master by treating the Empress disrespectfully, but though Hadrianus had frequently said, that if he had been a private individual, he would have repudiated her on account of the asperity of her temper,* he had too much right feeling to let the mean insolence of his dependants pass unpunished. His unkindness to Sabina† is said to have been the cause of her death, but he did not extend his want of affection for her to her match-making aunt. He actually mourned for Plotina, who died about the eleventh year of his reign, nine days,‡ and paid great respect to her memory. He built a magnificent Temple in honour of her at Nîsmes in Gaul, and wrote an elegy in her praise.

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

His love of hunting.

Hadrianus was passionately fond of hunting, and so eager in the chase that he broke his collar-bone; and on another occasion, paid the penalty of his impetuosity by a serious fracture of the thigh. He was so strong and active, that he once killed a wild boar with a single blow,§ and he often despatched a lion with his own hand.‖ He called a Town, which he had founded in Mysia, *Adrianotheræ*, because he had a pleasant chase and killed a bear in the neighbourhood. He was a lover of dogs and horses, and graced the monument which he erected to the memory of his favourite hunter, Borysthenes, with an inscription written by himself. Dion Cassius asserts, that he never allowed his passion for the chase to interfere with the execution of public business; but in his early youth he indulged it to a blamable excess,¶ for it was on that account that his guardian Trajanus recalled him from *Italica*, and kept him under his own eye.

Hadrianus had faith in Magic,** and was himself a student of that imaginary science. It had been foretold to him, when Tribune in the Mysian army, that his star promised him the Empire. He afterwards consulted several Oracles on the subject, and became so great an adept in Astrology, that, as Spartianus gravely affirms, he was in the habit of writing down in the Calends of January, all that was to happen throughout the following year; and even mentioned in this Almanack of his existence, the exact hour of his death.†† Dion Cassius seems to imply, that the self-devotion of Antinous in Egypt had some connection with Hadrianus's tampering with the Magic arts.

He falls into a decline.

Hadrianus did not long enjoy the result of his exertions for the real interests of the Empire, in the retreat of his Tiburtine villa. His health had suffered from fatigue and variety of climate, and he was there attacked with a vomiting of blood,‡‡ which threw him into a decline, and at last terminated his life. As soon as his disorder became alarming, he began to be anxious, as he had no children, to adopt a successor.§§ He thought of Servianus, of Fuscus, his grandson, and of several others, but he found some objection to all of them; and at last, fixed upon L. Ceionius Commodus Verus, a most unpopular choice, which the personal beauty of Commodus, his literary acquirements, or possibly some compunction for the fate of his grandfather Nigrinus, alone could have prompted: for, though descended from an ancient and illustrious family, his delicate health and effeminate character rendered him

Character of Commodus Verus.

---

* Spart. 16

FLORUS.	HADRIANUS.
Ego nolo Cæsar esse,	*Ego nolo Florus esse,*
Ambulare per Britannos,	*Ambulare per tabernas,*
Scythicas pati pruinas.	*Labitare per pruinas,*
	Cubices pati rotundos.

† Ibid. 20. ‡ Ibid. 18.
§ Ibid. 16. ‖ Dion Cassius.
¶ Tatianus was proscribed. We do not find that Turbo lost his situation; Dion does not even mention that he lost Hadrianus's favour. The passage in Spartianus is, "*Catilium Severum Turbonem et graviter inæquatus est.*" The latter was Præfect of the City in the last year of Hadrianus's reign, and lost his situation as hereafter mentioned.

* Spart. 11.
† Aurel. Vict. Her death preceded Hadrianus's only a few months, so that the effect of his unkindness upon her health was not very rapid.
‡ Dion Cassius, who asserts this gravely.
§ Dion Cassius. ‖ Spart. 26.
¶ "*Venandi usque ad reprehensionem studiosus.*" Spart. 1.
** Dion Cassius. †† Spart. 15.
‡‡ Dion Cassius. §§ Spart. 26.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

totally unfit to conduct the affairs of an Empire. He was a professed voluptuary.* His capacity for business was but moderate, and his only redeeming recommendations were his princely form, the elegance of his writings, whether in prose or verse, and his inoffensiveness.

His adoption by Hadrianus.

Such as he was, however, Hadrianus, to the regret and surprise of his friends, and of the Senate, adopted him† under the names of Lucius Ceionius Commodus Ælius Verus Cæsar; he gave Circensian Games to celebrate the choice; made an ample largesse to the soldiers and to the people; and personally attended the rejoicings, as much as the state of his health would permit. The new Cæsar was created *Prætor*, honoured with the Consulship, and sent to govern the Province of Pannonia.

Hadrianus repents his choice.

He obtained some credit in his command, and in consequence of his prospects and the partiality of Hadrianus, attention was paid to every request contained in his letters. But when Hadrianus found that the health of his adopted son rapidly declined, and that he was so feeble and enervated, as to be incapable of military exercises,‡ he began to repent his choice; and, alluding to the deification which generally followed the decease of the Cæsars, observed to his friends, "I have adopted a God, instead of a son."§ He was much chagrined at the disappointment of his plans, and often repeated, on the subject of Verus's health, "We have thrown away three million sesterces, and have leaned against a rotten wall, which cannot support ourselves, much less the Republic."‖ He entertained thoughts of making a new arrangement for the succession, as he afterwards confessed; but the death of Verus anticipated the necessity of superseding him.

Death of the adopted Cæsar.

On his return from Pannonia, he had composed an eloquent oration of thanks to his adoptive father, which he was to deliver in the Senate on the 1st January, A. D. 138. The anxiety, occasioned by Hadrianus's observations concerning him, which the Courtiers had repeated, increased his debility, and he took a composing draught the preceding night, in order that he might deliver his speech with effect, but which probably only accelerated his end, for he died in his sleep of an effusion of blood.¶ Hadrianus grieved for his adopted son as a good father, though not as a good Prince; for the death of Ælius Verus relieved the Empire from the prospect of the miseries attendant on absolute power in the hands of a feeble voluptuary. He forbade any Public mourning,** which would have been an inauspicious interruption of the Festival of the New Year; but Verus was buried with all the honours of Imperial rank, and statues of him were erected in many of the cities of the Empire.

Adoption of Antoninus.

Feeling that his own end was approaching, Hadrianus hastened to make a new adoption,†† and sending for the principal Senators, thus addressed them, as they stood by his bed-side, "Nature has denied me a son, but you have supplied that want by Law, and the chances are more in favour of adoption, which should be the result of superior merit in its object, than of birth, which depends on fortune. I had fixed upon Lucius Commodus,* who was such a son as I wished for; but the Fates have taken him from us. I have found another, whom I now give you: one, noble, mild, courteous, and of good understanding; removed alike from the impetuousness of youth, and the slowness of old age; one who has been bred up in reverence for the Laws, who has shown in authority an attachment to the customs and institutions of his Country, and is neither ignorant of the duties of an Emperor, nor likely to abuse the power. I speak of Aurelius Antoninus, who is at this moment overwhelmed with unpleasant business, and has never, I am certain, aspired even in thought to the Empire; but I trust that he will not decline my invitation, supported by yours."

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

Antoninus,† best distinguished by his surname Pius, was thus adopted; and Hadrianus, not satisfied with securing the succession by one wise choice, as if to atone for having intended to trust the welfare of his subjects to so unfit a ruler as Commodus, required Antoninus to adopt in his turn Marcus Annius, a most distinguished youth, distantly related to himself, and afterwards celebrated as the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, and Verus, the infant son of the deceased Cæsar, for he wished the Republic, he said, to have a branch of the Veri;‡ but on account of his seniority and relationship to Hadrianus, Marcus, who was a lad of seventeen, was to rank as the eldest son. Antoninus was immediately appointed the Emperor's colleague in the Proconsular and Tribunitial power.

These adoptions took place on the twenty-fifth of February, in the last year of Hadrianus's reign, and though most acceptable to the Senate, and the Empire at large, created, as promotion the most deserved always will do, individual discontent. Catilius Severus was amongst the number of murmurers, and was removed in consequence from the Præfecture of the City.

Execution of Servianus and Fuscus.

After his first choice, Hadrianus had ordered the execution of Servianus, and his grandson Fuscus.§ The former, who was ninety years of age, was accused of bribing the slaves of the Palace, of placing himself in the Imperial chair, and of affecting to show that old age had not impaired his vigour, to secure the good will of the guards. Fuscus,‖ his own grand-nephew, was charged with fomenting disturbances by attending to omens, that encouraged him to aspire to the Empire; an accusation that came with a very ill grace from Hadrianus. Sabina died about this time, and it was reported she had poisoned herself in consequence of her husband's ill-treatment. That lady's bare-faced

Death of Sabina.

---

* Spart. *Æl. Ver.*

† The year of Commodus's adoption is matter of dispute among the learned. Spartianus says, he was created *Prætor* and *Consul* after this event, from which it is argued that he had not been *Consul* before. But as he was *Consul* under his own name, L. Ceionius Commodus, in 886, and again the next year under that of Ælius Verus Cæsar, it is probable that he was not adopted until 887, or the end of 886.

‡ "*Scutum solidius jactare.*" See Casaub. *Æl. Ver.*

§ Spart. *Æl. Ver.* ‖ Ibid. *Hadr.* 23. *Æl. Ver.* 6.

¶ Spart. *Æl. Ver.* 5. ** Spart. *Hadr.* 24.

†† Dion Cassius. Spart. 24.

* Echard supposes Hadrianus to have made this Oration on the adoption of Commodus; but he, according to Dion Cassius, speaks of the death of Commodus, and dilates upon the merits of Aurelius.

† Spartianus calls him Arrius Antoninus; and Julius Capitolinus, in his life of him, Titus Aurelius Fulvius Boionius Antoninus: but he is easily distinguished by his surname of Pius. It was the fashion of the age to assume a variety of names.

‡ Spart. *Æl. Ver.* § Ibid.

§ Dion Cassius. Spart. *Hadr.* 23.

‖ Echard calls Fuscus, Hadrianus's nephew; Dion Cassius, Servianus's grandson,—he was both, as Servianus was brother-in-law to Hadrianus.

Biography. From A. D. 117. to 138.

declaration,* that she had taken pains to avoid becoming a mother, that the world might not be cursed with a ruler from his loins, does not incline us to lay the whole blame of the matrimonial discord to the charge of Hadrianus. In the mean while, the Emperor's disorder increased; the curse of Servianus,† who in his last moments had besought the Gods, that he might wish for death and not obtain it, seemed to hang over him. Aware how much public business, with which he was occupied to the last, was impeded by his illness, he frequently exclaimed, that an Emperor should die in full possession of his faculties, and not on a sick bed, and he invoked death in vain. He sought relief at *Baiæ*,‡ but his sufferings became intolerable, and he entreated his attendants to despatch him. As they refused to comply, notwithstanding his promises of impunity and reward, he sent for Mastor, a Jagyzian slave, who had formerly attracted his notice by his boldness in the chase, and commanded him to kill him, laying his breast bare, and pointing to a spot which Hermogenes§ his Physician had told him was vital. The Jagyzian drew his weapon, but his heart failed him, and he fled. Antoninus, who had been sent for from Rome, having removed all instruments of self-destruction, Hadrianus was now left to complain, that he could inflict death upon others, but not upon himself.

And of Hadrianus's A. D. 138. U. C. 889.

At length the remedies, which had given intervals of ease to the dropsy with which he was afflicted, failed of effect. Hadrianus, repeating the popular saying, "Many Doctors kill the King," refused to observe any longer the prescribed diet, and death, which he so much desired, was the consequence. He expired on the tenth of July, A. D. 138,‖ having lived sixty-two years, three months, and seventeen days, and reigned nearly twenty-one years.¶ In his last moments his corporeal sufferings did not exclude the feeling of a soul within him; and some recollection of the appeal of the Christian Bishops may possibly have been confused with his hopes of the Pagan Elysium and dread of Tartarus, when he composed the inquiring lines:

Ælianus Hadrianus. From A. D. 117. to 138.

"Animula, vagula, blandula,
Hospes comesque corporis,
Quæ nunc abibis in loca,
Pallidula, rigida, nudula?
*Nec ut soles, dabis jocos."**

Affection of Antoninus for his adoptive father.

The death of Hadrianus was cause of unaffected and deserved regret throughout the Empire; but the intelligence was received at Rome with gloomy pleasure; the Senators, sorrowing for the cruel loss of some of the most esteemed amongst them, hastily resolved to abolish his acts, and execrate his memory.

But after the funeral obsequies had been performed in Cicero's villa at Puteoli, Antoninus returned to Rome,† and repaired to the Senate, whom he reminded of the wisdom and beneficence of his adoptive father, and by his influence and arguments, but principally, perhaps, by the fact, that, secreted by himself, the supposed victims of Hadrianus's cruelty were living to resume their places, persuaded them to give all honour to his memory, and to rank him amongst the Gods. Notwithstanding the temporary indignation of the Senate, none of his predecessors, if we except Trajanus, had so well deserved these honours. If, instead of succeeding to that Emperor, and having Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius for his own immediate successors, his reign had fallen earlier, he would have shone forth as a model of excellence. Yet even where he really stands, we find much to praise, and comparatively little to blame.

---

* Aurel. Vict.
† Dion Cassius.
‡ Spart. 25.
§ Dion Cassius.
‖ Spart. 26. Dion Cassius.
¶ There is a difference of a year between Spartianus and Dion Cassius; we follow the latter, as Trajanus died in 868.

* Happily imitated by Prior:

"Poor little pretty fluttering thing,
Must we no longer live together?
And dost thou prune thy trembling wing,
To take thy flight thou know'st not whither?
Thy humorous vein, thy pleasing folly,
Lies all neglected, all forgot,
And pensive, wav'ring, melancholy,
Thou dread'st and hop'st thou know'st not what!"

† Dion Cassius, *Hadr. et Tit. Ant.* Spart *Hadr.* 23, 27. Jul. Cap. *Tit. And.* 5.

TITUS AURELIUS FULVIUS BOIONIUS ANTONINUS PIUS.

FROM A. D. 138 TO 161

Biography. From A. D. 138. to 161.

THE conquests of Trajanus in the East were splendid and extensive, but his successor wisely abandoned those claims which the remoteness of the vanquished nations would have made it difficult to enforce. The policy of Titus Antoninus aimed chiefly at the preservation of peace; endeavouring to convince mankind that the ambition of Rome sought not any additional dominion, though her dignity would speedily avenge any act of offensive aggression. But the legions which were now to defend her honour, differed materially from those which had gradually extended her frontiers in the days of Republican freedom. The science of tactics had made great progress in the time of Trajanus and his successor: the legions were largely supported by bands of Provincial auxiliaries, of whom some were trained to the severe exercises of Roman discipline, while others were suffered to retain those arms and that mode of warfare which national habits had rendered familiar.* The cavalry of the Emperors was no longer composed, like that of the ancient Republic, of the noblest youths of Rome and Italy, who, by performing their military service, prepared themselves for the offices of *Senator* and *Consul*, and solicited, by deeds of valour, the future suffrages of their countrymen.† Trajanus and Hadrianus formed their cavalry from the same Provinces and the same class of subjects which recruited the ranks of the legions: the peace establishment of the latter Emperor amounted to thirty legions, each containing 6831 Romans, and 5700 auxiliaries: to these if we add 20,000 Prætorian guards quartered in the Capital, two fleets established permanently at Ravenna and Misenum, a squadron of ships at Frejus, and the vessels constantly employed on the Rhine and the Danube, the computation of the whole force by land and sea will amount to 450,000 men.‡

Military state of the Empire on the accession of Antoninus.

Foreign policy.

The conduct of the Empire towards its extensive Provinces was marked by liberal and sound policy: the Barbarians whom their power subdued were admitted by their generosity to the blessings of civilisation, law, and polity; and wherever they found Civil institutions already existing, they were careful to regulate them after a Roman model. The freedom of the city, so widely communicated in the age of the Antonini, was connected with important rites, relative to marriage, testament, and inheritance. Distinguished merit in the Provinces found easy access to the Capital. Political ambition or military talent, which might have found in remote districts opportunities of disturbing the tranquillity of the Empire, were attracted to Rome, incorporated in the army or the Senate, and thus engaged to defend her interests. *Ipsi*, says Tacitus, recording a speech addressed to the Treveri, *ipsi plerumque legionibus nostris præsidetis; ipsi has aliasque Provincias regitis: nihil separatum clausumve.** In like manner, those who had the desire and capacity to seek distinction by the cultivation of Literature, flocked from various countries to this central point of union, where the course of genius might be directed by the contemplation of the most finished models, where able rivals might kindle emulation, and where successful exertion might be rewarded by the patronage of an opulent Court, or encouraged by the praise of an enlightened Metropolis. Spain herself sent forth Seneca, Lucan, Martial, Quinctilian, Florus, and Columella. Almost every period of the Roman History would furnish some names of celebrity to illustrate this subject. If we confine our attention to that Age to which the series of historical events has conducted us, it will be seen, that the wisest aphorisms of Stoical virtue were uttered by a Phrygian slave, and recorded by a Philosopher of Bithynia: Galen came from Pergamus to enlarge the stock and improve the arrangement of Medical science; Dio Cassius was attracted to Rome from Nice; Appian from Alexandria; and the restless curiosity of Apuleius from a remote Province of Africa. Perhaps the world at that time would have been more benefited if these lights had been left to illuminate each his separate sphere, and yet Posterity may have gained something from the concentration of their lustre: not that any advantage of this kind, either immediate or remote, was contemplated by Rome, but the circumstances arose naturally out of her policy towards her Colonies. Her great and paramount object in establishing these settlements was to add strength to the parent State. Accordingly, their destination was not determined by the will of individuals, by caprice or accident; they were not settled in distant lands, where absence might efface the memory of their original descent, or where danger might drive them to form foreign alliances; they were not planted like solitary fortresses, to defend their possessions or extend their territory by their own internal strength alone; but they were framed rather like the regular progressive bulwarks of a fortified city, each part lending support to the rest, and all combining to defend the citadel.† In pursuance of the system, not to aim at foreign colonization till this compactness and solidity of the parent State at home should enable it to maintain more remote conquests, which the march of Empire gradually obtained,‡ no Colonies were planted beyond the bounds of Italy, before the time of the Gracchi. Each Colony became, as it were, Rome in miniature:§ the safety of the new establishment was secured by a military force, equipped with its full complement,‖ and regularly arrayed under its Tribunes and Centurions, its Eagles and its standards; they went forth not merely to occupy a settle-

Titus Aurelius Fulvius Boionius Antoninus Pius. From A. D. 138. to 161.

Colonization.

* Vegetius, 2, 2. Arrian. † Livy, 42, 61.
‡ See Gibbon, chap. i. and the authorities on this subject there quoted.

* Tacit. *Hist.* lib. iv. 74. See also *Annales*, 11, 13.
† Cic. *de Lege Agr.* 2, 27. ‡ Velleius Paterc. 2, 15.
§ Aulus Gellius, 16, 13. ‖ Tacit. lib. xiv. c. 27.

Biography. From A. D. 138. to 161.

ment, but to take up a military position, and the foundation of the concord of the new Colony was laid in that unanimity of feeling and mutual affection which might be supposed to exist among men who were embarked in the same profession, and had shared the same dangers. As the Persians, when they emigrated into Hindústan, were careful to take with them a portion of the sacred fire, so the colonists carried a portion of the parent earth, to consecrate their new abode:* their pious caution transferred with equal anxiety the solemn auspices and other rites of Religion:† local names even, to which they had long been accustomed, were not forgotten; and thus those feelings of patriotic valour, which the Capitol and the *Campus Martius* had been used to, were still kept alive by the sight of their mimic representatives.‡

The advantage which a State derives from its Colonies and tributary subjects depends much on the art of engaging their affections: hence the Romans extended to both such kindness as might secure their fidelity without compromising the honour and safety of the Metropolis.§ The Latin Colonies‖ had the right of suffrage; and they who had held any public Magistracy in their respective settlements were entitled to enter the lists of ambition at Rome as Citizens. In the case of the Grecian Colonies, the oppression of the parent State, the heterogeneous nature of the new people, and the distance which separated the two parties, often produced, not the factious insurrection of an inferior State, which could be quelled as soon as the arm of superior force was interposed to chastise its rebellious subjects, but the deliberate opposition of a powerful rival, determined to obtain complete independence. But the privileges which Rome conceded were balanced by those which she withheld: the former were calculated to excite the gratitude of those on whom they were bestowed, but had no tendency to encourage the hope of independence, or suggest the practicability of separating from the Metropolitan State. The similarity of many Political and Religious institutions, the arrangement of the Orders of society, the titles of Equestrian and Senatorial dignity, the names of the various Magistrates, were all adapted to keep Rome continually in view. The natural result was, that the ablest minds were allured from the Provinces to the Capital, because they found there a more ample theatre for display and more valuable prizes to reward successful exertion.

Family of Antoninus.

If this subject needed additional illustrations, they might be found in the family and the person of Titus Antoninus. This Emperor was descended from an ancient line, which migrated from Nismes in Languedoc, and settled at Lavinium. His maternal grandfather, Arrius Antoninus, was *Consul* A. D. 69; the same, probably, whose talents and integrity in the discharge of his public duties are honourably mentioned by Pliny.¶ His daughter, Arria Fadilla, married Aurelius Fulvus, by whom she had Titus Antoninus, A. D. 86. At the age of thirty-four he was made *Consul*, and afterwards held the office of *Proconsul* in Asia, with as much reputation as his grandfather. On his return to Rome, Hadrianus admitted him to his friendship and his council, and afterwards adopted him as his successor.

* Ovid, *Fasti*, 4, 820. † Cic. *Phil.* 2. ‡ Velser.
§ Claudian, *in sec. Cons. Stil.* 150.
‖ Appian, *de Bel. Civ.* 26. ¶ Lib. iii. *Ep.* 3.

Titus Aurelius Fulvius Boionius Antoninus Pius. From A. D. 138. to 161.

The very first actions of the reign of Antoninus proved the superior excellence of his disposition, and obtained for him that distinguished and enviable title* by which he is so advantageously known to posterity. Although he was suspicious of a conspiracy, and several of the disaffected had been already denounced to him by name, he forbore to institute any proceedings against them, being unwilling, as he said, to commence his reign by deeds of prosecution and punishment.

His clemency.

The Historical documents of Dio Cassius relating to this period have perished. Xiphilin mentions this loss, and endeavours to supply the defect by researches into other works; but, if we may judge from the scantiness of the materials collected, his sources of information were not numerous: moreover, the Biographical notices of Antoninus Pius are by no means abundant; the most authentic and valuable are to be found in the *Meditations*† of his adopted son, Marcus Aurelius; and it is just to add, that, as far as we can form an opinion from other writers, the language of affection and gratitude in this panegyric, does not exceed the just limits of impartiality.

Deficiency of historical authorities for his reign.

Hence we learn much of the public and private character of Antoninus; and, indeed, a reign so pacific as his was gives us little else to notice. With all his capacity for government, he seems to have been naturally not ambitious of power; and yet we find that neither his unaspiring habits nor his literary tastes were allowed to prevent a vigorous application to affairs of State: his deference for the political institutions of his country was joined to a scrupulous observance of her Religious rites.‡ Public measures he communicated to the Senate in person, and to the People by decrees: men of merit had free access to his presence without any fear that an Emperor's vanity should thwart their pretensions, impede the exercise of their talents, or enviously reject that advice or knowledge which age, experience, or local information might enable them to communicate. Though the foresight of Antoninus was acute, his inquiries patient and extensive, and his judgment sound, yet if it seemed that any of his public measures might be so modified as to admit further improvement, the suggestions of his counsellors were weighed without partiality, and adopted without reluctance. His parental care extended to the remotest Provinces of the Empire; as if he really considered them as outlying branches of one great family, of which he was the head. Those who levied the taxes were commanded to do it with moderation, and those who paid them were encouraged to make known any cases of unjust exaction. Due severity was exercised towards those who abused their interest at Court to recommend or promote the unworthy, while liberal gifts and a continuance of power rewarded the judicious use of it. Thus Gavius Maximus, who was celebrated for his exemplary discipline, held, during twenty years, the office of Præfect of Prætorian guards.

Wisdom of his government.

His Laws.

Nor did Antoninus disdain to seek the instruction of the ablest jurisconsults, and by their assistance to regulate and improve the Courts of judicature at Rome. It is said we owe to him the law which forbids a criminal to be tried twice for the same offence; and he certainly directed on equitable principles the inheritance of property, in cases where a father was a Roman Citizen

* Dio. Appian. † Lib. i. c. 13. ‡ Capitolinus.

Biography. From A. D. 138. to 161.

and the children were not so. The reputation of his justice, joined with the fear of his power, made several Eastern nations submit their disputes to his judgment, and abide by his decision: thus he settled Rhætalus in the Kingdom of the Bosporus;* Pacorus was appointed to rule over the Lazi in Colchis; and the Armenians, and *Quadi* consented, in electing their Monarch, to admit the arbitration of Antoninus. At an early period his character and conduct, in all the social relations of life, had so endeared him to his friends, that he acquired great wealth by legacies; this enabled him, on his accession to the throne, to distribute ample largess to the troops, and yet to decline entirely, or remit in part, the customary offerings of tributary States. The Games and public spectacles he exhibited were sufficiently splendid to gratify his taste and secure his popularity; still they were not conducted on such a scale of extravagance as to leave no funds for works of durability and public benefit. He expended money on the harbours of Gæta and Terracina: at Puzzuoli the tomb of Hadrianus was finished, and quinquennial Games established to his memory. Several cities in Ionia, Greece, and Syria, received money at the hands of Antoninus, to be laid out in ornamental and useful buildings; and Nismes, the birth-place of his family, owes to him two of her noblest works of art, the Amphitheatre and the Pont du Gard. Yet was not the generosity of the Emperor extended without discrimination; he took away several pensions which his predecessor had granted, closing the door against importunate idleness and poverty, to open a wider avenue to the claims of unmerited distress, or distinguished services. Philosophers and Rhetoricians were attracted to his Court by kindness and patronage; and when the Capital was, at various times, afflicted by calamitous visitations of famine, fire, and inundations, the suffering citizens were extensively relieved by the princely munificence of their Sovereign.

Foreign arbitrations.

His magnificent liberalities.

Such was the justice and such the liberality of Antoninus Pius; and when we turn from the view of these Imperial virtues, to contemplate the traits of private character, there is much to excite our interest and command respect. His form was well proportioned, and so tall, that in old age he required stays for his support,† his countenance majestic, and his conversation affable and agreeable; exalted rank did not prevent enjoyment of the intercourse and equality of friendship, and his attachments, which were formed with deliberation, were maintained with fidelity. His habits of life were temperate even to abstemiousness, his establishment simple, and he was contented either to use the comforts of life with moderation, or relinquish them with indifference. He taught his successor, M. Aurelius, that it was possible for an Emperor to divest himself, in great measure, of the ceremony, the pomp and circumstance of power, without diminishing the usefulness, or degrading the character of a monarch. Possessing a temper calm and equable, he was more indulgent to the faults of others than to his own; wise without the pride of learning, grave without austerity, and a Philosopher without the affectation of singularity, or the coldness of Stoical apathy. When M. Aurelius was once blamed for shedding tears at the untimely death of one with whom he had been educated, Antoninus said, "Suffer him to weep, for neither the wisdom of a Sage nor the dignity of a Prince require us to eradicate the feelings of a Man." We learn from a story recorded by Philostratus, that this Emperor united to his other merits a readiness to forgive injuries, which is the more remarkable, inasmuch as this virtue did not occupy a prominent place in the scheme of Pagan Morality. During his Proconsulate in Asia, he arrived at Smyrna, and occupied the house of a Sophist, Polemo, who happened to be absent; the Sage on his return was little pleased at the presence of his exalted guest, and exclaimed so loudly against the grievance, that Antoninus, to pacify the complainant, quitted his house at midnight. On the death of Hadrianus, the same Polemo came to Rome to pay his respects at Court; a jocose allusion to his former inhospitality was the only reproof he received; the Emperor ordered an apartment to be prepared for him, and added, "Let no one turn him out."

Private virtues.

Titus Aurelius Fulvius Boionius Antoninus Pius. From A. D. 138. to 161.

Anecdote of Polemo.

Such a character as we have here described deserves part, at least, of the concise and comprehensive panegyric of an author, removed, by the distance of time at which he wrote, beyond any imputation of flattery: *Hunc*, says Aurelius Victor, *ferè nulla vitiorum labes maculavit.** And again: *Tantæ bonitatis in principatu fuit ut haud dubiè sine exemplo vixerit.*† Still it must be confessed the claim of Antoninus to this spotless purity cannot be established, for prevalent example, and, perhaps, an unhappy marriage, led him to indulge in irregular pleasures. His wife, Faustina, will only escape censure when she passes without observation; this Empress was, probably, the most licentious woman of the age, except her daughter: the reverse of the medals of the former bear the image of *Pietas*, those of the latter the figure of *Pudicitia*; possibly, to make amends for the little influence which these Goddesses were suffered to exert over their conduct. Antoninus, who (like Hadrianus) is accused of carrying‡ inquisitiveness to a fault, could scarcely be ignorant of the vices of his wife: perhaps he dissembled his knowledge of guilt which he was ashamed to perceive, and yet unable to correct; at all events, the immorality of Faustina did not prevent her deification; the ruins of her Temple still remain at Rome, a model of architectural taste, and a monument of superstitious folly.

Licentiousness of the Empress Faustina.

Antoninus died at the advanced age of seventy-five, in the twenty-third year of his reign, A. D. 161. His illness was brief and not painful, and even during a short period of mental aberration, which occurred in its progress, from the words which he uttered, it was plain that State affairs continued to occupy his thoughts. The confidence he felt in the virtues of his successor, the certainty that the care of the Empire was to be transmitted to one who had been trained by his precepts, and would imitate his example, made the last moments of life calm and easy. Marcus Aurelius had indeed been educated under his own inspection; no pains had been spared to collect about the young Prince those whose knowledge might form his understanding, or whose virtues might improve his disposition, and the care of Antoninus was abundantly rewarded by a grateful and affectionate attachment. His daughter, Faustina, had been betrothed to Lucius Verus, the son of that Ælius whom Hadrianus originally intended for his successor; but this engagement was subsequently

Death of Antoninus.

* Capitolinus.

† *Sed quum esset longus et senex incurvareturque, tiliaceis tabulis in pectore positis fasciebatur ut rectus incederet.* Jul. Cap. 13.

* *De Cæsaribus.* † *Epitome.* ‡ Julian.

Biography. From A. D. 138. to 161.

broken, and Faustina became the wife of M. Aurelius: for, although Pius had two sons, he preferred the welfare of Rome to the interest of his family. He was *Quæstor* in 139, and the next year we find him, at the request of the Senate, made *Consul*, and invested with the title of *Cæsar*. By sharing the confidence, the councils, and the power of Antoninus, he learnt the arts of Government, and later events called into play the exercise of his military talents.

The tranquillity of this reign was little interrupted either by domestic tumult or foreign war; the Moors in Africa rose in arms, but the insurgents were soon dispersed. Lollius Urbicus chastised the rebellious *Brigantes*, who then inhabited Northumberland, and a wall to repress more Northern invaders was carried from the Frith of Forth to the Frith of Clyde. Such annals of this period as we possess, are, for the most part, barren of public events: the most interesting and important of them relate to the progress of Christianity, which belongs to another portion of our work.

Titus Aurelius Fulvius Boionius Antonius Pius. From A. D. 138 to 161.

MARCUS AURELIUS ANTONINUS PHILOSOPHUS

FROM A. D. 161 TO 180.

Biography. From A. D. 161. to 180.

M. AURELIUS succeeded peaceably to the vacant throne. One of his first acts was to admit to an equal participation of the Imperial power the son of Ælius Verus, who, at the request of Hadrianus, had been adopted by Antoninus Pius. This monarch, however, respected the wishes of his benefactor only so far as was consistent with his duty to the public; and, accordingly, since the young Prince showed neither virtue, talents, nor, indeed, any merit, except a frank and easy disposition, he was not brought prominently forward into public life. His subsequent conduct proved the wisdom of Antoninus; and it is not easy to determine the reason which induced M. Aurelius to depart so immediately from the system of his predecessor. Perhaps, as the austerities of Philosophy had impaired his health, and he still wished to devote his leisure to study, he might hope to find in Verus a colleague whose bodily vigour would enable him to support the fatigues of war, and who might also devote some time to the despatch of public business. But the pursuit of pleasure was more agreeable to the disposition of Verus: he would, probably, have been neither good nor useful in that comparative privacy to which the wise policy of Antoninus destined him; but, at least, his vices would have found a less ample field, and his example would have been less extensively pernicious. Perhaps, also, Aurelius, in admitting a partner of his power, was willing to give his beloved Philosophy the credit of such a sacrifice; and, accordingly, we find the flatterers of the day complimenting the Emperor on his unexampled generosity. The two Emperors shared the Consulate during the first year, distributed, in concert, the customary largess to the troops, and jointly assisted at the apotheosis of their deceased benefactor.

Association of Ælius Verus in the Imperial power.

The reign commenced prosperously; a Philosophical Monarch was likely to make a nation happy, and Verus, at first, conducted himself with that decent submission to his colleague's will, which feelings of gratitude and a sense of inferiority prescribed. M. Aurelius, in order to strengthen the ties of friendship by those of consanguinity, promised to Verus his daughter, Lucilla: but, at this time, the appearance of foreign war delayed the alliance. Vologeses, King of the Parthians, rose in arms, to assert his claim to Armenia; having defeated the Romans under Leverianus, near Elegia, he proceeded further to make a descent on Syria.* Aurelius, thinking his colleague might be more useful in the field than in the cabinet, despatched him towards the seat of war; but the pursuit of amusement was more attractive to Verus than the dangers of the camp, or military fame, and thus his progress was frequently delayed by the charms of conviviality, or the pleasures of the chase. At length he reached Antioch, and, on pretence of superintending the supply of provisions for the army, he passed four years amidst the licentious indulgences of that luxurious Capital:† in the mean time the command of the troops was committed to three Generals of courage and ability, Statius Priscus, Martius Verus, and Avidius Cassius. The details of this war have not been accurately transmitted, but we learn from Dio, that the success of Cassius was brilliant and complete. He awaited the attack of Vologeses, repulsed his army, harassed his retreat, gained possession of Seleucia, and proceeded so far as to destroy the Royal palace of Ctesiphon. The two Emperors triumphed for the success of their Generals in the East, and accepted, from the flattery of the soldiers and the Senate, the pompous titles of *Parthicus* and *Armeniacus*.

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Philosophus. From A. D 161. to 180.

War with Parthia.

Its successful termination.

Verus, though he had now espoused Lucilla, returned to Rome reluctantly; for habits of licentiousness indulged at Antioch, made him unwilling to brook restraint, and his indolence, extravagance, and debauchery, were practically reproved by the activity, temperance, and frugality of M. Aurelius: the zeal of the latter, the equability of his temper, his attention in the despatch of public business, the patience with which he listened to the prolixity of judicial causes, lest haste should interfere with the interests of equity, or apparent carelessness should shake the confidence of the people in their Monarch; his disposition to lenity wherever the offender might be reclaimed, united to inexorable firmness wherever punishment seemed neces-

Virtues of Marcus Aurelius.

* Dio. † Capitolinus

sary, his deference to the Senate, his reluctance to oppress the People by taxes, and his generous expenditure in patronising Literature and relieving distress, combine to form a character of high Pagan excellence, deserving more commendation than Mosheim is disposed to bestow. *Vide*, says he, *infelicitatem temporum Marci quo nullus Imperatorum justior et sapientior putatur: Princeps* MINIME MALUS *Philosophicis meditationibus animum pascebat, non admodum curiosus eorum quæ in Imperio gererentur. Interea Magistratus impunè voluntati suæ obsequebantur, quasque venerari videbantur leges turpissimè violabant.* And again: *Dubitari potest tantus num fuerit Marcus quantus esse plerisque omnibus et olim visus est et hodie videtur: bonum virum fuisse valde licet superstitionum dubitare nolo, boni vero Imperatoris et Principis nomen an mereatur dubito. De reb. Christ. ante Const.* It must be confessed, that the Persecution with which he harassed the Christians was a flagrant crime, which no reasons of policy, no principles of justice or humanity can excuse. M. Aurelius could not be ignorant of the celebrated *Apology* composed by Justin, or of the edict issued by Antoninus, in their favour. Yet cruelty certainly formed no part of his disposition: he interfered to prevent bloodshed in the sports of the Gladiators by substituting foils for swords; and his public address to the army, on the rebellion of Cassius, which we shall soon have occasion to notice, closes with sentiments of forgiveness and mercy, which would do honour to the followers of a purer faith. Cassius,* indeed, was prevented, by death, from experiencing the Emperor's clemency; but the generous pardon extended to his family and followers, fully proved the sincerity of Aurelius's professions. The main cause therefore of the Christian Persecution must be sought for in the Emperor's attachment to the reigning system of Philosophy, an attachment which commenced almost in the days of infancy, and acquired strength with his maturer years: at the age of eight he was initiated among the *Salii*, and administered, in succession, the various offices of the sacred College, as *Vates, Præsul*, and *Magister*:† in his twelfth year he put on the Philosophic gown, and at this early age carried his voluntary austerity so far as to injure his health for life. The most distinguished Sages, among whom were Cornelius Fronto, Herodes Atticus, and Apollonius the Stoic, were selected to conduct his education;‡ and so great was the veneration which he felt for his instructors, that their images were placed in his chamber, and he decorated their tombs with flowers.§

Persecution of the Christians.

Probable causes of this Persecution.

It cannot be doubted, that at a Court, wherein the avenues of favour lay open to learning, many would attempt to impose on Aurelius by the garb of Philosophy and the language of Virtue. Now in one point both the real and pretended Sages would agree, namely, in exasperating the Emperor against the Christians, by traducing their character, customs, institutions, and principles, and by misinterpreting their motives whenever they could not deny facts; for the superior virtues of the Christian converts, their active benevolence, their patient forbearance and fortitude, the purity of their morals, and their zeal in spreading widely the light of truth, made them an object of hatred to the Heathen Philosophers. Again, the Christian writers attacked the pretensions, and exposed the inconsistencies of these pretended Sages, some with inevctive and some with derision. Tatianus, for instance, ridicules their affected disregard of death, and asks how their pretended contempt of the good things of this life can be reconciled with their alacrity in frequenting the Court, and their readiness to accept pensions; "and yet," adds he, ironically, "your wisdom, in this respect, is to be commended, lest you should seem to have cherished your beards and neglected your dress for nothing." Such shafts of satire, though they would wound only the worthless professors of Philosophy, had certainly no tendency to conciliate the best among her votaries, and they would all view, with feelings of anger, the rapid progress of the new Religion.

All these causes would contribute to unite the teachers of the Pagan schools against the followers of Jesus Christ. The influence of the former over the mind of Aurelius may be traced to early habits, confirmed by the prejudice of age and the pride of learning; and though in his mind contempt might hold the place of anger, still its effects were equally inimical to the Christians. Lastly, we may observe, that the crime urged against them by ignorance and malice was a crime of serious magnitude, and well calculated to awaken the vigilance of the civil Magistrate; they were charged with hatred to the whole race of Mankind, and the accusation rested on their refusal to participate the rites of Pagan worship. *Haud perinde*, says Tacitus,* *in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis convicti.* And Pliny, *Neque enim dubitabam qualecunque esset quod faterentur, certe pertinaciam et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri.* † Now the friendly intercommunity of worship among the Heathens was so firmly established by custom, that inflexible obstinacy in refusing this, seemed not only contemptuous to the Deities, but directed also towards the dissolution of Civil Society.‡ Charges such as these, urged with earnestness and exaggeration by persons who had the readiest access to M. Aurelius, will tend to account for his conduct, and, in some degree, may extenuate his guilt.

If Verus was unwilling to exchange the luxurious enjoyments of Antioch for a residence at Rome, still more reluctant was he to leave Rome and encounter the perils of war. Scarcely had the two Emperors triumphed, when the *Marcomanni*, the *Quadi*, and other nations, who had long been forming a confederacy, rose in arms. The resources of Rome were little prepared to resist so formidable opponents. Notwithstanding the preceding period of peace, the Treasury was exhausted, insomuch that the jewels of the Crown and Court furniture were sold by public auction, in order to raise supplies. Besides this deficiency, the army which had pursued the flying Parthians, suffered subsequently by sickness: the plague spread its devastations over the Empire, and the Capital was afflicted by the additional calamities of inundation and famine Under these circumstances, M. Aurelius recruited the troops by enlisting slaves and Gladiators, and by engaging mercenary soldiers in Germany. He determined, also, that Verus should accompany him to the field, thinking, perhaps,

War with the Marcomanni and Quadi.

* Dio. † Capitolinus.

‡ Letters from the former, with the replies of M. Aurelius, have lately been discovered in the Ambrosian library at Milan.

§ Zonaras.

* *Ann.* 15, 44. † Lib. x. *Ep.* 97.

‡ Warb. *Div. Leg.* book ii. sec. 6.

that his continuance at Rome might be more mischievous than his presence in the camp.

Death of Verus. A. D. 166.

The accounts in the Augustan Historians of this war with the *Marcomanni*, are composed without precise dates or due arrangement, and will be read with little interest. We learn that the two Emperors went to Aquileia, and that two years were past in occasional skirmishes, without any decisive battle. At the end of this period Verus died suddenly at Altinum; Aurelius consequently returned to Rome and conducted the body of his deceased colleague to the magnificent mausoleum of Hadrianus; his departure gave new hope and courage to the *Marcomanni*, though at that time they were pretending to desire peace: but the next year, the Emperor returning to Aquileia, pushed his conquests with vigour and success, and defeated the *Jazyges* in two battles; the last of which was fought on the frozen waters of the Danube.

A. D. 170

The Thundering Legion. A. D. 174.

A battle which took place with the *Quadi* derives importance and interest from the discussions it has raised among the writers of Ecclesiastical History. Dio details the circumstances, and calls the victory which the Romans gained wonderful, (παράδοξον,) or rather the gift of God. The substance of his account is, that the *Quadi*, having enclosed the Romans in a defile where no supply of water could be obtained, occupied every strong post, and left their enemies to perish by thirst, heat, and famine. Courage was now useless, and escape seemed impossible, when suddenly the clouds collected, water descended in torrents, with hailstones and hot thunder-bolts; the fire, however, did not injure the Romans, while the *Quadi* derived no benefit from the rain; on the contrary, the flames seemed to burn more fiercely, so that some attempted to extinguish them with their own blood, and others fled to the Romans as to the only place of safety. It is said that Arnuphis, an Egyptian magician, who was with Aurelius, invoked with certain incantations the Aerial Mercury and other Genii, and by their aid drew down the rain. Xiphilin, who lived in the XIth century, and abridged the latter part of Dio Cassius, interrupts the narration at this point, and, accusing the Historian of wilful misrepresentation, proceeds to relate, that in the army of M. Aurelius there was a legion of Christians, and, in this exigency, the efficacy of their prayers having been mentioned to the Emperor, he desired they would exert it in behalf of the army. Their supplications were graciously heard by God, who at the same moment struck the *Quadi* with lightning, and relieved the Romans by rain; whereupon M. Aurelius, being greatly astonished, published a decree honourable to the Christians, and gave this legion the name of the *Thundering Legion*. It is said that a Letter from him on this subject is still extant.

These observations of Xiphilin have raised a controversy which has been conducted at some length by Messrs. Moyle* and King. The former seems to have the advantage in extent of research and conclusive reasoning: his remarks are arranged under the following heads.

First, it is highly improbable there should have been in the army of Aurelius a whole legion composed of Christians, for their numbers at this period do not sanction such a supposition; and the military oaths tendered to the soldiers on enlistment contained an idolatrous recognition of the Pagan Deities.

Secondly, the *Thundering Legion* did not take its name from this battle, for Scaliger has proved it to be as old as the days of Trajanus.

Thirdly, Aurelius thought himself indebted for his deliverance to his own Pagan Gods, and not to the God of the Christians; for on a pillar still standing, is represented the figure of *Jupiter Pluvialis*, and a medal has been found struck, A. D. 174, bearing on one side a bust of Aurelius, and on the other the words *Religio Antonini*, encircling a Mercury: besides, Claudian and other writers ascribe the victory to the Pagan Divinities, even in their address to Christian Emperors,

omne Tonantis
Obsequium Marci mores potuere mereri.

This they would scarcely have done if a Pagan Emperor had therein recognised the power of the Christian God.

As to a Letter said to have been written on the subject, none of the early writers pretend to have seen it; and that which is now extant has been proved by Joseph Scaliger to have been a forgery, composed probably about the Vth century. Nor did Aurelius, in consequence of this battle, publish any edict in favour of the Christians.* For the Alexandrine Chronicle speaks of the Persecution terminating in the first year of Commodus: moreover, in the first book of M. Aurelius's *Meditations*, which was written after the battle with the *Quadi*, mention is made of the obstinacy and sufferings of the Christians in a manner which seems to imply a continuance of the Persecution; beside, the martyrs suffered at Lyons the most horrible cruelties subsequently to this battle, and it is improbable this would have happened if Aurelius had ascribed his deliverance to the Christians, or had issued an edict in their favour.

Moreover, none of the writers of the IId and IIId centuries mention the circumstances of the battle as miraculous, except Apollinaris and Tertullian:† the latter was an author of more genius and eloquence than sound judgment: his reasonings are often subtle, rather than solid; and his learning did not save him from the errors of credulity. Theophilus, who wrote only seven years after the pretended miracle, and Origen, who certainly would have urged it against Celsus, are alike silent. Arnobius and Lactantius do not mention it in their works; and even Cyprian, though an admirer of Tertullian, yet leaves out this story. Neither does Eusebius give testimony decidedly in favour of any miraculous interference on the part of Providence; his account is given as the substance of the common report, and concludes thus; on these points let each one judge for himself, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὅπῃ τίς ἐθέλῃ τιθέσθω.

These and other observations of Mr. Moyle, replete with much learning, and urged with considerable force and ingenuity, tend to this conclusion, that the fact of the Romans having been refreshed by rain at the time

* The Miracle of the Thundering Legion examined.—Moyle's Works, vol. ii.

* Proofs of the prevalence of Persecution may be found in the various Apologies which appeared in this reign. Justin speaks of the unjust and unreasonable proceedings of the Roman Governors every where. Theophilus of Antioch and Tatian, Apollinaris, Athenagoras and Melito of Sardis employed in the cause of true religion "the manly arms of rational argumentation."

† Mosheim.

the *Quadi* suffered from lightning is true, and that the relief was critical and accounted by both parties supernatural. The Pagans, we have seen, ascribed it to the interference of their Deities, while the Christians were not unwilling to think and assert that the deliverance was miraculous, and owing to the efficacy of their prayers. It is acknowledged on all hands that the relief afforded was very seasonable, though the circumstances do not seem to warrant the application of the word "miraculous" in its strict sense.

The consequences of the victory were very advantageous to M. Aurelius; many of the Barbarians sued for peace; the safety of *Pannonia* was secured; and an invasion of *Marcomania* was planned, when the appearances of Civil Rebellion diverted the attention of the Emperor from the prosecution of foreign conquest.

Rise of Avidius Cassius.

We have seen that in the early part of this reign Avidius Cassius was one of the Generals who conducted the Parthian war successfully. The severity of his discipline, although occasionally pressed beyond the line of necessity, justice, and humanity, was yet well adapted to improve and control an army to which the luxuries of an Eastern Capital were more agreeable than the rigours of a Roman camp: still his personal character, together with his military talents and success, endeared him to the troops, and Verus had long since cautioned Aurelius not to trust him too far.

The reply of the latter, if genuine, is a singular specimen of imprudence under the garb of magnanimity, justified on principles of fatalism.* "I have received your letter filled with jealousies unbecoming our rank and such a Government as ours. If the Gods destine him to the Empire whom you exhort me to guard against, we shall not be able to prevent it though we should be never so fain, for you know the saying of our grandfather Hadrianus, No man ever killed his successor. If, on the contrary, Avidius fights against the decrees of Fate, he himself will meet his destruction without our cruelty bringing the reproach of it upon us."

His rebellion

At length, on a false report of the Emperor's death, Avidius Cassius raised the standard of rebellion, and the Provinces within Mount Taurus soon acknowledged his dominion. When the revolt was generally known, M. Aurelius in a noble speech, addressed to his army, expressed his sorrow that no respite was allowed between the dangers of foreign war, and the discord of Civil rebellion; a rebellion the more atrocious because it originated in the faithlessness and treachery of a false friend. His own victory he considered to be certain, and he regretted that death might prevent the rebel Cassius from experiencing his clemency. The subsequent conduct of the Emperor (as we have before remarked) showed the sincerity of these professions; for though Cassius fell by the hands of his own officers, those who shared his guilt were not implicated in his fate; and M. Aurelius even wrote to the Senate, lest, in the zeal of their loyalty, the crimes of a rebellious subject might be visited on his innocent family.

The Emperor now proceeded into the East, thinking his presence might be useful in those districts which had been the scene of the late insurrection. In this expedition, Faustina, his wife, died, an Empress whose name has been handed to later times as a by-word of licentiousness and infamy. Her excesses were viewed by her husband with a Stoical indifference, false in its principle, degrading and mischievous in its effects: her memory was publicly idolized, and her character extolled in the book of *Meditations* in a style which argues the extremity of folly and dissimulation. From Syria, M. Aurelius went into Egypt; and, at length, having established order in the various districts through which he passed, and having founded at Athens Professorships in various branches of polite learning, he returned for two years to Rome: a gorgeous Triumph celebrated the extent and splendour of his conquests, and the People had reason to applaud the liberality of their Emperor. His time was now divided between the care of public affairs and a vain attempt to amend the disposition and curb the vices of his son, Commodus. Although he had already experienced the evils and impediments which arise from a worthless partner in power, the feelings of the Parent prevailed over the wisdom of the Magistrate. Commodus was very early invested with the title of *Cæsar;* at the age of fifteen, he was admitted to the Tribunitial power, and, lastly, raised to the same dignity with Aurelius himself. Being thus exalted beyond the restraint of authority, and the necessity of dissimulation, he abandoned himself to sensual pleasures and illiberal pursuits. At this time war again broke out on the banks of the Danube; and the Quintilii being unable to check the Barbarians, Aurelius, taking Commodus with him, left Rome to assume the command in person: success attended the expedition: a great battle took place, in which the *Marcomanni*, *Quadi*, and *Sarmatæ*, were routed: their complete subjection now seemed inevitable, when M. Aurelius was seized with sickness, which in a few days terminated his life at Vienna. His latter days were embittered by the vices of Commodus, by whom parental authority and example were alike disregarded, and whom parental indulgence had fostered to be a private and public scourge. Dio calls this period a transition from the Golden to the Iron Age; and, indeed, the reign of Commodus is a scene of guilt and misery, which the Historian contemplates with disgust, and is glad to dismiss with brevity.

Death of Faustina.

Commodus associated in the Empire.

A. D. 178. Second war with the Marcomanni.

A. D 180. Death of Antoninus.

* Crevier.

COMMODUS ANTONINUS.

FROM A. D. 180 TO 192.

Biography. From A. D. 180. to 192.

No sooner was Aurelius dead than Commodus became anxious to proceed to Rome. But Pompeianus, who had married Lucilla, the widow of Verus, and sister of the new Emperor, persuaded him to postpone a measure so like ignominious retreat, and to preserve during a decent interval at least the appearance of warfare. In the same year, however, a treaty, neither honourable nor advantageous, was hastily concluded with the Barbarians; Commodus returned to the Capital, and the son of an Emperor, long beloved and sincerely regretted, was naturally received with the joy and acclamations of enthusiasm. At first, amidst a mad career of gross licentiousness and vulgar amusement, he left affairs of State to the management of his father's friends. Their counsels, however, were soon disregarded; and the evils of a corrupt Government combining with other causes produced discontent, and discontent conspiracy. Among the ringleaders was his sister Lucilla, whose pride was wounded in being obliged to yield to Crispina, his wife: the execution of the plot was intrusted to an assassin, who, waiting for the Emperor in a narrow avenue leading to the Theatre, aimed a blow at him, and said, "The Senate sends you this:" perhaps, he might have succeeded had he struck in silence; but the utterance of these words alarming Commodus, saved his life, and created a deep and lasting hatred against the whole body of the Senate. The assassin was put to death, Lucilla was banished to Capri, and numbers, whose wealth and character tempted the avarice, or raised the suspicions of the Emperor, became the victims of his unsparing cruelty.

Conspiracy of Pompeianus.

Herodian and Dio differ respecting the names of some who were engaged in this conspiracy, and disagree widely respecting the character of Perennis, who was at this time the reigning favourite. Dio professes to write from his own knowledge; and being on the spot, he had the best means of information, without any inducement to deceive his readers. He condemns Perennis for having contrived the death of his predecessor Paternus, but adds, that his public measures tended to the welfare of the Empire, while his private character was alike free from avarice and ambition. Herodian, on the contrary, accuses this Minister of making the passions of Commodus subservient to his own designs, by awakening suspicious jealousy, and thus procuring the death or banishment of those who had been the friends of Aurelius. His object was to possess himself of the Throne by corrupting the army, and to this end his son was placed over the troops in Illyria: at length, his treachery was discovered, a deputation of soldiers from Britain demanded his death, and accordingly he was sacrificed to appease their fury. The dangers of the Empire, however, were not terminated by his death; disaffection had spread over the legions, and an attempt of Maternus, a private soldier, who headed a band of deserters, and projected the assassination of Commodus during the celebration of the festival of Cybele, was so ably conceived, that he must have been successful but for the treachery of an accomplice.

Ministry of Perennis.

Conspiracy of Maternus.

Commodus Antoninus. From A. D. 180. to 192.

But neither duty nor danger could draw Commodus from the sports of gladiators or the pleasures of debauchery. Cleander, a Phrygian slave, who had rendered himself useful to his master's vices, soon succeeded to the place and influence of Perennis: under him the pardon of guilt, and the enjoyment of office, might equally be purchased, and no traffic was too base or corrupt if it filled the coffers of the Minister. During three years the Empire was drained by his rapacity; but his insatiable avarice attempting to keep up the price of corn by monopoly, so exasperated the populace that they besieged the Palace, till Commodus sacrificed his favourite to preserve himself. It was not easy, however, to awaken the Emperor from his dream of luxury, and the tumult well nigh cost him his own life. It was to the entreaties of his favourite concubine that he at last granted the head of his Minister.

Ministry of Cleander.

Crimes of Commodus.

As tyranny naturally produced conspiracies and tumults, so these increased the cruelty of the tyrant; not only did the best and noblest citizens become the victims of his suspicion, revenge, and avarice, but his very amusements were stamped with a character of incredible ferocity; and the dream of his mother, Faustina, during her pregnancy, that she was delivered of two serpents, one of which far exceeded the other in savageness of nature, appeared amply verified in her surviving son. It is an unpleasant task to record the insane crimes of a ferocious sensualist, who possessed the means of unlimited indulgence; but the truth of History demands that facts should be adduced to avouch for the proverbial infamy which attaches to the name of Commodus. His disposition to cruelty was early manifested; and, at twelve years of age, he ordered an unhappy slave who had the care of his bath to be thrown into the furnace, because he had miscalculated the temperature of the water. By an artifice of his tutor, the Prince's anger was satisfied without the death of his victim. His amusements, when not ferocious, were illiberal and unbecoming of his station; and he excelled in various mechanic arts as well as in the discipline of the buffoon, the gladiator, and the charioteer. His unnatural lusts were shamelessly exhibited in the face of day; and his favourite minion, who was afterwards assassinated by popular rage, ostentatiously accompanied him in the very car of triumph on his first return to Rome as Emperor. His private hours were distributed between 300 beautiful concubines, and as many boys of every rank and province; and not satisfied with this unbounded gratification he heightened the stings of lust by incest. Protracted banquets wore away his nights, and (to adopt

Biography. From A. D. 180. to 192.

the strong phrase of one of his biographers) he glutted on the whole resources of the Empire.* Even his jests were distinguished by cruelty. In celebrating the rites of Isis, the master of the Roman world appeared with a shaven crown, and bore in his arms an image of the dog Anubis; with this, as opportunity offered, he repeatedly struck the heads of the Priests who accompanied him, many of whom, also, he compelled to wound themselves to death, by turning into reality the mock beating of the breasts with which they were used to lament their God. The lame and halt were selected as his antagonists in the *arena;* and these, dressed up as mimic giants or monsters, he assailed with a club or transfixed with arrows. Though luxurious in his dress, frequently resorting to the bath eight times in the day, scattering gold-dust in his hair, and, from the fear of admitting the approach of a razor in the hand of another, singeing off his beard, he was especially proud of exhibitions of personal strength, and frequently butchered victims with his own hand in the garb of a sacrificer. Among the flatteries of the obsequious Senate none pleased him more than the vote which styled him the *Hercules of Rome;* not even that which annexed to him the titles *Pius* and *Felix*, or which offered to abolish the name of the Eternal City, and substitute for it *Colonia Commodiana*. Seven hundred and thirty-five times did he exhibit as a *Secutor;* and he considered his glory at its height, when the name of Paulus (the most celebrated of this species of gladiators) was inscribed on the Imperial statues.

Commodus Antoninus. From A. D. 180 to 192.

After thirteen years of unmitigated oppression, his favourite, Martia, ultimately became the instrument by which the Roman world was delivered from its odious master. She discovered from some private notes of Commodus, that herself, Lætus, the Prætorian Præfect, and Electus, the Chamberlain, were on the list devoted to death: a conspiracy was immediately formed, Martia administered poison to the Emperor, and, lest the measure should not prove effectual, the deed was completed by suffocation.

Assassination of Commodus. A. D. 192.

* *Cum potaret in lucem, helluaretur que viribus Romani Imperii.* Lampridius, 8

PUBLIUS HELVIUS PERTINAX.

A. D. 193. FROM JANUARY TO MARCH.

Biography. A. D. 193. From JANUARY to MARCH.

No sooner was the Throne vacant than Lætus and the rest of the conspirators determined on offering it to Pertinax, one of the few friends of Aurelius who had escaped the cruelty of Commodus.* Capitolinus accuses him of being at first acquainted with the plot; but the suddenness of its execution, the testimony of Dio, and the character of Pertinax himself, all combine to make this imputation improbable.

Early life of Pertinax.

Pertinax had early chosen the profession of arms, and his whole life, with the exception of the period of the administration of Perennis, when he retired into Liguria, was passed in active and honourable employment; at different times, he was invested with military command on the Danube, in Syria, and in Britain; and when he was subsequently appointed to hold Civil offices at Rome, he discharged their various duties with integrity, prudence, and fidelity. The successive appointments by which he rose to be master of the Roman world are related by Capitolinus; and Gibbon justly remarks, that their order is worthy of preservation as expressive of the form of Government and the manners of the Age. 1. He was a *Centurion*. 2. Præfect of a cohort in Syria, in the Parthian war, and in Britain. 3. He obtained a squadron of horse in Mœsia. 4. He was Commissary of provisions on the Æmilian way. 5. He commanded the fleet upon the Rhine. 6. He was Procurator of Dacia, with a salary of 1600*l.* a year. 7. He commanded the veterans of a legion. 8. He obtained the rank of *Senator*. 9. Of *Prætor*. 10. With the command of the first legion in Rhætia and Noricum. 11. He was *Consul* about the year 175. 12. He attended M. Aurelius into the East. 13. He commanded an army on the Danube. 14. He was Consular Legate of Mœsia. 15. Of Dacia. 16. Of Syria. 17. Of Britain. 18. He had the care of the public provisions at Rome. 19. He was *Proconsul* of Africa. 20. Præfect of the city.

Publius Helvius Pertinax. A. D. 193. From JAUNARY to MARCH.

A visit at midnight from the ministers of Commodus seemed to indicate a summons to death, rather than the offer of a Throne: when, however, Lætus had related the origin and event of the conspiracy, and urged Pertinax to assume the purple, the latter reluctantly consented. The next step was, to secure the support of the army; and though the Prætorian guards were little pleased with the death of an Emperor under whom they had enjoyed more license and indulgence than the well-known character and discipline of Pertinax allowed them to hope in future, yet, agitated by the emergency of the moment, and tempted by the promise of an ample donation, they took the oaths of allegiance. On the next morning the Senate assembled; and while the populace were expressing their joy at the death of Commodus in the exclamations and outrages of vindictive fury, the Conscript Fathers inflicted on his memory every mark of scorn and detestation. His statues were overthrown, his memory declared infamous, and his body dragged by a hook into the stripping room of the gladiators, as the uttermost malignity which vengeance could offer. Pertinax modestly stated his desire to abdicate his recent dignity in favour of some one

* Julian.

Biography.

A. D. 193. From JANUARY to MARCH. His wise Government.

of nobler birth and higher pretensions; since age and infirmity disqualified him from duly discharging its duties: the Senate, however, confirmed by their tribute of sincere approbation, the choice made by Lætus and the army. The new Emperor applied himself immediately to rectify abuses which had grown up under the late Government: he replenished the exhausted Treasury by retrenching superfluous expenses, and by the sale of those articles of luxury which had ministered to the vices and extravagances of his infamous predecessor. The plan of his private expenditure was frugal without meanness, and his manner of receiving his friends affable without unbecoming familiarity. Such a system pursued in public and in private, however agreeable to the few remaining friends of virtue, was little adapted to conciliate those who remembered with regret the festivity and revels of Commodus. Lætus, who procured the elevation of Pertinax, was also the cause of his destruction. At his instigation the disaffected troops besieged the Palace, conscious of their power, and certain of profiting in any tumultuous disturbance by the bounty of their friends, and the plunder of their enemies. Pertinax, either hoping to awe them by his presence, or determined to meet his fate with fortitude, presented himself before them. A feeling of shame, the consciousness of guilt and ingratitude, now arrested their progress: the pause, however, was but momentary, and the virtuous Pertinax, after a reign of eighty-seven days, was massacred by an army too vicious to admire his excellence, and too powerful to acknowledge his authority.

Publius Helvius Pertinax.

A. D. 193. From JANUARY to MARCH.

His assassination.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXX.

LITERATURE OF THE AGE OF THE ANTONINI.

LUCIANUS	BORN A. D. 124. DIED	204.
PAUSANIAS	FLOURISHED CIRCITER A. D.	174.
JULIUS POLLUX		180.
AULUS GELLIUS		130.
CLAUDIUS GALENUS	BORN A. D. 131. DIED CIRCITER	200.
LUCIUS APULEIUS	FLOURISHED CIRCITER	160.
ATHENÆUS		220.
MAXIMUS TYRIUS		150.
MARCUS FABIUS QUINCTILIANUS	BORN A. D. 42. DIED	122.

Biography.

In our Historical account of the Age of the Antonini, no mention has hitherto been made of its Literature. We have, however, seen that the love of Philosophy and studious pursuits was the ruling passion of MARCUS AURELIUS. His *Meditations* contain as pure a code of Moral precepts as could be expected from the genius of Paganism,—teaching the Immortality of the soul, not as a separate existence, but rather as a reunion with the essence of the Deity.* This work is too well known to require any very particular notice: it was translated into French by Dacier, 1690; into Italian, by an unknown author, 1675; and into English by Meric Casaubon, 1634, and by Collier, 1701.† Gataker published an excellent edition of the original, with ample notes and commentary, parallel passages, and *prolegomena*. Some *Letters* of this Emperor are commended by Philostratus as models of epistolary style, and a part of his correspondence with Cornelius Fronto was lately found among the manuscripts in the Ambrosian library at Milan, and published by Angelus Maius in 1815.

Meditations of M. Aurelius.

As the example of Aurelius encouraged Literature at Rome, so his bounty rewarded it in the Provinces. His own attachment to the Stoics did not prevent his regarding with an eye of favour the patrons of opposite sects: the disciples of Plato, the Peripatetics, Stoics, and Epicureans, Professors of Philosophy and Rhetoric, all taught their dogmas with equal freedom in the Schools of Athens; and by the generosity of the Antonines, a salary, equal to three hundred pounds sterling, was annexed to each Chair of Science.‡ This Imperial favour, which was neither bigoted in its principles, nor parsimonious in its supplies, naturally encouraged emulation, and accordingly we know that many strove, by the exercise of literary talents, to deserve well of their contemporaries and of posterity. But the ravages of Time have deprived us of great part of their labours: authentic sources of Historical knowledge being few and imperfect, we are compelled to accept our information through the medium of abridgements and compilations. Some works, however, composed about this time, have come down to us in tolerable preservation; and, although there does not appear among them any master mind whose writings were calculated to influence and guide the tone of public feeling, or stamp its own character on the pursuits of the Age, still they are not without their value. The Grammarian and Philologist are assisted by the labours of Julius Pollux; he who directs his inquiries towards the works of Art, which at this period were the ornament of Greece, will find his researches rewarded in the writings of Pausanias; while the student sees an infinite number of subjects connected with antiquity discussed and illustrated in the curious Miscellany of Athenæus. Aulus Gellius and Apuleius depart more widely from the models of pure style than the Greek writers who lived about the same period, Dio Cassius, Maximus Tyrius, and Lucianus. Aulus Gellius is obscure; and in Apuleius, the frequent occurrence of abstract nouns is a sign of declining Latinity. Of Dio mention has been already made in a preceding paper on the Historians of Rome, and of Maximus Tyrius we shall have occasion to speak shortly.

Literature of the Ages of the Antonini.

Literary patronage of the Antonini.

But among all the authors of this time, LUCIANUS stands unquestionably first in natural abilities, in originality of character, and in playfulness of fancy. Though his talents were not of the very highest order, yet in his own line they were unequalled: his chief strength lay in ridicule, which, though it is not the test of Truth, may become an useful auxiliary or a formidable foe to it.

Lucianus.

Some of the minor works of Voltaire abound in that vein of sarcastic humour which forms the great charm

* Lib. iv. c. 9. † Fabricius.

‡ See Gibbon, vol. vii. c. 40, and the authorities there named

Biography.

of the writings of Lucianus. The French Philosopher seems to have persecuted the cause of Truth with a feeling of personal hostility; and his raillery has probably been more effectively mischievous than the subtle reasonings of Hume: but the powers of Lucianus were by accident, and to a certain extent,* effectively useful; more useful, perhaps, than the labours of abler and wiser men. We say by accident, because, although in an Age of free inquiry, the instruments, which Lucianus employed with so much dexterity, were precisely adapted to expose sophistry, and clear away the rubbish of Heathen superstition; yet he had no design so excellent and so important, as to establish in their stead the fabric of Truth and Religion. While, therefore, we admire his singular abilities, we must condemn the man, who being by habit and by natural inclination studious, by profession a Philosopher, and by conviction † a contemner and enemy of the whole system of Pagan Mythology, should nevertheless make Christianity the subject only of contemptuous allusion,‡ rather than of that serious and sober investigation, which were fairly demanded even by the number of its converts, and the authority of its advocates.

It is much to be wished that Lucianus, in his various works, had communicated more respecting his private life and history. The biographical notices, which we find from himself, are scanty and uninteresting, nor have we any other sources from which this defect may be supplied.

We know, however, with certainty, that he was born at Samosata,§ near the Euphrates; and since it was necessary that he should earn his bread by his own industry, he was placed with his mother's brother,‖ who was by profession a statuary. This step was taken partly because it was the least expensive, and partly because Lucianus had already shown natural genius and dexterity in modelling figures in wax. Here he commences inauspiciously, by breaking a tablet, and his master having chastised him with severity, he quitted his new employment in disgust. The same night he saw a vision;—the Goddess of Sculpture and the Goddess of Polite Literature both appeared before his eyes; the one covered with the dust of the quarries, the other fair in person and elegant in her attire. Each proposed her claims, and stated the advantages of her respective pursuits; and when Lucianus determined to commit himself to the guidance of the Goddess of Literature, the other deity, like a second Niobe, became turned into stone. These circumstances form the substance of the treatise *De somnio seu Luciani vitâ:* the object of which was to encourage those, whose poverty appears to doom them to the walks of laborious life, while natural genius justifies them in aspiring to nobler and more intellectual pursuits. "Though," says Dryden,¶ "it is not to be supposed that there is any thing of reality in this dream or vision of Lucian, which he treats of in his works, yet this may be gathered from it, that Lucian himself having consulted his genius and the nature of the study his father had allotted him, and that to which he found a propensity in himself, he quitted the former, and pursued the latter, choosing rather to form the minds of men than their statues."

The learned Mr. Moyle has taken some pains to adjust the age of Lucianus; and from some notes of time which are preserved in his works, his birth is fixed to the 124th year of Christ, and the 8th of the Emperor Adrian.* After his determination to abandon the Art of Sculpture, he taught† the Art of Rhetoric in Gaul, and practised it at Antioch;‡ but his pleadings at the Bar not being attended with success, he betook himself at the age of forty to the study of Philosophy. During the latter part of his life he became Registrar (ὑπομνηματογράφου) of Alexandria,§ which post was a step towards the government of a Province. The manner of his death is doubtful, but he is supposed to have lived to the age of eighty.

Literature of the Age of the Antonini.

It happens, unfortunately, that as the biographical notices respecting Lucianus are scanty, so the nature of his works is not such as to supply the defect satisfactorily. He appears to have resembled his favourite Menippus, who was χλευαστὴς τῆς ἐωικήου καὶ ἐφημέρου τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζωῆς,‖ and there is a passage in Cicero's *Academics*, wherein Varro is speaking of his own imitation of the Menippèan satires, which may stand for the character of Lucian's works in general: *In illis veteribus nostris, quæ, Menippum imitati, non interpretati, quâdam hilaritate conspersimus, multa admista ex intimâ Philosophiâ, multa dicta dialecticè, quæ quo facilius minus docti intelligerent, jucunditate quâdam ad legendum invitati, &c.*¶ He tells us, indeed, that his object was to combine the playfulness and wit of Comedy with the graver lessons of Philosophical discussion. Lucianus, however, was more a Satirist than a Philosopher; and although he had not the honest indignation of Juvenal, although, in polite wit and delicacy of taste, he was inferior to Horace, yet he surpassed them both in facetious humour and powers of derision. The range of his satire is more extensive, and its severity more generally intelligible than that of Aristophanes. Aristophanes was a Political wit; and he who would appreciate his Comedies must possess a minute knowledge of the History of the times in which he lived; of the personal character of the demagogues whose administration he attacked; and of the Political institutions, private habits, and distinguishing peculiarities of the audience which he addressed. The pleasantry of Lucianus is accessible without so much preparatory study. He had, without any real hatred of vice, a quick sense of that part of it which is ridiculous:** no one saw more clearly the frailties of human nature, the "fears of the brave and the follies of the wise:" no one exposed more happily the vanity of those pursuits in which mankind most eagerly engage,†† the disproportionate sorrow which is suffered to arise from disappointment, and the secret vexations which frequently accompany success.‡‡ But his lessons, even where they are good, are imperfect: they do not suggest any higher pursuits, they do not instil any worthier motive of action, they do not tend to any useful exertion: the Satirist, in his sketches of life and character, borrows freely the pencil of Democritus, and only qualifies his pupils to follow that Philosopher's employment. It is, indeed, vain to expect, in the writings of Lucianus, any very high tone of Moral feeling, or to find Virtue, even in

* Erasmus.
† *Dialogi Deorum, passim.*
‡ *In vitâ Peregrini.*
§ *Quom. scrib. sit Hist.*
‖ *Somnium.*
¶ *Life of Lucian.*

* Moyle's Works.
† *Hercules Gallicus.*
‡ Suidas.
§ *Pro mercede conductis.*
‖ Antoninus, τῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν, lib. vi.
¶ *Prom. es in verbis.*
** Aristot. *Poetica.*
†† *Nigrinus, et Navigium seu Vota et Gallus.*
‡‡ *Hermotimus, et Necyomantia, et Navigium, et Gallus.*

Biography.

the Pagan sense of the word, portrayed with the dignity of Aristotle, or recommended by the eloquence of Plato. Nevertheless, he had honesty enough to hate* the hypocrisy of pretended Philosophers,† the arts of casuistical Rhetoricians, and the subtleties of scholastic Logic:‡ he had penetration enough to see the absurdity of the whole system of Pagan Mythology;§ and he possessed an inexhaustible fund of wit and humour to expose these various subjects to the contempt and derision of mankind.

But in the cultivation and use of these dangerous and fascinating talents, Truth and Falsehood, simply as such, became indifferent, and were patronised by turns, as they afforded materials for the display of ingenuity, or the excitement of mirth: the plainest‖ and most important truths of Natural Religion are treated by him with the same levity as the grossest follies of Heathen Superstition: the existence of the Deity,¶ the duty of worship, and the administration of a Providence, are involved in the same ridicule with the characters and actions of the fabulous inhabitants of Olympus. In the Dialogue entitled *Jupiter Tragœdus*, the cause of Natural Religion is betrayed by a feeble and frivolous defence. Whether Lucianus here intended to express his own sentiments under the character of *Damis* is uncertain: probably he had not any settled opinions to express. He did, indeed, dedicate his *Alexander*, or Ψευδόμαντις, to Celsus, who was an Epicurean; and, in the same treatise, he calls the founder of that sect "an instructor really divine, the only one who understood and taught the system of Truth and Virtue, and gave freedom to the minds of his followers:" moreover,** the highest honours in the land of the blessed are allotted to Epicurus, and his follower, Aristippus; whereas, in the *Vitarum Auctio*, the former is sold for two *minæ*, and the latter finds no purchaser. From the unsparing ridicule of this and some other Dialogues,†† Lucianus was accused of being the enemy of Philosophy; and he attempts to defend himself from this charge in the *Revivescentes*, or *Piscator*. Here an inquiry is supposed to be instituted, over which the Goddess of Philosophy presides, and Diogenes, in the name of his brethren, is appointed to conduct the prosecution. Lucianus argues, on his own behalf, that *False* Philosophy alone was the object of his sarcasms, and that he designed to expose the degenerate followers of the ancient Sages, who had corrupted the purity of their doctrines, and who pursued the good things of this world as eagerly as their less learned neighbours: the Court is satisfied, and the Dialogue ends with a tale of considerable drollery and humour: but, in fact, Lucianus had no love for Truth,‡‡ his raillery is severe, without discrimination;§§ the researches of Aristotle into Natural History are treated with the same derision as the scepticism of Pyrrho, and the Logical subtleties of Chrysippus.

As the ruling passion of Lucianus prevented his adopting, in earnest, any set of Philosophical tenets, so also did it affect his taste in Literature. In no other writer do we see more strongly exhibited that unequivocal mark of bad taste, a fondness for parody, a delight in degrading the most sublime passages of Poetry, by the opposition of ludicrous and low images: although he could write with good feeling and good sense,* he always seems impatient of the restraint of serious composition. His sketch of the character of Demonax† is beautifully drawn; but he soon betakes himself to relate that Philosopher's bon-mots and repartees. His remarks on the manner in which History should be written are sensible and just: he appears to have appreciated duly the inimitable excellence of Thucydides; and he inveighs strongly against the Historians of his own time, for their ignorance of the proper object of Historical composition, their utter disregard of Truth, their base flattery, their false estimate of the comparative importance of events, and the prolixity and impertinence of their descriptions. But after a few pages in this rational and serious strain, he proceeds to expose the lying wonders of Historians, and the fictions of poetry, in another treatise, which is called, in derision, *Vera Historia*. Here he relates his being absorbed and buried in the bowels of an immense pit, his journey to the moon, and his visit to the shades below. On this occasion,‡ as on many others, Homer comes in for his full share of ridicule. Lucianus was familiar with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; and without having enough severity of taste fully to appreciate their excellence, he had discernment enough to perceive their minutest faults. Many of these, which ought to be ascribed to the Age rather than to the Poet, are brought into notice with considerable humour; and he must be indeed fastidious, who has not sometimes found himself laughing with Lucianus at the expense of the Mæonian bard.

Literature of the Age of the Antonini.

The style of Lucianus is easy and perspicuous, and the subjects on which he touches are miscellaneous: some of these are, in themselves, highly objectionable; and even where they are not, we find many coarse and indelicate expressions and illusions, the fault of which may, with justice, be attributed to the evil Moral taste of his Age. The *Dialogues of the Dead* are entertaining, though they exhibit little diversity of character, and though their highest strain of morality inculcates only the Pagan precept, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The *Life of Peregrinus Proteus* may be read with interest; caution, however, is necessary, for, as Lardner has observed, the treatise contains some misrepresentations, either wilful or undesigned: Lucianus is the only author who has made this rambling Philosopher a Christian. That Lucianus was an enemy of Christianity is true, inasmuch as he esteemed all Religion a compound of fraud and folly: he speaks, however, the language of contempt rather than of enmity; it does not appear that he persecuted the professors of the true Faith with any particular or personal hostility, nor had he taken much pains to acquaint himself with their distinguishing tenets.

In 1714, Gesner held a disputation at Jena, to prove that the treatise entitled *Philopatris* was not written by Lucianus, because it shows a more minute knowledge of the doctrines and Scriptures of the Christians, than can be traced in those works which are confessedly genuine. In the account of the death of Peregrinus, Lucianus says of the Christians, "They worship even now that great man who was crucified in Palestine, because he introduced this new system of Religion." And again: "These ill-fated men (οἱ κακοδαίμονες) per-

---

* *Hermotimus et Piscator.* † *Rhetorum Præceptor.* ‡ *Vitarum Auctio.*
§ *Jupiter confutatus, et de Sacrificiis, et Dialogi Deorum et Concio Deorum.* ‖ *Jupiter Tragœdus.* ¶ *De Sacrificiis.*
** *Veræ Historiæ*, lib. ii. †† *Hermotimus.* ‡‡ *Symposion.*
§§ *Vitarum auctio.*

* *Nigrinus, et Imagines.* † *Demonactis vita.*
‡ *Contemplantes, Timon, et Dialogi.*

suade themselves that they shall live for ever, wherefore they disregard, and in many cases voluntarily seek death. They live as brethren, having their possessions in common, and regulating their lives according to the laws of their master who was crucified, (*τὸν ἀνάσκολοπισμένον ἐκεῖνον σοφιστὴν ἀντῶν*) whom they worship."

But the author of the *Philopatris* knew much more respecting the Christians than these passages imply. The dialogue is conducted between Critias and Tisiphon, one being a professed Heathen, and the other an Epicurean personating a Christian. The design is partly to represent the Christians as a sect disaffected to Government, and dangerous to Civil society; and partly to expose some of their peculiar opinions. We find clear allusions to the Book of *Genesis*, and several other parts of the Scriptures,* on the subject of the Creation, the doctrine of the Trinity, and the ceremony of Baptism. On these grounds Gesner would reject the *Philopatris* from the works of Lucianus; and Mr. Moyle argues on the same side, from the Political events which the dialogue mentions, namely, the conquest of the Scythians, the reduction of Egypt, and a victory over the Persians. "These," he says,† "can never be applied to the reign of Antoninus; nor indeed to that of any other Emperor except of Dioclesian, in whose reign they all met together, in the same order of time as they are set down, as may easily be seen; but more particularly in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, who places the wars with the Scythians, and the reduction of Egypt, many years before the great victory obtained over Narseus, King of Persia, in the year of Christ 302, and twenty-three years before the Council Nice, at which time I do verily believe this Dialogue was written." Nor is the *Philopatris* the only spurious treatise which has come down to us in company with the works of Lucianus. The Critics have observed, that *Demosthenis Encomium* is devoid of his wit, elegance, and perspicuity. The *Pseudosophistæ*, *Fugitivi*, *Charidemus*, *Nero and Ocypus* are rejected; and also the *Amores*, by Bourdelotius and Kuster. The manner of Lucianus has been imitated in French by Fontenelle, and in Latin by Erasmus. The latter was a great admirer of his works, some of which he translated. Parts of them have been also translated into French by D'Ablancourt, 1634; into English, by F. Hickes, about the same time; by Dr. Mayne in 1664; by Spence in 1684. Dr. Franklin published a translation of his works, in two volumes quarto; and also, still more lately, Mr. Tooke, with the comments and illustrations of Weiland and others. There is an excellent edition of the original by Hemsterhusius, in four volumes quarto.

Pausanias.

Suidas mentions two persons of the name of PAUSANIAS, one being a Laconian, and the other a native of Cæsarea in Cappadocia: the Topographer probably was not the former of these; for his reflections on the Laconians are severe, and his style approaches the Ionic rather than the Doric. There is reason to suppose he was the second mentioned by Suidas; the same whom Galen calls the Syrian Sophist, and a disciple of Herodes Atticus. From his works we know very little of himself or his family: he was alive in the fourteenth year of Marcus Aurelius: he travelled through Greece, Macedon, Italy, and part of Asia; having also visited the Oracle of Jupiter Ammon, Palestine, and the Dead Sea. Fabricius enumerates in the catalogue of the lost works of Pausanias, Geographical Treatises respecting Asia, Syria, and Phœnicia, together with others entitled, 1. *μελέται*, or Declamations; 2. *περὶ συνταξέως*; 3. *προβλήματων βιβλίον*; 4. *Ἀττίκων ὀνόματων συναγωγή*.

The work of Pausanias which has come down to us is divided into Ten Books, of which two are devoted to a description of Elis, and one to each of the following districts, Attica, Corinthia, Laconia, Messenia, Achaia, Arcadia, Bœotia, and Phocis. The painter, the architect, and the antiquary, will find much that is interesting in the minute and curious details which are given respecting the ancient relics of Grecian Temples, buildings, and statues. These passages have been selected by Uvedale Price, translated into English, and published in one octavo volume. The fidelity of the Geographical descriptions of Pausanias is thus acknowledged by a modern traveller:—"On arriving from Albania, in the Morea, you quit a region little known at any time, for one which the labours of ancients and moderns have equally contributed to illustrate; and after wandering in uncertainty you acknowledge the aid of faithful guides, who direct every footstep of your journey. Pausanias alone will enable you to feel at home in Greece. The exact conformity of present appearances with the minute descriptions of the *Itinerary*, is no less surprising than satisfactory. The Temple and the Statue, the Theatre, the Column, and the marble porch, have sunk and disappeared; but the vallies and the mountains, and some not unfrequent fragments of more value than all the rude and costly monuments of barbaric labour; these still remain, and remind the traveller that he treads the ground once trod by the Heroes and Sages of Antiquity."*

The Historian will find in the IVth Book of Pausanias, an account of the wars between the Messenians and Laconians; and of those, moreover, which took place on the death of Alexander, between Perdiccas, Ptolemy, and Cassander: various observations are introduced throughout the work on ancient Games, Festivals, Offerings, &c. &c., and many Oracles are recorded, with their supposed accomplishment. Taylor, who has made the whole work of Pausanias accessible to the English reader, says,† these "Oracles may be considered as a treasure of popular evidence for the truth of his Religion: for if it be admitted that they were given, and such events happened as are here related, it is impossible such a series of predictions could be true by casual concurrence." Such admissions, however, are to be made with caution; and when we have set aside from among the ancient Oracles those the date of which is doubtful, those the terms of which are ambiguous, and those which had a natural tendency to work their own accomplishment, "this treasure of popular evidence" will be materially reduced. Some notion of Taylor's candour may be formed from the following passage. His notes to Pausanias were added to preserve the knowledge of the ancient Theology of the later Platonists; "these," he says, "are considered by verbal Critics and sophistical Priests as fanatics, but the discerning reader knows that the former never read a book but in order to make different readings of

* Lardner. † Vol. i. p. 292.

* Hobhouse, *Journey through Albania*, &c.
† Taylor, Preface.

the words in it, and that the latter wilfully pervert the meaning in some places and ignorantly in others, of every valuable author, whether ancient or modern."

The *Itinerary* of Pausanias was first published at Venice by Aldus, in 1516: a folio edition came out in 1583, with the notes of Xylander and Sylburgius: Isaac Casaubon's copy of this book with his own MS. notes is in the British Museum. There is also an excellent edition in folio by Kuhnius, dated 1696. The style of this author is abrupt and intricate, rude and unpolished: a variety of grammatical anomalies are collected in the notes of Sylburgius.

Julius Pollux.

JULIUS POLLUX, a Lexicographer, was born at Naucratis, in Egypt, a city situated not far from the Canopic mouth of the Nile. He flourished in the reign of Commodus, to whom he addressed a work in ten Books, called *Onomasticon*, intended, as he himself tells us, to be a vocabulary of select synonyms with authorities. He filled the Rhetorical chair at Athens, and was the author of other works now lost; some were entitled διαλέξεις, some μελέται: of these Philostratus criticises the style as inelegant, and Athenodorus the matter as puerile. Julius Pollux is called by Isaac Casaubon, "*Optimus, utilissimus, eruditissimus.*" The arrangement of the *Onomasticon* is not alphabetical; this will be evident to any one who examines the following heads, which form the subjects of the second Book. 1. *Hominum ætates et vocabula.* 2. *Quæ sunt ante generationem et quæ sunt post generationem.* 3. *Hominum membra et partes.* 4. *Partes externæ et internæ.* 5. *Quæ singulis partibus congruunt nominum frequentissimus usus.* A fine edition of this work, in two volumes folio, has been published by Hemsterhusius, *cum notis variorum*, Amsterdam, 1706.—See Fabricius's *Bibl. Græc.*

Aulus Gellius.

The work of AULUS GELLIUS remaining to us may be called an ancient Common-place book. It is introduced to the attention of the reader by a preface commencing with this very candid remark, *Jucundiora alia reperiri queant;* after which he who continues his researches without finding entertainment, has no reason to be discontented with the author. Aulus Gellius goes on to explain the character of his work, and the intention with which it was composed. He tells us, that it was written to employ those hours of recreation which business allowed to his children. Whenever, in the course of his studies, he met with any thing either in Greek or Roman Literature, or amidst the intercourse of society, which seemed worthy of notice, he transferred it to his tablets, together with his own remarks, without any system or methodical arrangement: this habit assisted his memory, and enabled him to recover facts and opinions, if the books from which they were originally derived lay at any time beyond his reach. The title, *Noctes Atticæ*, was suggested by the time and place of the compilation: its simplicity is consistent with the tone of modesty which runs through the preface, and is contrasted strongly with those pompous titles, which he says it was customary to annex to works of this description. The object of this author's work, namely, to employ on innocent and useful subjects the leisure hours of his children, must be confessed to be excellent, although we may not admire the taste displayed in the choice of his materials. Unless the children of Aulus Gellius inherited their father's taste for the studies of a Grammarian, they would not find much relaxation or pleasure in great part of his literary labours; especially since there is little elegance or felicity of style to relieve the general dryness of the matter. The book abounds in quotations from old writers, from Ennius, Accius, Quadrigarius, Nævius, Cæcilius, Menander, and others. It is divided into twenty Books, the eighth being lost, and these are again subdivided into short chapters on miscellaneous subjects. Some contain Literary, Historical, and Biographical Anecdotes; others, old Epitaphs, Epigrams, and Proverbs, explanations of legal and other technical terms, and phrases in familiar use, together with their probable Etymology, or observations on the quantity of words, and the correct modes of writing and pronouncing them. One chapter records a ludicrous disputation between two celebrated Grammarians in Rome, relating to the vocative case of *Egregius*, whether it should be *egregie* or *egregi*. In connection with grammatical and etymological questions, we hear much of Gabius Bassus, who wrote *De Origine Vocabulorum*, of Nigidius, of Cornutus, and Hyginus; it should, however, be added, that when the cavils of the two latter are directed against Virgil, Aulus Gellius has generally the good taste to defend the Poet. His mind certainly inclined much towards verbal criticism; he takes delight in vindicating, by the authority of very old writers, phrases which appear grammatical anomalies, and in reviving the memory of obsolete words, such as *memordi*, *cecurri*, *spespondi*, and *descendidi*, instead of the more classical forms, *momordi*, *cucurri*, *spospondi*, and *descendi*. Still there are many chapters which are interesting and curious.

The authenticity of the titles of the several chapters has been attacked by H. Stevens, and defended by Falster: the student who desires more information respecting Aulus Gellius may consult with advantage a Dissertation prefixed to the *Criticæ Lucubrationes* of Lambecius.—The Editio Princeps of our author is dated 1469; an Elzevir edition appeared at Amsterdam, 1665.—Henry Stephens published one with notes, emendations, and two Dissertations, at Paris, 1585.—Another by Gronovius appeared in quarto, dated Lugd. Bat. 1687.—The work has been translated into English, and illustrated with notes by Beloe, 3 vols. Oct. 1795.

Galenus.

The celebrated GALENUS was born at Pergamus: his father Nicon enjoyed an ample fortune, and having cultivated his own mind, and thus, knowing by experience the value of a superior education, placed his son under the tuition of the best masters. Accordingly, Galenus passed successively through the systems recommended by the Stoics, Academics, Peripatetics, and Epicureans; the Philosophy of the latter he rejected without hesitation. This extensive acquaintance with the opinions of different sects operated advantageously on his mind, by producing a disinclination to attach himself exclusively to any set of instructors,—a disposition which he carried to the studies of his maturer years. His mind being thus preserved from bigotry, and ready to admit from every quarter sound principles and just inferences, he did not, after the example of preceding Physicians, follow blindly any of the sects existing in his day, namely, the Methodic, Dogmatic, or Empiric, but determined to select and appropriate that which appeared valuable in each. From a very early age, Galenus had suffered from weakness of digestion; and the necessity of habitual attention to various kinds of diet and their effects, and experience of the symptoms of internal disorders, and their consequences, may

Biography.

have contributed to lead his mind to pursue the study of Medicine at large, and to grasp that Science in a manner more methodical and comprehensive than preceding writers had done. This might have been one cause of his determination to Physic; a dream of his father is assigned as another: Galenus certainly was superstitious. On one occasion, he says, "Being afflicted with a fixed pain in that part where the diaphragm is fastened to the liver, I dreamed that Æsculapius advised me to open that artery which lies between the thumb and second finger of my right hand. I did so, and immediately found myself well." In another instance, we find him prescribing a gargle of lettuce juice, in consequence of a similar dream. Galenus, however, at the age of seventeen, brought to his professional pursuits two qualities which carry their possessor far in any career; a zeal in the pursuit of knowledge, which no difficulties alarmed, and a confidence in his own talents, which knew no bounds. He visited, in pursuit of professional information, Cilicia, Palestine, Crete, and Cyprus; and remaining some time at Alexandria, made himself acquainted with the nature of the nerves, and discovered a new way of healing injuries of them. On his return to Pergamus at the age of twenty-eight, he applied his method to wounded gladiators with great success. At the expiration of four years, in consequence of some seditious disturbance, he betook himself to Rome, where his skill secured him some powerful patrons, among whom were Eudemus, a Peripatetic Philosopher, and Severus, afterwards Emperor; while, at the same time, it excited the envy and opposition of rival practitioners. Their machinations, together with a dread of the plague, drove Galenus again to Pergamus. Scarcely had he arrived, when he was summoned to Aquileia by the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Verus. The latter died, and Galenus again visited Rome. His reputation rising rapidly, and the Capital offering ample opportunities for the practice of his art and the prosecution of his studies, he was naturally unwilling to accompany Aurelius in his expedition against the *Marcomanni*. He had the address to excuse himself under the pretence of a dream from Æsculapius, who, in the visions of the night, forbade his leaving Rome. About this time he composed his celebrated Treatise *De Usu Partium;* in which he proves, against the Philosophy of Epicurus, from the frame of the human body, the wisdom, power, and goodness of the Creator. Of this tract, which coincides in its details with one part of Paley's well known *Natural Theology*, it is not too much to say, that, even in the present advanced state of Medical science, it may be read with advantage; and at a period when infidelity was fashionable, Galenus deserves praise for having thrown into the opposite scale the weight of his abilities and science.

The facility with which he wrote is proved by the great extent and variety of his works. We learn from Suidas, that some of these were on Geometry and Grammar; two books he compiled as a mere catalogue of the rest, recording the time, place, order, and motive, of their composition. Of these works, part were lost in a fire at the Temple of Peace, but a considerable number are preserved. It has been before observed, that Galenus did not so far addict himself to any sect as to follow its opinions implicitly; in fact, his vanity often betrayed him into intemperate language respecting his contemporaries and predecessors. Yet he seems to have thought very highly of Hippocrates;* at the same time assuming to himself the credit of being the first to understand and explain that great author's system, and supply his defects. Between Hippocrates and Galenus there is this difference, the works of the first consist chiefly of facts observed by himself or others; those of the latter are Reasonings and Hypotheses, and therefore have furnished more matter of dispute. Galenus's system was ingenious: when he illustrates any part of Hippocrates, we are indebted to his sagacity and industry; when he harangues respecting faculties, spirits, and occult causes, he reasons well from principles false or precarious, and therefore leaves us in the dark.

Literature of the Age of the Antonini.

Vanity in writing respecting himself, and affectation in disclaiming praise, are his chief blemishes; the superiority of his talents and the valuable additions he made to the stock of Medical science might safely have been left to be appreciated by the judgment of posterity. Eusebius tells us, that the respect paid to his memory amounted almost to veneration. His successors were Oribasius, Ælius, Alexander, and Trallianus Mysepsus, of whom Dr. Friend says, "they did not compile so as to have nothing at all new and what we may call their own in their very voluminous works; for though I must confess there are not a great many things in them in proportion to the bulk of their books, but such as may be found in Galenus and others, yet some there are, too, in regard to the real improvement of the art itself." Of these writers, Oribasius made large extracts from the works of Galenus, and Trallianus calls him most divine. Simplicius, moreover, styles him *θαυμάσιος καὶ πολυμαθέστατος*: and Athenæus introduces Galenus as one of the guests at his banquet. The place and circumstances of his death are not known with accuracy; Fabricius conjectures that he lived till the seventh year of Severus, and the seventieth of his own life. The works of Galenus in Greek were published in five folios by Aldus, 1525; another edition more correct appeared at Basle, in 1538: a Latin translation was published by Frobenius, in 1541, at Basle, and in 1562, with a preface well written by Conradus Gesnerus. A Greek and Latin edition was published at Paris, in 1639, by Renatus Charterus, in thirteen folios; this comprehends Hippocrates also.

Lucius Apuleius.

Lucius Apuleius was a Platonic Philosopher born at Madaura, a Roman Colony in Africa. The date of his birth is not known with accuracy, but the names of Lollianus Avitus and Lollius Urbicus, and the omission of the title *Divus*, after the name of Antoninus Pius, enable us to ascertain that he flourished under this Emperor. His mother's name was Salvia, and he inherited from his father Theseus respectability of family and a considerable fortune. The latter, however, was soon exhausted by the expenses of foreign travel, which his zeal in the pursuit of knowledge induced him to incur; he tells us, moreover, in his *Apology*, that much of it was spent in acts of benevolence and charity. His early studies were conducted at Carthage, where he imbibed that taste for the Platonic Philosophy which was confirmed by a residence at Athens. At that celebrated seat of learning he passed through the schools of Grammar and Rhetoric, and he gives in the following metaphorical sentence an account of his subsequent studies:—*Hactenus a plerisque potatur; ego et alias crateras Athenis bibi, Poeticæ commen-*

* *Method. Medendi*, lib. ix.

*tum, Geometriæ limpidam, Musicæ dulcem, Dialecticæ austerulam, enimvero universæ Philosophiæ inexplebilem scilicet nectaream.** Engaged in the pursuit of learning, he spared nor time, nor health, nor fortune, and his diligence is attested by the number and variety of the works which he composed. Of these, there remain at present, 1. A Treatise *De Dogmate Platonis*, in three books; the first on Natural Philosophy, the second on Moral Philosophy, and the third on the Categorical Syllogism. 2. A Treatise *De Deo Socratis*, inferior, though not unlike, to one by Maximus Tyrius on the same subject. 3. A Treatise *De Mundo*. After these come eleven books of the *Metamorphoseon*, better known to the literary world under the title of the *Golden Ass*. Besides this, we have his *Apology* or vindication of himself from a charge of Magic, (the circumstances of which we shall soon have occasion to mention;) and, lastly, a composition called *Florida*, which seems to consist of passages from speeches delivered at Carthage, extracted by some of his admirers,† and put together without care or connection.

The works of Apuleius which are now lost were numerous, both in Greek and Latin: he wrote History, Dialogues, Epistles, Orations, Proverbs, various compositions in verse, Epigrams,‡ Satires, together with Lyric and Dramatic Poetry. He, moreover, turned his mind to speculations on Medicine, Politics, Arithmetic, and Philology; and, amidst such numerous and opposite pursuits, still found leisure for jocose subjects called "*Ludicra*,"§ and for questions adapted to provoke the ingenuity of convivial‖ discussion called γρίφοι or enigmas.¶

After leaving Athens Apuleius came to Rome, where, by diligent and unassisted labour, he acquainted himself with the Latin language; he studied also the principles of Roman jurisprudence, in which he made such proficiency as to be enabled to support himself by pleading Causes. But before his success at the Bar he had lived in great poverty; in Greece he had been initiated into many of the Mysteries of Pagan worship, and at Rome, being desirous of enrolling himself among the votaries of Osiris, we find him driven to great extremities to defray the necessary cost.** But no sacrifice was too great if it would facilitate his favourite pursuit; and, indeed, in various parts of his works he speaks with the most Philosophical contempt of wealth as compared with the acquisition of knowledge.†† His industry and talents as they met with professional success at Rome, so were they rewarded at Carthage, and at Æa, by marks of public respect; at Madaura, too, he tells us, he held the situation of *Duumvir*, which had been previously occupied by his father. His fortunes, however, were chiefly advanced by a marriage with a rich widow, named Pudentilla; which, though it appears to have been contracted with the consent, and even planned at the suggestion, of her son Pontianus, did nevertheless involve Apuleius in a vexatious litigation. Æmilianus, the brother of Pudentilla's first husband, accused our author of having gained possession of his wife's affections and fortunes by the arts of Magic, and accordingly a trial of the question took place before Claudius Maximus, *Proconsul* of Africa. The speech of Apuleius on this occasion yet remains, and although it may excite a smile at the nature of the proofs which were brought to support the charge of Magic, still we must remember that similar absurdities are found in connection with this imaginary crime at a much later period, and in an age which the progressive march of knowledge ought to have rendered wiser. The facts urged against Apuleius were his personal attractions, his habits of versification, and his having composed a poem on the sons of Scribonius Lætus, his possession of a mirror, his purchasing a rare fish, and dissecting the same, and the circumstance of a youth having fallen to the ground in his presence. The defendant disposed of these several weighty accusations with considerable wit and humour, ascribing some of the facts to his good fortune, some to his Poetical taste, and others to his well known zeal in the pursuits of Natural History. He then proceeded to meet the imputation of having been induced by mercenary motives to seek the hand of Pudentilla, alleging, first, that the proposal originally came from her son, and was long rejected as being an impediment to his intentions of foreign travel; and, secondly, by asserting that at his own particular instigation the property in question had been given at the time, and was ultimately bequeathed, to the family with whom he had connected himself, in a greater degree than they had any reason to expect. This part of the speech gives us the sentiments of an honest man expressed in a style which, if it is not remarkably elegant, does not justify the satirical remark of Melancthon, that the Latinity of Apuleius was like the braying of his own ass. This allusion applies to the *Metamorphoseon;* in which the author commences by apologizing for his defective style, and prepares his reader for a Grecian tale after the manner of the Milesian Fabulists. He then proceeds to relate what befel him at Hypata, in Thessaly, where he became the guest of a celebrated Magician; and in an unfortunate attempt to imitate the transformations which he had witnessed, he mixed the magical ingredients unskilfully, and, instead of assuming the shape of a bird, he found himself suddenly changed into an ass. Under this shape, he passes through a variety of adventures, which are put together with little art, and, for the most part, have small pretensions to character, invention, wit, or humour. However, some of the circumstances (as Dunlop has observed*) have been borrowed by modern novelists. Two of the stories introduced are to be found in Boccaccio. The adventure of the wine-skins in Don Quixote, and that of the Robber's cavern in Gil Blas, may be traced to the same source: and in all these cases the resemblance is too strong to be accidental.

Apuleius professes that his *Metamorphoseon* is a work of amusement: *At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram, auresque tuas bibulas lepido susurro permulceam.* Accordingly Severus and Macrobius assigned the work no higher province than to excite the surprise of infancy, or beguile the tedious hours of age; and later Critics† have considered it only as a satirical representation of the vices of his time. But Bishop Warburton, whose extent and variety of knowledge might have made him a safer guide if they had been employed less frequently in supporting paradox, has found in this composition a store of Philosophical wisdom, and has pressed it with great ingenuity into

* *Florida.*
‡ Ausonius.
‖ Macrobius, *Sat.*
** *Metam.* lib. xi.
† Joann. Woweri *Præfatio.*
§ Nonius.
¶ Derived from γρίφος, a net.
†† *Apologia.*

* *History of Fiction*, vol. i. † Bayle, *Fleuri.*

Biography.

the service of the *Divine Legation*, (see book ii. sec. 4.) He characterises the author as "one of the gravest and most virtuous, as well as one of the most learned Philosophers of his age," and endeavours to show that the object of the *Metamorphoseon* was to *recommend* Pagan Religion, and particularly initiation into the Mysteries, as "the only cure for all vice whatsoever." Now the greater part of the incidents are copied from a tale of Lucian, entitled ἡ ὄνος, which Photius tells us was written to *ridicule* the Pagan Religion; and if this was its popular character, Apuleius surely would have found a better model on which he might form his intended vindication. Where the resemblance was so great, that one might almost be called a translation of the other, men would naturally suppose the end proposed could not be very different. It is true that Apuleius was a great admirer of the Mysteries of Heathen superstition, and has casually introduced some contemptuous allusions to Christianity; but if his thoughts had been set on so excellent a design as the discovery of a remedy for all vice whatsoever, his knowledge and abilities would have suggested a more effectual method. For a moral which was so concealed under the veil of allegory, that it remained undiscovered for several centuries, could not be expected to remedy the mischievous effects of those idle and indecent stories of which the *Metamorphoseon* mainly consists.

That part of the work which does Apuleius most credit, namely, the beautiful fable of Cupid and Psyche, is not taken from Lucian. Perhaps the materials were borrowed from the stores of Egyptian Mythology,* but the mode in which they are here put together, shows delicacy of taste and a Poetical imagination.† This "Philosophical Allegory of the progress of Virtue towards perfection," as it may have been the prototype of some of the Fairy tales which entertain our infancy, so is it well known to the lovers of the fine arts: for it has furnished to the engraver of antique gems, and to the ancient sculptors, some of their most beautiful subjects, while in later days it has employed the pencil of Raphael and the chisel of Canova. This Fable has also been imitated in an old French Romance, called *Partenopex de Blois*, and is well known to the English reader by Mrs. Tighe's exquisite adaptation of it.

There is a Delphin edition of Apuleius; one on a smaller scale, with notes on the *Metamorphoseon* by Beroaldus; and one without notes, but containing a prefatory dissertation and emendations of the text by Wower. Casaubon has published notes on the *Apologia*, and Josias Mercer on the Treatise *De Deo Socratis*.

Athenæus.

Athenæus, a celebrated Grammarian, was born at Naucratis, in Egypt, and flourished early in the IIId century. He was the author of a very learned work, entitled Δειπνοσοφίσται, *Eruditi viri cœnantes;* the plan of which, however improbable, was well adapted to communicate the stores of curious and miscellaneous information, which various and extensive reading had enabled Athenæus to collect. Larensius, a rich and literary Roman, is supposed to collect at his hospitable table learned men of various professions, Poets, Lawyers, Grammarians, Physicians, Rhetoricians, and Musicians, and their conversations are related to Timocrates by our author. The courses of the banquet suggest the subjects, in connection with which are introduced passages from Historians, Poets, Philosophers, Orators, and Philologists, on a variety of topics almost infinite: for example, on fish, vegetables, living things, musical instruments, cups, and fruits; on Italian, Greek, and Egyptian wines, on the qualities of various kinds of water, on water-drinkers, on the diet of Homer's heroes; also, on Natural History, on curious inventions, on customs and habits of private life, especially among the Greeks. Interspersed with these subjects are instances of ingenious parody, and proverbs, which, together with many anecdotes and stories, are still current in the world. He who borrowed so largely from others, furnished in his turn materials for later writers; Macrobius imitated his plan in the composition of the *Saturnalia*, parts of which are evidently taken from the Δειπνοσοφίσται. *Confer.* lib. v. c. 21, with Ath. ii. 474.

Literature of the Age of the Antonini.

But, in the estimation of the scholar, this vast compilation of Athenæus derives, perhaps, its chief value from the immense number of citations which he has introduced from various authors. Some of these passages, explanatory of rare and obscure words, are from works which have not come down to us; others are useful to later commentators, in correcting the errors and supplying the defects of ancient manuscripts: we owe, moreover, to Athenæus many of the fragments of Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Menander, and Philemon, which have been edited, besides parts of the *Poetarum Analecta*. Philology was certainly a favourite pursuit of Athenæus, and reference is frequently made to him by Eustathius, Suidas, Hesychius, and others. Hemsterhusius very justly styles him *subactus si quisquam in libris veterum evolvendis, et idem diligens singularium vocum captator;* it is conjectured that Lucian had his writings in view, when he composed the satirical *Lexiphanes*.

The manuscripts of the Δειπνοσοφίσται are few and defective: Casaubon, to whose stores of learning the readers of Athenæus are indebted for much valuable emendation and illustration, confesses in a letter to a friend the extreme difficulty of his undertaking, *Hoc dico tantum absolvisse me tandem virtute Dei Optimi Maximi, molestissimum difficillimum et tædii plenissimum opus, animadversiones in Athenæum*. The first and second Books are known to us only by an Epitome. Casaubon knew not by whom, or at what time, this abridgement was made, but conjectures that it was done before the days of Eustathius: it is well executed, for not only are extracts made, but the system of the larger work is preserved; the references, however, ought to have been more fully and distinctly made than they are.

Those who are desirous of more information respecting Athenæus may consult Schweighäeuser; this Critic had access to two manuscripts which were not known in Casaubon's time, one of which, called the *Veneta-Parisiensis*, he considers the oldest we have: his edition of the Δειπνοσοφίσται with a Preface, Notes, and a Latin Translation is in repute among the learned. Respecting prior editions, see Bayle's *Dictionary*, Art. *Athenèe*.

Maximus Tyrius.

We have already, in our account of the *later Platonists*, made slight mention of Maximus Tyrius: the title Maximus is common to so many, that much confusion has arisen from the numerous claimants to it; but there is reason to think that the author whose Dis-

* Bryant. † Warburton.

Biography.

sertations have come down to us, is the same whose instructions are mentioned with respect in the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius. These Dissertations are in number forty-one; Heinsius thinks they should be divided into ten tetralogies and an introduction. Several of them seem to have been composed in Greece; in the 37th the allusions are Greek,* and in most others Maximus Tyrius shows a more familiar acquaintance with Grecian than with Roman customs and history. The subjects are various, some turning on matters of practical Philosophy, and some on those subtle questions which have at all times exercised the ingenuity, and baffled the inquiries of thoughtful minds. The following are among the number: 1. Περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ θεὸς κατὰ Πλάτωνα. 19 and 34. Τί τὸ τέλος φιλοσοφίας; 25. Τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιοῦντος πόθεν τὰ κακά; 26, and 27. Τί τὸ δαιμόνιον Σωκρατοῦς; 38. Εἰ θεοῖς ἀγάλματα ἱδρύτεον; 40. Τί ἔστιν ἐπιστήμη;

The style of Maximus Tyrius is elegant and perspicuous, abounding with apt illustrations and metaphors. Casaubon calls him *mellitissimus Platonicorum*. Learned without prolixity, argumentative without intemperance, he wins assent rather than extorts it.† Plato and Homer seem to have been his favourite authors. It has been said, that in the 37th Dissertation he writes too arrogantly of himself and his Philosophy; but the reward which he claims so strongly, was the practical virtue of his hearers, not their applause.

On the subject of Prayer, we find in Maximus Tyrius those arguments which might be expected from natural reason; they are expressed with elegance, and urged with ingenuity, not so much against a habit of Prayer in general, as against its prospective efficacy, and particularly against making temporal advantages the object of it: his master, Plato, reasons in the same way in the *Second Alcibiades*. Socrates is there represented as meeting Alcibiades on his way to address the Gods for temporal blessings, and dissuades him from offering such petitions, by showing that he could not be certain whether the fulfilment of his wishes would be eventually advantageous or not. Maximus Tyrius argues thus against the use of Prayers for external goods. These, he says, must come from Necessity, or Chance, which are unassailable by Prayer; or from Art, to which no man prays; or from Providence. Now the latter will not derange its purposes on account of our supplications: to repent and vary is unsuitable to the character of even a good man, much more is it unsuitable to God. If we deserve the desired object, it will come unasked; if not, no entreaty will obtain it. Maximus Tyrius acknowledges that the whole life of Socrates was full of prayer, μεστὸν εὐχῆς: but he did not, as other men do, vex the Gods with petitions for wealth or power; his object was not so much to ask favours, as to hold communion with Heaven; and he obtained with the assent of the Gods (συνεπινευόντων ἐκείνων) intellectual excellence, a life of blameless tranquillity, and a death of cheerful hope. In the 26th Dissertation, he dwells with much pious feeling on man's weakness, his need of divine help in danger and temptations, and he says, it was on these subjects that Socrates consulted his Dæmon.

The first of two Essays devoted to this inquiry, τί τὸ δαιμόνιον Σωκρατοῦς; is thus introduced. Since no one denies or ridicules the idea of the Gods being present at the various Oracles, and communicating future events by means of their Priestesses, why might not Socrates have enjoyed the constant presence of a Deity? Should one ask, who this Deity was, I must inquire whether he believe in the existence of Dæmons? Does not Homer introduce a Dæmon or Genius, whom he calls Minerva, checking the rage of Achilles, prompting Telemachus, and encouraging Diomede. Unless you are willing to deny the existence of these beings, to contradict Homer, giving up all oracles and dreams, certainly Socrates deserved a particular protector as much as any one. Surely some men have their protecting Genii, who warn them by auguries, and assist them in the strife when virtue proves an unequal match for Fortune. These beings are ministering angels above mortals and below God.

Literature of the Age of the Antonini.

Τοῖς γὰρ μύρια εἶναι ἴσως χθονὶ πολυστάτῃσι
Ἀθάνατα Ζηνὸς, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Of these, some cure diseases or assist the labours of Art, others communicate information or suggest advice, attendants at home or abroad by land or sea, varying in character with the dispositions of men; but the wicked have no protecting Genius.

In the 2d Dissertation the nature of this familiar Dæmon is thus described. There is in nature a regular gradation, commencing with God and terminating with plants; Dæmons, Men, and Brutes being the intermediate links: by the union of different qualities in the same Being, each rank in existence is connected with one above and one below it; Dæmons, Men, or Genii, being immortal and yet passive, partake of the divine nature on the one hand, on the other of the human, and thus connect God with Men. The soul preserves the body as long as it remains in it; on escaping it becomes a Dæmon, and lives in peace and pleasure: these Beings compassionate their earthly friends, are permitted to assist them, protecting the good and punishing the wicked: each has its office, and is peculiarly conversant about such things as it loved on earth. Æsculapius still promotes the healing art, and Achilles sports in arms; the latter is still said to be seen with Thetis and Patroclus in an island in the Euxine Sea: Hector still bounds over the plains of Troy: and endangered mariners often acknowledge the assistance of the Dioscuri.

Traces of this fanciful and pleasing theory are familiar to the mind of the scholar who is conversant with the writings of antiquity; and the Rosicrucians may have borrowed from these sources that beautiful machinery with which Pope has embellished the *Rape of the Lock*. The Treatise of Maximus Tyrius is superior in style to that of Apuleius on the same subject. Maximus Tyrius was first translated into Latin by Cosmus Paccius, and published in 1519; the Greek text was edited by H. Stevens, in 1557; the Greek and Latin together, by Heinsius, in 1607. There is also another edition by Davis of Queen's College, Cambridge, dated 1703.

Marcus Fabius Quinctilianus.

Marcus Fabius Quinctilianus died before the accession of the Antonini to the Imperial power, and therefore cannot in strictness be included in a sketch of the Literature of their Age; nevertheless, since there has not appeared any intermediate place after the reign of Augustus, in which this distinguished writer could be noticed, we may be allowed without any great breach of chronological order to introduce him here. The

* Davis, *Præfatio.* † Paccius, *Præfatio.*

Biography.

days of Quinctilianus were passed in instructing his contemporaries in the principles of the Art of Rhetoric, and latterly in compiling for the benefit of posterity the result of his studies, his practice, and his observation. Such occupations offer little variety of incident, and we know few circumstances of his life except those which are occasionally mentioned by himself in connection with his professional pursuits. Notices of this kind which occur in his works have been carefully examined by the learned Dodwell, and annexed under the title of *Annales Quinctiliani* to Burmann's edition of the *De Institutione Oratoriâ*. Ausonius calls our author *Hispanus* and *Calagarritanus;* but the silence of Martial on this point has given rise to an opinion that he was not a native of Spain, at all events he came early to Rome. According to Dodwell's conjectures, Quinctilianus was born A. D. 42, and at the age of fifteen was placed under the instruction of Domitius Afer, of whose abilities the highest character is given by the pen of his grateful pupil. *Vidi ego longè omnium quos mihi cognoscere contigit summum oratorem Domitium Afrum, &c.** This Orator, however, dying in A. D. 59, Quinctilianus was transferred to the care of Servilius Nonianus. In A. D. 61 he probably went into Spain with Galba. His employment not being of a military nature, he might there have begun to teach Oratory, and to lay the foundation of that Rhetorical celebrity which Galba afterwards rewarded by appointing him to the Professor's Chair at Rome; this, moreover, would account for the names by which Ausonius has mentioned him. However, in 68 he returned to Rome, and from this period we are to date the commencement of the twenty years which he speaks of having spent in tuition.† From this employment, and from professional practice as a speaker, he retired at the age of forty-six; partly, perhaps, warned by the example of Domitius Afer, who continued to appear in public after the day of his reputation was passed, and partly because, under the reign of Domitianus, he might wish to escape those disquietudes and anxieties of an Orator's life which are mentioned by Maternus in the Dialogue *De Oratoribus.*‡ In A. D. 89 Quinctilianus wrote his Treatise *De Causis corruptæ Eloquentiæ;* and between the years 92 and 96 he commenced, concluded, and published his celebrated work *De Institutione Oratoriâ*. In the proem of the sixth Book we find him lamenting in the language of sincere affection the death of his wife, whom he married in A. D. 82, and of two sons whose promising abilities and virtues are mentioned with parental fondness. In 94 he married the daughter of Rutilius, and by her he had a child, whose marriage portion was a present from Pliny§ in A. D. 107. How long Quinctilianus survived after this is doubtful. We know that he rose to distinction and wealth: Flavius Clemens had married a sister of Domitianus, and Quinctilianus was appointed to superintend the education of their children: he might owe to this connection the Consular ornaments which Ausonius calls "*honestamenta nominis potius quam insignia potestatis.*" There is a learned note in Bayle's *Dictionary* tending to prove that the pupils of Quinctilianus were grandchildren of Domitianus. Dodwell conjectures that he might have assisted in the education of Hadrianus, and have owed his promotion to that Emperor, who was desirous of patronizing Literature and the Arts. Juvenal describes it as the gift of Fortune deserved by merit.

Literature of the Age of the Antonini.

Unde igitur tot
Quinctilianus habet saltus? exempla novorum
Fatorum transi: felix, et pulcher, et acer
Felix, et sapiens, et nobilis et generosus,
Appositam nigræ lunam subtexit alutæ.—Sat. vii. 188.

The private character of Quinctilianus seems to have commanded the respect and esteem of his contemporaries:* in his works he appears a severe judge of licentious writings,† and speaks of himself with modesty; yet his flattery of Domitianus is gross and inexcusable, and in his lamentations over his domestic sorrows we see that resignation to the will of Providence was not one of the lessons he practised.

As a writer, Quinctilianus has great merit in systematic method, yet even here he falls short of Aristotle: perhaps no scientific treatise offers so good a specimen of beautiful arrangement as Aristotle's *Rhetoric;* the second Book, moreover, displays an intimate knowledge of human nature, a masterly analysis of the passions, a developement of their sources and their objects, to which there is nothing comparable in Quinctilianus, in respect of depth and originality of thought.

If we compare Quinctilianus with Cicero, we may observe, that as the object of the latter was to *create* among the Romans a literary taste, that of the former was to correct a taste which had taken a false direction. For this task he was well calculated; sound judgment was one of his chief qualifications. His admiration is never lavished on ordinary performances; and though inferior writers generally come in for a share of approbation proportionate to their respective merits, yet the attention of the student is always directed to the contemplation of the best models, so that the first lines of thought may be correctly drawn. When he applies to Domitianus this line of Virgil,‡

Inter victrices hederam tibi serpere lauros,

we must esteem this as the flattery of the Courtier, not the judgment of the Critic. Cicero's Rhetorical works are deficient in arrangement and method, yet had he left us nothing but these, they would have stamped him as an eloquent writer. Quinctilianus on the other hand is more copious and more methodical; he knew and felt what eloquence was, he delivered rules which would assist the Roman student to attain it, and he rather teaches us to forge weapons, than, like Cicero, to employ them. Quinctilianus has indeed some beautiful passages, and he writes pathetically respecting his domestic sorrows in the Introduction to the sixth Book, yet the details of the work are often minute even to prolixity. Still he has communicated to us much that is valuable: it is highly curious and interesting to observe the system of liberal education which obtained in his time; for though his work is a professional treatise, inasmuch as its object is to form the Orator, yet such a vast range of Literature is brought within this system, that it cannot be called a Professional Education, in the narrow and restricted sense in which we use the term; in fact, this range is unreasonably extended, and to make so many branches of knowledge essential to an Orator may remind us of

* *Inst.* xii. 11.
‡ C. 13.
† See Martial, *Ep.* xc. lib. ii.
§ Pliny, *Ep.* xxxii. lib. vi.

* Juv. vi. 75. Martial, ii. 90.
‡ Lib. x. c. 1.
† Lib. x. c. 1.

Biography.

Vitruvius, who bade his Architect acquire a knowledge of Civil Law, that he may not be cheated in the title of the ground on which he builds.

One who was unacquainted with the works of the ancient Orators would learn from Quinctilianus how widely they differed from the moderns, not only in vehemence of thought and expression, but in the vehemence of action that attends it. We may observe, that the aid of the Comedian was called in to regulate, not only the modulation of the voice but the gestures of the body. The position of the Orator's person, and the adjustment of his dress, depended on rules which seem to have been carried to a degree of minuteness almost ludicrous.* *Duo quoque medii sub pollicem veniunt et est his adhuc priore gestus instantior, principio et narrationi non accommodatus: at cum tres contracti pollice premuntur, tum digitus ille, quo unum optimè Crassum Cicero dicit, explicari solet. Est et ille verecundæ orationi aptissimus, quo quatuor primis leviter in summum coëuntibus digitis, non procul ab ore aut pectore fertur ad nos manus, ac deinde prona ac paululum prolata laxatur. Hoc modo cœpisse Demosthenem credo in illo pro Ctesiphonte timido summissoque principio: sic formatam Ciceronis manum cum diceret. "Siquid est in me ingenii, judices, quod sentio quam sit exiguum."*

We may observe, also, that the ancient Orators in their attempts to excite compassion used means which would now appear ridiculous; employing, for instance, in a case of murder, a picture † representing the bloody deed, in order to move the judges by the display of so tragical a spectacle; or collecting the relations of the dead, introducing them in squalid attire, and making them at a signal throw themselves at the feet of the judges to implore justice with tears and lamentations. ‡ Quinctilianus in connection with this subject tells a jocose story of an advocate, who on some such occasion having introduced into Court a young witness, and proceeding to ask why he wept, received for answer, *ex pædagogo se vellicari*, that his pedagogue was pinching him.

It is not easy to imagine a richer or more tempting subject to one, like Quinctilianus, whose early life had been passed in extensive and various studies, and who found leisure in his later days to examine, correct, and record his opinions, than a comparison of Greek and Roman Literature. In this discussion, as in the rest of his work, he shows more of good taste than comprehensive or commanding intellect. There is nothing like a full statement of the characteristic differences of the Greek and Roman writers, or a Philosophical inquiry into the causes of this diversity: the praise awarded might have been more discriminating, and the subject treated at far greater length: some of the opinions expressed are undoubtedly liable to objection; the commendation, for instance, bestowed on Apollonius, "*æqualis quædam mediocritas*," is so faint as to amount almost to a sentence of unmerited condemnation:—the partial feelings of a Roman only, would place Sallust and Livy on the same level as Historians with Thucydides and Herodotus.—Terence and Plautus are too hastily dismissed without any remarks on their peculiar merits, the true delineation of nature observable in the former, to which the latter added a richer vein of invention, and greater variety of character. But while we regret that this part of the *De Institutione Oratoriâ* was not expanded; while we confess that to have seen this ample subject more largely and more critically discussed, would have compensated for the omission of many of the rules and technicalities of the schools of the Rhetorician; while we may differ from Quinctilianus in some of his opinions, we must remember that his judgment in general has been ratified by posterity.

Literature of the Age of the Antonini.

The manuscript of Quinctilianus was found in the bottom of a tower of the Monastery of St. Gal, by Poggius, as appears by one of his letters dated 1417, written from Constance. Editions of the *De Institutione Oratoriâ* are very numerous; that by Peter Burmann in two quartos, 1720, enriched with critical and explanatory notes, may be recommended. The same author has also edited the *Declamationes Quinctiliani*; but since the Critics have decided that neither these nor the Treatise called *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, are the work of Quinctilianus, it is needless to make particular mention of them here.

* Lib. xi. c. 3. † Quinct. lib. vi. c. 1.
‡ See Hume, *Essay* 13. *Of Eloquence.*

SEXTUS EMPIRICUS.—THE PYRRHONISTS.

FLOURISHED *circiter* A. D. 190

Biography.

THE Sceptical Philosophy, as developed in the writings of Sextus Empiricus, forms one of the most curious portions in the History of the Human Mind, and it is on this account that we have separated his name from those of the other writers who flourished under the Antonini. To mark by what process and through what gradations an entire deviation from the general opinions and feelings of mankind was effected, is in itself a study neither destitute of interest, nor unproductive of utility. But in a work intended to exhibit in one distinct and comprehensive view the rise and advancement, and multifarious relations of Science, it is peculiarly necessary to describe the nature of that system which attempts to overthrow the fundamental principles of Universal Knowledge. To little purpose indeed have we laboured to sketch the magnificent structure which the genius of Ages has raised and adorned, if it be but an unsubstantial fabric, which vanishes at the approach of scrutiny.

Causes of Pyrrhonism.

The causes, from which a tendency to perpetual doubt was first derived, have been variously sought, in the affectation of superior acuteness; in the confusion of ill-directed studies; in the habit of sophistical disputation; in the attractions of brilliant paradox; and, above all, in the extreme difficulty of separating Truth from Falsehood, strangely as they are intermixed and scattered in a mass of diversified opinions. But most commonly excessive Scepticism springs, as by a kind of reaction, from excessive Dogmatism. "If a man will begin with certainties, he shall end in doubts," is an observation of the great reformer of learning, in his examination of the different disorders which have checked its growth and perverted its application.* And Socrates has shown,† with that simplicity and clearness with which he unfolded the most complicated operations of the Mind, that, as an unnatural aversion to Mankind arises in general from a detection of treachery in those persons in whom confidence had been reposed, so a settled distaste for all Reasoning originates in a discovery of unsoundness in those arguments on which reliance had been placed. It is indeed impossible to consider that singular union of ignorance, presumption, and obstinacy, which characterised the ancient Dogmatists, without feeling that, antecedently to experience, it must have been most probable, that some more candid as well as more intelligent reasoner, impressed with a sense of our intellectual weakness, and disgusted with unmeaning propositions,—however magisterially delivered, and however disguised under a variety of pompous technicalities,—would at length draw the mortifying contrast between the boundless extent of Science, and the circumscribed powers of our understanding. It might also have been expected, that his indignation would rise in proportion as he saw more fully the effects of a system which substituted conjecture for experiment, and authority for proof; or, as he observed more frequently the efforts of its defenders in maintaining the most palpable absurdities with as much pertinacity and violence, as if they were contending for the most evident and the most important demonstrations. It might also have been naturally supposed, that the vivacity of impatient genius might lead him, in his zeal against learned despotism, to sacrifice strong arguments indiscriminately with weak, and to sink from sober caution into a morbid state of complete distrust. But it could hardly have been foreseen, that a Sect would arise, the avowed object of which would be to evince, by a long train of Reasoning, that all Reasoning is fallacious, and to establish as its principle, that all the principles of Human Knowledge are too dubious to command the slightest degree of assent. That one man should be so perplexed by cavils, and so confounded by difficulties and contradictions crossing him in all the paths of literary or scientific research, as to deny at once the evidence of his senses, is no extraordinary circumstance; but that a body of men should systematically profess to doubt, and labour to persuade others to doubt, whether Truth be discovered or discoverable, must be regarded as one of the most striking phenomena which the annals of Philosophy present.

Sextus Empiricus. The Pyrrhonists.

Probable effects of Dogmatism.

Such, however, was that class of Philosophers of whom we shall endeavour succinctly to trace the rise and progress, and to delineate the features and character, in connection with our Biographical notice of the celebrated disciple who has collected their arguments, and illustrated their method.

From the earliest ages of Philosophy we may remark a frequent expression of doubt, bordering on despondency, in the language of its most distinguished followers.* They seem nearly all, at some time, to have made the melancholy confession, that 'whatever we look upon within the amplitude of Heaven and Earth is evidence of human ignorance.' To imagine, however, that such reflections materially influenced their opinions and pursuits, is to deny the tenour of their general Reasoning. We are far, therefore, from supposing, what Huet has laboured to prove,† that a system of Scepticism existed in the most ancient times: his conclusions are drawn from a few partial facts, hastily recorded by writers who were more anxious to enliven their meagre narratives, than to ascertain and deliver the Truth. It cannot be denied, however, that some Philosophers proceeded to considerable lengths in throwing doubt on the most common maxims; and that both the minute controversies of the Sophists, and the embarrassing objections of Socrates, operated in a powerful manner in unsettling the notions of subsequent inquirers. Without reverting to remote periods, or renewing the details which we have already given of the ACADEMIC Sects, we shall content ourselves with

History of Scepticism.

* Lord Bacon, *Of the Advancement of Learning*, book I. p. 31.
† *In Phædon.*

* See Diog. Laert. *in Vit. Pyrrhon.*
† *Traité Philosophique de la Foiblesse de l'Esprit Humain.*

Biography. Pyrrho. A. C. 340.

some observations on those who are strictly called the members of the Sceptic or Pyrrhonic School.

Pyrrho was a native of Elis, and flourished about the CXth Olympiad. Even from the scanty details of his life which have been transmitted to us, we can perhaps trace, with a considerable degree of probability, the source of that entire Scepticism on all points of Moral evidence and of abstract Reasoning, for which he was peculiarly distinguished. We learn, that after having abandoned the study of Painting, to which he had applied himself in early youth, and having devoted his time to Philosophical pursuits, he directed his attention principally to the works of Democritus, and received the instructions of Anaxarchus, whom he accompanied in the expedition of Alexander the Great into India, where he conversed with the Magi and Gymnosophists.*

Now we know that Democritus expressed in most positive terms his opinion of the uncertainty of Human Knowledge, and the impossibility of finding Truth, which he was in the habit of describing as sunk in some deep well; † we know, too, that from the School of Democritus came Metrodorus the Chian, who placed in the very beginning of one of his works the maxim, That we are ignorant of all things, and even of the truth of this very assertion; ‡ and that among the disciples of Metrodorus was Anaxarchus, the tutor of Pyrrho. When to these circumstances we add the fact mentioned by Strabo, that the Brachmans, a branch of the Sect of Indian Gymnosophists, maintained that nothing was in its nature good or bad, but was only such in appearance, § we possess some of the principal points which, if considered in conjunction with the effects of natural disposition, enable us in a great measure to account for that tendency to Scepticism in Pyrrho, which was no doubt increased and elicited by the overbearing arrogance of the Dogmatic teachers. When, however, his Biographers proceed to relate, that he adopted in practice those principles which he defended in theory, it is, we think, sufficiently manifest, that they have mistaken for authentic anecdotes the satirical inventions of his enemies, whose design was, probably, to prove that, whatever might be the triumphs of Pyrrhonism in the shade of the Schools, the slightest occurrence in real life dispelled the illusion, and left the refined caviller precisely in the same situation as vulgar mortals.‖ What, indeed, can be more ridiculously absurd than the idle tales of Antigonus Carystius,* that Pyrrho would not stir a step to avoid a chariot or a precipice, and was frequently indebted to the kind assistance of the friends who attended him, for the preservation of his life? † The honours which were paid to him, may be deemed a proof that the tenour of his conduct was not at variance with the received customs of society,—customs which he considered as causing, by their arbitrary decision, the only difference between right and wrong.

Sextus Empiricus. The Pyrrhonists.

In conformity with existing prejudices, he suffered himself to be appointed one of the Priests of a Religion ‡ the truth of which his own opinions must have led him to question, if not to deny. This circumstance will, however, excite no surprise in those who have attended to the peculiar train of thinking, with respect to the political utility of Polytheism, which pervades the writings of the ancient Philosophers, and appears to have produced the same effect on the least scrupulous as on the most superstitious Sects. Impressed with a conviction of the vanity of earthly pursuits, Pyrrho is said to have constantly repeated the well-known lines, in which Homer compares the race of men to leaves, "now green in youth, now with'ring to the ground," and from which he probably passed, by an easy transition, to reflections on the vicissitudes of fortune, the fluctuations of fashion, and the mutability of opinion. The remaining instances, intended to illustrate his manner of life, which may be found in the ill-connected, but entertaining collections of Diogenes Laertius, are trivial and contradictory: at one time he is represented as secluding himself even from his nearest relations, whilst at another he is described as joining his family in the management of their domestic affairs, and as performing the meanest duties with cheerfulness and indifference. From the general language of his Biographers, however, we may conclude that both the powers of Reasoning which he displayed in his discourses, and the remarkable composure which he evinced in the midst of danger and suffering, attracted the notice and commanded the respect not merely of the multitude, but of his Philosophical opponents.

Disciples of Pyrrho. Timon.

Of his disciples, scarcely any facts of importance are related; the most eminent among them was Timon the Phliasian, a Philosopher who joined to an indolent and unobtrusive disposition a keen and sarcastic vein of humour, which manifested itself in numerous Poems, Dramas, and Dialogues against the Dogmatists. Fragments of his chief work, entitled *Silli*, in which he attacked his adversaries with caustic ridicule, are found interspersed in many subsequent writers. From the saying of a Peripatetic Philosopher, that "as the Scythians shot flying, so Timon gained disciples by shunning them," § we may infer that he was not without followers; yet no regular successor seems to have transmitted the principles of the Pyrrhonic School, which, perhaps, by being identified with the later Academics, was considered as extinct in the time of Cicero.‖ It had been renewed, however, by Ptolemy

* Diog. Laert. *in Vit.* Aristocl. *ap. Euseb. de Præpar. Evang.* lib. xiv. c. 18. Lucian, *in Bis Accusat.* Suid. *in* Πύῤῥων.

† *Democritus* (*pronunciat*) *quasi in puteo quodam sic alto ut fundus sit nullus veritatem jacere demersam.* Lactant. *Instit.* lib. iii. c. 27. Comp. Cic. *Academ. Quæst.* Diog. Laert. lib. ix. sec. 72.

‡ Cic. *Academ. Quæst.* lib. i.—*Chius Metrodorus initio libri qui est de Naturâ: Nego, inquit, scire nos, sciamusne aliquid, an nihil sciamus; ne id ipsum quidem nescire, aut scire, scire nos; nec omnino, sitne aliquid, an nihil sit.* See also Diog. Laert. *in Vit. Anaxarch.* lib. ix. sec. 58.

§ Strab. lib. xv. Sects of men who professed universal doubt, seem to have flourished in many other nations, *e. g.* the Hairetis among the Turks, the Medabberim among the Arabians, &c.

‖ See Hume's *Essays*, (vol. ii. p. 183—186.) Having observed, that "the great subverter of Pyrrhonism is action and employment, and the occupations of common life," he allows, that even the determinate Sceptic will "be the first to join in the laugh against himself, and to confess, that all his objections are mere amusement, and can have no other tendency than to show the whimsical condition of mankind, who must act, and reason, and believe; though they are not able, by their most diligent inquiry, to satisfy themselves concerning the foundation of these operations, or to remove the objections which may be raised against them."

* Quoted by Diog. Laert. *in Vit. Pyrrhon.*

† Comp. La Mothe le Vayer, *De la Vertu des Payens*, p. 243. Bayle, *Dict. Hist.* Art. *Pyrrhon.*

‡ Diog. Laert. *in Vit.* Hesych. Miles.

§ Λόγος γοῦν εἶναὶ τὸν πυῤῥωνικὸν τὸν τοιοῦτον· ὡς παρὰ τοῖς Σκύθαις καὶ οἱ φεύγοντες τοξεύουσι καὶ οἱ διώκοντες· οὕτω τῶν φιλοσόφων οἱ μὲν διώκοντες ὑφῶσι τοὺς μαθητάς, οἱ δὲ φεύγοντες, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Τίμων. (Diog. Laert. *in Vit. Timon.*)

‖ *De Finib.* lib. ii.

Biography.

the Cyrenæan, and was defended at Alexandria about the very period, when the Roman Philosopher thought it no longer in existence, by Ænesidemus, who wrote eight Books of Pyrrhonian discourses.

From this last author, the tenets of the Sceptics were taught by a succession of masters, of whom little, but the name, is recorded, till the Age of Sextus Empiricus, a writer of considerable learning and ingenuity,—in whose works, replete with a curious variety of recondite knowledge, which would otherwise have been totally lost, the method, principles, and design of his Sect are copiously detailed, and systematically explained. Of his life scarcely any account is to be found in succeeding writers, or to be extracted by inferential reasoning from his extant Treatises. Conjectures have been resorted to as substitutes for facts, and have perplexed, rather than informed, the historical examiner.

Whether the same as Sextus Chæronensis?

Suidas identifies Sextus Empiricus with Sextus Chæronensis,* a nephew of Plutarch, and one of the tutors of Marcus Antoninus. This account is rejected by Salmasius,† Rualdus,‡ Jonsius,§ Casaubon,‖ Kuster,¶ Menage,** and Fabricius;†† and defended by Hervetus,‡‡ G. Vossius,§§ and Huet in his Sceptical Treatise on *The Weakness of the Human Mind*. The chief argument in its favour is drawn from the circumstance, that the names of both Philosophers, and also that of their preceptor, Herodotus, are the same: to which it is easy to reply, that several learned men, the two Zenos for instance, have borne the same name, and that this very coincidence, by perplexing the interpreters, may have led them to assert that one Herodotus was master to both. And, not to insist on the difference of their sirnames, the rules of conduct which the Philosophic Emperor acknowledges he had received from Sextus Chæronensis,‖‖ rather tend to confirm the opinion of those Commentators who infer from a passage, somewhat ambiguous, in Capitolinus,¶¶ that he was a Stoic, and certainly seem less likely to have formed the main subject of a Sceptic's instructions. Salmasius draws his principal proof against their identity from the fact, that Sextus Empiricus is cited by Galen in his *Isagoge*, and must, therefore, have been more ancient than that writer, and consequently than his contemporary Sextus Chæronensis: to this reasoning Huet naturally objects, that Galen might cite a writer of his own age, and that, besides, the *Isagoge* seems not to have been written by the great Physician to whom it is ascribed. We mention this fact the more particularly, because Brucker, a writer of unquestionable authority in Philosophical discussions, has, we think, in this last instance strangely mistated the meaning of the author whose arguments he professes to detail.* Sextus belonged to that Sect in Medicine called Empirics, who, judging Nature to be incomprehensible, followed experience in preference to Reasoning.† His country is unknown: his works refute the assertion of Suidas, that he was a native of Libya,‡ and indeed rather enable us to discover where he did not, than where he did, live. His Age may perhaps be referred to the reign of the Emperor Commodus.§

Sextus Empiricus. The Pyrrhonists.

The extant works of Sextus consist of three Books of Pyrrhonic Institutes or Sketches, and ten, or, according to a different arrangement, eleven Books against the Mathematicians, by which word are meant all who profess any kind of knowledge. The former Treatise is designed to be a summary of the principles, method, and end of Scepticism. In pursuance of our plan, therefore, we shall present such an outline of its contents as may assist the reader in forming some idea of the instruments employed by the ancient Pyrrhonists, when they attempted to destroy the basis of Reasoning, and in discovering the stamina of those modern systems which, in a more expanded shape, have been maintained with the most refined subtilty and address.

Works of Sextus.

Sextus begins his *Institutes* by dividing the ancient Philosophers into three classes: the Dogmatists, such as were the Peripatetics, the Epicureans, and the Stoics, who asserted that they had discovered Truth; the Academics, who denied the possibility of such a discovery; and the Sceptics, who neither asserted, nor denied, but doubted. He then proceeds to explain the character and arguments of the latter Sect. Scepticism is defined to be, the art of comparing in every way sensibles and intelligibles,—the reports of our senses and the conceptions of our minds. The end of this comparison is to find as strong reasons for the rejection as for the admission of any point whatever. The great principle on which the whole system is allowed to rest, is, that to every proposition a contrary proposition possessing equal weight may be opposed. This maxim, however, was not laid down as incontrovertible. The Sceptic perceived the inconsistency of asserting that no assertion is true, and therefore consented to doubt even whether he doubted. He agreed, moreover, with the mass of mankind respecting appearances; but he hesitated to receive opinions founded on them, with regard to the real nature of things. His conduct was

Analysis of his Pyrrhonic Institutes.

Definition of Scepticism.

Fundamental principle.

---

* Σέξτος Καϊρωνεύς, ἀδελφιδοῦς Πλουτάρχου, γεγονὼς κατὰ Μάρκον Αντωνῖνον τὸν Καίσαρα Φιλόσοφος, μαθητὴς Ἡροδότου τοῦ Φιλαδελφαίου· ἦν δὲ τῆς Πυῤῥωνίου ἀγωγῆς· καὶ συσσώσει πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὰ βιβλία ἅπερ, ἴσως καὶ συνιδιάζων αὐτῷ· ἔγραψεν Ὑπλικὰ καὶ Σκεπτικὰ ζ΄βιβλία δέκα. Menage thinks the words μαθητὴς Ἡροδότου τοῦ Φιλαδελφαίου ἦν δὲ Πυῤῥωνίου ἀγωγῆς and καὶ Σκεπτικὰ βιβλία δέκα are interpolations.

† *In Not. ad Capitolin.* ‡ *In Plutarch. Vit.* c. 5.

§ *De Script. Hist. Phil.* lib. iii. c. 12.

‖ *In Not. ad Capitolin.*, though he adopts a different opinion in *Not. ad Diog. Laërt.* ¶ *Ad Suid.* tom. iii. p. 299.

** *In observat. ad Diog. Laërt.* p. 444.

†† *Biblioth. Græc.* tom. v. p. 527.

‡‡ *In Præf. ad Sext. Empiric.*

§§ *In Libr. de Phil.* p. 99.

‖‖ *In Meditat.* lib. i. c. 9.

¶¶ *Audivit et Sextum Chæronensem Plutarchi nepotem, Junium Rusticum, Claudium Maximum, et Cinnam Catulum, Stoicos.*

* *La preuve dont se sert Saumaise pour faire voir que ces deux Sextus ont été différens n'est pas plus forte que les précédentes. Il la tire de ce que Sextus de Chæronée fut contemporain de Galien, et que Sextus Empiricus fut plus ancien que lui, étant mis par lui dans son Isagoge au nombre des Empiriques. Comme si pour être cité par Galien, il étoit nécessaire qu'il eût précedé l'âge de Galien, et comme si nous ne citions pas souvent nos contemporains.* (Huet, *De la Foiblesse, &c.* p. 158.) Which Brucker thus states, *Quamvis autem in Isagoge, quæ Galeno tribuitur, Sextus nominetur, nondum tamen inde sequi, fuisse eum Galeno coævum, potuisse enim ad antiquiores se provocare auctorem.* (*Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. iii. p. 634.)

† Sextus indeed maintains that the Methodic Sect in Medicine was more favourable to Pyrrhonism than the Empirical, (*Pyrrh. Hyp.* lib. i.,) whence Marsilius Cognatus contends that he belonged to the former: in which opinion he is seconded by D. Le Clerc, (*Hist. Med.* part ii. p. 378;) but it is justly observed by Fabricius, that the Sceptics never professed to follow their maxims in common life, and therefore not in the practice of Medicine. *Bibl. Græc.* ed. Harles. tom. v. p. 527.

‡ In lib. iii. sec. 213, of his *Pyrrh. Instit.* he contrasts the customs of his country with those of the Libyans.

§ Fabr. *Bibl. Græc.* tom. v. p. 527. Menage places Sextus Empiricus about the time of Trajan and Adrian. (*Obs. in Diog. Laërt.* p. 1.) Brucker refers his age to the IIId century, in the reign of the Emperor Severus. (*Hist. Crit. Philos.* p. 636.)

consequently regulated in compliance with the state of established usages and institutions. In theory, he withheld his assent from the most general maxims of Physics and of Morals, because he did not see any infallible criterion by which he could distinguish Truth from Falsehood; in practice, he followed the instinct of nature, the bent of passion, the laws of society, and the common rules of Art and Science. His speculations, however, though confessedly not productive of any alteration in the employments of life, were represented as leading to results of a most important nature. The entire suspension of judgment (ἀποχή) induced by the impossibility of discerning reality from illusion, in our internal thoughts and external impressions, was said to beget a state of perfect indifference and tranquillity, a total freedom from the fretful variety of cares and sorrows which agitate the human breast. The Sceptic pursues not with feverish anxiety what cannot be shown to be really good; he shuns not in perpetual alarm what cannot be proved to be essentially evil. The process by which this mental imperturbability (ἀταραξία) was effected, is described as entirely fortuitous. As Apelles, despairing to imitate the foam in his celebrated picture of a horse, flung against it his sponge, still stained with the different colours which he used, and thus, by a fortunate accident, produced that exact effect which the most exquisite skill was incapable of accomplishing: so the Sceptic, who had attempted the separation of Truth from Falsehood, with a view of releasing his mind from the troubles which oppressed it, unable to attain this object, suffered his judgment to remain suspended by the equal force of contrary reasons, and through this very suspension eventually obtained that tranquillity which he sought in vain from another source.

End of Scepticism, and method by which it is obtained.

In order to maintain this desirable indecision, the Sceptic resorted to a variety of methods, which were dexterously opposed to the several arguments of the Dogmatists. He endeavoured to show, that the evidence derived from our perceptions was, considered under every point of view, fallacious. For, in the first place, since animals, arising from different species and in different manners, possess a different conformation of the organs of sense, they cannot be affected in the same way by the same external objects. But, as the parts of the material world seem to us of different colours, in consequence of the jaundice or a suffusion, and of different figures, according as we press the sides of the eye, or as we view them in convex or concave mirrors; so it is possible that animals, some of whom have the eye red, some white, some narrow, some oblique, some prominent, some depressed, receive impressions from objects dissimilar from those which they convey to man. And the same remark is equally applicable to the remaining senses. Even as digested food becomes veins, arteries, bones, or sinews, according to the difference of the recipient parts, or as water, when poured on plants, becomes bark, boughs, or fruits; so he concludes that objects are variously felt, according to the constitution and temperament of the animal creation. Indeed, it must be in consequence of the incongruity of their sensations, that the same substance is eagerly desired by some, and utterly loathed by others; and that what is wholesome to one class is deadly to another. If, therefore, the question be put to the Sceptic, whether hemlock be nourishment or poison, he will answer,—that it is the former to quails, the latter to men; but he will cautiously avoid pronouncing that it is either the one or the other, in the nature of things. For Man, being an interested party, cannot be qualified to judge between his own sensations and those of animals, in order to decide to which the preference ought justly to be given. Nor can any demonstration be adduced; for though the demonstration be apparent to us, to determine on that account that it is true, is to assume the very point which it was meant to prove.

Sceptical methods of suspension.

Difference among animals.

The Sceptic, having thus far reasoned to show that Man has no right to pretend that his own perceptions are more correspondent with the real nature of things than those of animals termed irrational, is willing to argue even on the supposition that men have the exclusive privilege of discerning Truth, and to evince that a suspension of judgment is even then altogether necessary. So various are the corporeal frames and constitutions of Mankind, that the same objects produce different effects upon different persons, and it is impossible to be certain that our particular apprehension is entitled to superior credit. We cannot, he will add, place confidence in all men, for we should thus admit the most palpable contradictions; we cannot discover, by a review of the Universe, on what side the majority of Mankind in any question ought to be ranked; and if we are required to follow a few, we must immediately ask, who are these few? the Platonists will refer us to Plato, the Epicureans to Epicurus; and, amidst this contrariety, the Sceptic will rest in his usual indecision.

Diversity of men.

After having thus argued on the concession, that men in general have the power of judging, he will consent to meet his adversaries even by granting, that there may be some one individual on whom reliance might possibly be placed, and he will merely ask, to which of the senses of this individual must credit be attached? For different organs present things in different modes. Painting sets forth to the sight some objects as standing out, others as sinking backwards, but to the touch the picture presents no inequalities. Honey, which is luscious to the palate, is offensive to the eye; and balm, which is delightful to the organs of smell, is repulsive to those of taste. It is, besides, impossible to ascertain, whether substances have all the qualities which they appear to possess; or only one quality, which seems different, owing to the diversity of our senses; or many more qualities than our limited number of senses is capable of perceiving. And if our senses cannot comprehend external objects, neither can our intellectual faculties arrive at the knowledge of their real nature, and suspension is again requisite.

Diversity of senses in the same man.

But still the Sceptic is content to pursue the discussion, and to grant to his adversary, for the sake of argument, that we can confide in one sense of one individual; yet, again, this one sense will be variously disposed, according as its possessor is young or old, in health or in sickness, asleep or awake, sated or hungry, or, in short, agitated by one or more of the numerous passions, owing to which the senses give different reports, and the understanding forms different deductions. All therefore that can be asserted of any thing is, that it appears to us in a certain manner at a certain period of life, and under certain circumstances; but that we know not whether it be really such in its nature. For, continues the Sceptic, by introducing one of his favourite cavils, it cannot be proved that one of these states is

Different states of the same senses.

Biography.

preferable to another, unless we have some criterion which itself can only be made credible by a demonstration. But how can the demonstration be judged to be true but by a criterion? The demonstration therefore will require a criterion to confirm it, while the criterion requires a demonstration to prove it true.

Thus the Sceptic, having, with an air of triumph, destroyed by his *alternate method* both the demonstration and the criterion, by which alone one sensation can be shown to be preferable to another, finds an additional reason for his boasted suspension. He proceeds, however, to confirm it by several other commonplaces. He urges the dissimilarity of objects in consequence of distance, place, and position: the same tower from afar seems round, from a nearer point square; the same oar under water seems broken, above water straight; the same light in the sunshine is dim, in darkness bright; the same image, which when laid flat, seems smooth, when inclined, seems uneven; the same feathers on the dove's neck assume various hues, according as they are variously turned.* Now, since there is nothing which is not in some position and place, and at some distance, the absolute nature of things is undiscoverable, and their appearance only can be determined according to these three points.

Situation and distance of objects.

Mixtures in the objects which present themselves to the senses.

He derives another argument from the mixtures in the objects which present themselves to our senses. The images which proceed from surrounding objects reach us not in a pure and uncompounded state, but they are blended and modified by the medium through which they pass; for the same thing will wear a different aspect, as the impressions take place through a medium which is warm or cold, dry or moist, curved or straight, broad or narrow,—hence the varieties of sounds, smells, and colours. And that, too, without mentioning the coats and humours of the eye, through which the images of objects, with all their external admixtures, are conveyed. And as the senses err, so also will the intellect, which is guided by them, err. Indeed it is possible, that the intellect itself produces an alteration in what it receives from the senses, in consequence of the humours which exist in its material seat.

Quantity and constitution of subjects.

But, besides this, the Sceptic will urge the confusion which arises from the quantity and constitution of the subject. For instance, the shavings of goat's horn seem white, though the horn itself seems black; and filings of silver seem black, though silver itself seems white; grains of sand, which are rough and uneven, when viewed singly, are smooth and plane, when viewed jointly; the same medicine, which in a small quantity, refreshes and heals, in a larger, oppresses and destroys. All therefore that can be asserted of an object is, that it appears in a certain manner, when in a certain quantity, and in a certain state; but not that it is such in its nature.

Relation.

He will contend, moreover, that all things are relative:—relative to the thing which judges, namely, the animal, the man, the sense, and the state of the sense; relative to things seen with it, to the composition, quantity, and position of objects; relative also as genus and species, as like and unlike, as equal and unequal. And of this relation alone can we be assured.

Sextus Empiricus. The Pyrrhonists.

He likewise draws an argument from frequency and rareness of occurrence: Comets attract more attention than the Sun, because seen less often; Gold is more prized than Water, because more rarely found: but let the novelty alter, and language will alter; the Sun will be more admired then Comets, and Water more valued than Gold; so that there is no fixed measure by which we can determine the intrinsic merit of any thing.

Frequency or rareness of occurrence.

Variety of laws, institutions, fables, persuasions, &c.

But the Sceptic borrows his most powerful argument from the acknowledged variety of laws, customs, institutions, fabulous creeds, and dogmatic opinions. By constantly opposing all these with promptitude and address, and by showing them to be repugnant and destructive one to another, he learns to repeat with additional confidence the necessity of a complete indecision.

Other methods of suspension.

It were unnecessary to detail all the other methods, however ingenious, which Sextus has enumerated. It is sufficient to observe, that by their means the Pyrrhonist was furnished with a kind of panoply of cavils against every species of reasoning. If an hypothesis was made, he would counterpoise it by some contrary hypothesis; if a proof was offered, he would ask how the proof itself was demonstrated; and, if an additional proof was given, he would require this additional proof to be proved, and so on *ad infinitum*.

Reduction ad infinitum

Observations on the Pyrrhonic Philosophy.

Contradictions.

But why, it may be asked, such subtile definitions of terms, if all is equally uncertain? Why such careful attempts to avoid confusion, if all is equally confused? Why pretend to understand the systems of the Dogmatists, if nothing can be understood? Why determine that their proofs are weak, if Man is not qualified to determine anything? Why style those who mistake his object ignorant, unless the Sceptic himself possess some knowledge of which they are exempt?* How can one hypothesis be opposed to another, unless that other be comprehended? How is it ascertained that contrary reasons of equal force can be raised against other reasons, unless equality of force can be inferred? And, if as many and as valid arguments may be urged in favour of any one proposition as against it, what shadow of use can all his own Reasoning possess? Might not the Dogmatist turn round on the Sceptic, and accuse him of obstinate Dogmatism—of believing every thing—of asserting every thing; and when the disciple of Pyrrho replied, "Nay, but I assert nothing, I believe nothing;" might not the same Dogmatist exclaim, "I maintain that you are one of my Sect, and to every argument you may bring to show the contrary, I will affirm that a contrary argument of as much weight may be opposed to it; things seem to me different from what they seem to you, and you have no right to suppose your own senses are superior to mine: nay, be not indignant, if you attempt to give me a proof that you are not a Dogmatist, on your own principles I will require a proof of that proof, and so on without end."*

Considerations on its object.

Indeed the great body of the Pyrrhonian Philosophy seems to have depended on no better assertion than the following: some things are false, therefore perhaps all things are false; some men differ in opinion, therefore perhaps no man's opinion is correct. But the Pyrrhonist urged, that the effects of his system were an unvaried state

* Compare Senec. *Nat. Quæst.* lib. i. c. 5, and Tertullian, *de Anim.* c. 17. The arguments of the latter have been sketched by Bishop Kaye, with great perspicuity, in his excellent analysis of the Treatise *De Animâ*, (*Eccles. Hist. of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian*, p. 200.) The reasoning of the Sceptic drawn from the deceptibility of the senses is ridiculed by Epictetus. (*Ap. Arrian*, lib. ii. *Diss.* c. 20.)

* See the objections more fully stated in Crousaz's *Examen du Pyrrhonisme.*

Biography.

of internal tranquillity. It requires but little knowledge of Human Nature to be convinced of the falsehood of this assertion. There will always be the reaction of a natural propensity to belief against the pressure of adopted doubt, and this struggle will necessarily destroy the mental equipoise. The truth of this fact is abundantly exemplified in the history of man: Sylla, Tiberius, Louis XI. of France, not to mention other instances, will prove that the disbeliever in Religion is often a believer in Divination and Astrology. And even in the works of professed Sceptics, in Sextus Empiricus,* in La Mothe le Vayer, in Huet, in Glanvile, we discern an extreme facility in admitting reports, which would have been rejected with pointed ridicule by men but little inclined to indulge in unreasonable doubts. But if perfect Scepticism were really attainable, still the conflict of our passions and our opinions would disturb and poison the sources of enjoyment; or, even granting that the appearances of pain would be then incapable of inflicting pain, the Sceptic must admit, by parity of reasoning, that the appearances of pleasure would be unable to excite pleasure; and if our hopes must be sacrificed with our fears, and our joys with our sorrows, if all our feelings, in short, must be deadened into a state of torpid lethargy, it can hardly be supposed that the happiness of life would be eventually promoted. Such are the obvious faults of excessive Pyrrhonism.

Objections against the Dogmatists.

It cannot be denied, however, that when the Sceptic expatiated on our total ignorance of the essence of Matter, and when he laboured to prove that the sensible qualities of bodies are not inherent, but only secondary and relative to the perceptions of the Mind, his arguments were no less ingenious than forcible and just. It must also be remarked, that though he often resorted to puerile devices in order to elude the sober arguments of common reasoners, yet he sometimes stated objections to the distempered theories of the Dogmatists, which seem worthy of the better Scepticism introduced in after times by Descartes, as a necessary preparative to Philosophical investigation. He discarded with profound contempt the prevaleut practice, of suffering the mind to be preoccupied by hypothesis; of alleging reasons neither self-evident nor demonstrated; of ascribing to one single cause phenomena which might arise from several joint causes; of attributing a series of regular effects to the operation of unconnected and unobserved causes; of drawing a false analogy between the visible and the invisible world; of offering explanations inconsistent with their own principles; and of seeking reasons for facts before they were well assured of the facts themselves.

Observations on the last two Books of Pyrrhonic Institutes.

It would be inconsistent with our plan to enter into a detailed account of the last two Books of this singular work, it will be sufficient to state their general design. The second Book treats chiefly of Dialectics: it is employed in proving, in opposition to the opinions of the Logicians, that there is no method by which Truth can be discovered. Sextus returns continually to his favourite objection: there is no criterion, and all demonstration, by which the existence of such a criterion is to be shown, requires itself another demonstration, and so on for ever. We cannot trust our senses—they deceive us; we cannot confide in advisers—they differ. And here it may be remarked, that the cavils of Sextus are not, like the dexterous subtilties of Bayle, adroitly insinuated in some lively anecdote, curiously wrought into some brilliant train of reasoning, and unexpectedly introduced in various historical articles which in themselves possess intense interest; but they are methodically and heavily brought out, with tedious and insipid repetition. He argues, that there is no such thing as a demonstration, because it would consist of connected propositions, and this connection can never be proved. The Stoic objected with great acuteness, You must allow that there may be a demonstration, if you can, as well as if you cannot, prove the contrary: if you cannot, you have no right to deny it; and if you can, your reasoning is a demonstration. All the Sceptic could answer was, that maxims which destroy others destroyed themselves also; that the medicine passed away with the disease which it removed.* He felt that the maxim, "all is false," is self-contradictory; for if it be true, all is not false. Sextus proceeds to attack syllogisms—a mode of reasoning unquestionably liable to objection,—and afterwards produces the following cavil against definitions: "Either you know what you are defining, before you define it, or you do not; if you do not, you cannot define; if you do, you need not: but, you will answer, I define for the use of others; but if you understood the point without a definition, why should not they?" As if a definition were not the result of a gradual succession of ideas, linked together and developed in a manner useful to ourselves by the simplification, and, for the same reason, still more useful to others. He objects, that a definition, in consequence of the limited nature of our knowledge, may perhaps never embrace all the qualities of the subject; but such reasoning would rather tend to show it to be incomplete, than dangerously false. He objects also, that wrong definitions have been often given; but does it follow that none are true? is it because some men have defined Light to be the act of a luminous body, that no definition of Light can ever be given?

Sextus Empiricus. The Pyrrhonists.

Definitions.

Existence of the Deity.

After having next examined the various divisions of Logic, he devotes his third Book to the consideration of Physics, and begins with its most important branch,—the existence of the Deity—premising, however, that in practice he conformed to the established Religion, and admitted the necessity of worshipping the Gods. And it is fortunate for the happiness of Mankind, that the arguments by which he endeavours to contradict the voice of universal Nature are as feeble as they are trite: they are derived from the impossibility of comprehending his essence; of forming any defined idea of his substance; and from the diversity of opinions respecting his form and nature. And if we know not his essence, says the Sceptic, we cannot know his attributes. As well might he argue, that because we are utterly ignorant of the essence of Matter and of Spirit, that we are therefore ignorant of their properties and their operations. It cannot but excite a smile to observe the ridiculous contradictions into which the habit of cavilling will lead even men of considerable penetration; it

* The works of Sextus teem with tales which would hardly be equalled by the anecdotes of the most credulous: e. g. that Demophon was cold in the sunshine and warm in the shade; that the Tentyrites in Egypt are not hurt by crocodiles; that the elephant flies from the ram, the lion from the cock, and whales from the crackling of bruised beans, &c. (b. i. c. 13 and 14.) Sir Thomas Brown might have enriched his Treatise on *Vulgar Errors*, by having added Sextus to the writers whom he consulted.

* Sext. c. *Mathem.* Aristocl. *ap. Euseb.* Diog. Laert. lib. ix. sec. 76.

Biography.

is impious, says Sextus, to believe in God, because it is impious to allow, as we must, in consequence of such a belief, allow, that he has either not the will, or not the power to remedy existing evils; but what is the meaning of *impiety*? is it not want of reverence towards the Deity, which is an assumption of his existence?* If there be no Deity, there can be no impiety; and if there be, it cannot be impiety to assert his existence.

Puerile sophisms.

But these sophisms are plausible in comparison with many which occur in other parts of the work, and which were, surely, rather intended as playful means of tormenting the Dogmatists, than as serious objections. For instance, his arguments against a Cause: a Cause cannot be posterior to its effect, neither can it be anterior, for it would then be a Cause before it produced an effect, that is, a Cause without being a Cause, since it is a Cause only inasmuch as it produces an effect: or, his arguments against the common notion of a lesser number being contained in a greater; if five be contained in six, as the fewer in the more, for the same reason, four will be contained in five, and three in four, and two in three, and one in two; therefore six will contain five, four, three, two, one, which being put together make fifteen:—or, lastly, his arguments against motion: if a thing be moved, it is either moved in the place in which it is, or in that in which it is not; but not in the place in which it is, for if it be in it, it continues in it; nor in the place in which it is not, for where a thing is not there it cannot act or be acted upon.

After having urged a variety of cavils not very dissimilar from the egregious trifling which we have just noted, (and which we should have passed over with the contempt it merits, were it not calculated to give a view of ancient Pyrrhonism,) on our notions of augmentation, diminution, subtraction, addition, generation, corruption, place, time, and number, Sextus examines the grounds of the Ethical part of Philosophy, and attempts to annihilate the essential difference between right and wrong, by showing that there is nothing in itself good, bad, or indifferent. His arguments are nearly the same as those which modern writers have urged as disproving the existence of a Moral sense, and are replete with a rich variety of facts, illustrative of the customs of antiquity, and of the sentiments of Pagan Philosophers. He concludes, by confessing that he has employed reasoning sometimes strong, and sometimes comparatively weak, in order to adapt himself to the capacities of Mankind in his attempt to check the temerity, and to humble the arrogance of the Dogmatists.

Treatise against the Mathematicians.

The Treatise against the Mathematicians, or professors of any kind of Knowledge, is a work of greater extent, containing a copious collection of extracts, explanatory of the systems of the different Schools in every branch of ancient Literature and Science. Objections are successively directed against the Grammarians, Rhetoricians, Geometers, Arithmeticians, Astrologers, Musicians, and writers on Physical and on Ethical subjects.

Sextus Empiricus, The Pyrrhonist.

The Pyrrhonic Institutes have been partially explained by M. Sorbiere in his *Lettres et Discours*, and by Le Clerc in his *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne*, (tom. xiv. p. i.;) and have been translated into English by Stanley, in his *History of Philosophy*. The whole body of ancient and modern Scepticism has been reviewed with considerable attention by M. Crousaz in his *Examen du Pyrrhonisme*; a work in which the fallacies of perverse ingenuity are refuted with that soundness of reasoning which results from long discipline in habits of rigid Logic and accurate research. It is melancholy, however, to reflect, that a keen insinuation, conveyed in one smart sentence, produces an effect on the mind which a folio of elaborate discussion can with difficulty remove. The lively versatility of Bayle is strikingly contrasted by the cautious, and often prolix, and tedious method of his more exact, but less able, opponent. The paradoxes of Sextus are more easily detected and exposed: but still the absence of that spirited attack, which, neglecting all subordinate errors, seizes at once on the most prominent, and strips them of their attractions with unrelenting severity, render his dissertation, not perhaps less intrinsically valuable, but less interesting and less popular. The first Treatise of Sextus was translated by Henry Stephens, and the second by Gentian Hervet: these translations contain some inaccuracies, arising chiefly from an inadequate acquaintance with the peculiarities of the Stoic dialectics.* The best edition of the entire works of Sextus is undoubtedly the following: Sexti Empirici *Opera. Græcè et Latinè. Pyrrhoniarum Institutionum*, lib. iii. *cum* Henrici Stephani *versione et notis. Contra Mathematicos, sive disciplinarum Professores*, lib. vi. *contra Philosophos*, lib. v. *cum versione* Gentiani Herveti. *Græca ex MSS. codicibus castigavit, versiones emendavit supplevitque, et toti operi notas addidit* Io. Albert. Fabricius, Lipsiensis, &c. Lipsiæ, 1718, fol. Further information may be found in Morhoff, *Polyhist.* tom. ii. l. i. c. 6; and in Fabricii *Bibliotheca Græca*, tom. v. p. 527, ed. Harles.

Editions, &c. of Sextus Empiricus.

* See Crousaz, *Examen du Pyrrhonisme*.

* Menage, who passes the highest praise on the works of Sextus, seems to have been inclined to comply with the request of a learned friend, who urged him to write observations on them; it is to be regretted that he was prevented from executing a task for which his varied erudition rendered him eminently qualified. (See his *Obs. in Diog. Laërt.* lib. ix. sec. 116.)

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXXI.

APOSTOLIC AGE.

FROM A. D. 33 TO 100.

History. Object of this and the succeeding Chapters.

In the great variety of subjects which a work like this embraces, its object is not throughout the same. Addressed not to the student in any single branch of knowledge, but to him who is desirous of that general insight into *all*, which may either satisfy a limited curiosity, or stimulate and help the inquirer in his further progress in any specific direction, its method of displaying the several departments of Literature and Science naturally varies with reference to this view. In such as are least likely to be investigated further by the general reader, the subject is placed before him in as complete a form as is compatible with our scheme. In those, on the other hand, for a due acquaintance with which most persons may be presumed to apply to more copious sources, our object is not to supersede more intimate inquiry, but rather to qualify the reader for it.

In no department is this course more fitting than in the History of Christianity. In the present diffusion of knowledge, there are other portions indeed of History and even of Science, which few would be content to derive from a mere summary of Knowledge, however exactly and ably executed. Each individual, again, by profession, or by taste, will be led to pursue some particular path of study much beyond that which is sufficient as a portion of general information, and, consequently, beyond the compass of our plan. But what such Arts, Sciences, and speculations, are to this or that individual, Christianity is to all. To attempt to write a work which should supersede, or even diminish, the general perusal of the Bible, would be worse than absurd; and scarcely less so would be the endeavour to provide any substitute for the many original sources of light, which it has pleased God to throw on his inspired word, through those his uninspired servants, whom from time to time he has raised up for this purpose.

Not to detail the New Testament History.

The same reasons, therefore, which induced us to decline a detailed account of the Biography of our blessed Lord, (although a necessary constituent in the History of Christianity,) will apply also to the most important portion of the lives of the Apostles; and, indeed, to the whole narrative of the early progress of the Gospel, which has been written by the finger of God himself, and intended doubtless to be read in that sacred character, not merely by the Philosopher and the scholar, but by the unlearned, and by all.

As the records of Christianity change their character, and are presented to us by human authorities, this scruple will cease to operate, and the propriety and need of completeness and detail will vary according to the circumstances under which any portion of Ecclesiastical History may be already before the public—according to the popular and accessible form in which it is circulated, together with the merits and the defects of the performance.

Introductory Remarks.

Even in the former case however, much assistance may be afforded to the reader of Holy Writ, by providing those collateral points of information, which are requisite to a full and fair view of the sacred records. Much, too, may in this case be done, in the way of pointing out the general scheme—the combining principle, as it were, of events and circumstances, which, without such assistance, to some may wear the aspect of detached and unconnected fragments. It is by reference to these objects, then, that the course observed in pursuing the History of Christianity will be regulated.

But to afford collateral information.

§ *Distinction between Christianity, as taught by our Saviour and by his Apostles.*

In treating of our Lord's Ministry, it was remarked, that some of the most important points of the Christian scheme were either wholly omitted by Him, or lightly touched on. Few, even preparatory, steps appear to have been taken for the establishment of his Church—that Kingdom which was to comprehend all Mankind. As if the very office of initiating members into this great Society did not properly belong to Him, he Baptized none. His revelations were for the most part communicated in Parables, or by hints and allusions equally obscure; and although it is true, that His Apostles were allowed an explanation of these, yet it is clear that at His death, and even after His ascension, they were as much in the dark on some of the main truths of Redemption, as were the Jews who crucified Him.

It is evident, indeed, that our Saviour's object in His Ministry was not to teach Man Christianity, nor to establish the Christian Society. It was necessary that He should leave the world, in order that He might become the subject of the one, and the head of the other. "It is expedient for you that I go away," are words in which He plainly declares this Himself. The office of making Christians, was the office of the Comforter. God manifested Himself in the flesh to redeem the world, and to atone for sin—to be made the object of a new Faith, the subject of a new Religion. God manifested himself by the Spirit to instruct Men in what He

History.

had done, and to teach them what they were in consequence of this to do.

Evident as this may be when stated, it is very apt unless it be so, to be overlooked or forgotten. Many have been the fruitless and unsatisfactory attempts to reconcile the Gospels with the Epistles,—one part of the New Covenant with the other, by persons proceeding on a vague conception of the whole being promulgated at the same time, and with the same intent.

It may be useful therefore, for the purpose of marking clearly the distinction alluded to, to consider it more exactly, as exhibited in what was taught and what was done—in the words and the works of our Lord on the one hand, and of our Lord's Apostles on the other; both proceeding from the same divine source, and harmonizing so as to produce one common result; yet so different in their character and import, as to occasion serious error in those who neglect the difference.

Difference in their Miracles.

First, then, Our Saviour wrought Miracles, and so did the Apostles, and so, may we add, did Moses, Elias, and many others commissioned by Heaven. To a careless observer, then, it may be satisfactory to say, that Christ's were superior to the others, because they were more in number, and perhaps greater in kind, than had been performed by His predecessors, or were to be performed by His followers. Granting this, however, we may still reasonably expect to find in Christ's Miracles not merely superior power,* but somewhat in that superiority which should especially denote the character of His mission. Else the manifestation of superiority would be only a barren display of power, a thing very inconsistent with the general scheme of God's dealings. Let any one, then, candidly and attentively examine the mode of exercising this power in both cases, and he will scarcely fail to observe

Christ in His Miracles the primary agent.

I. That in our Lord's Miracles, He was the primary agent, in those of the Apostles and others, they were the Instruments. Several incidental circumstances may be noticed in illustration of this position. No one, for instance, was more fully invested with the power of healing than was St. Paul; for we read, that certain sick folk recovered only by touching his garments; yet we are equally sure that he was but the medium through which the Comforter performed these Miraculous cures, because we find him, on one occasion, leaving behind him at *Miletum* a useful coadjutor, *because he was sick*:† and on another occasion, suggesting to Timothy an ordinary remedy for an infirmity under which he was labouring.‡ In our Saviour's Ministry, on the contrary, human means are never resorted to, so as to imply the want of Miraculous power. His Miracles are at one time the result of persevering importunity,§ at another the dictate of friendship or of pity;‖ on them His missionaries and His followers were taught to rely for food, for money, and for raiment;¶ and on one remarkable occasion He rebukes them for having recourse to ordinary means, as implying the failure of this resource in Him. "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to the Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of Angels?"* All this was surely intended to point to the *discretionary* power which was peculiarly His. To Him alone God gave the Spirit not by measure. The very words which He used in the exercise of Miraculous power have a distinct character; such as, e. g. "I say unto thee, Lazarus, come forth;" whilst in the Miracles themselves, in many of them at least, the marks are more unequivocal. Take the cure of Malchus's ear—Who does not see in such an act as this, the unconstrained agency of divinity, called into exercise by the circumstances themselves, and not connected, as in the case of the Apostles, with any special commission, nor directed to any special purpose, beyond the display of His real character? Who, in short, can peruse the course of His Ministry, without sympathizing with the sister of Lazarus, in that tone of mind which caused her to exclaim, "Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died."

Introductory Remarks.

His Miracles generally symbolical.

II. There is another line of distinction still more discernible between our Lord's Miracles and those of the Apostles, and of all others. They were generally *symbolical*—the vehicles of instruction as well as the signs of power. Like the voice from Mount Sinai, they were at once Miracles and Revelations, a divine language conveying a divine message. And this circumstance, if rightly considered, not a little confirms the view which has been given of the primary, immediate, and independent agency of Christ, as contrasted with the instrumental character of his Apostles: the former not only performing acts above human nature, but moulding them at will to serve occasional purposes, as if the power were His own, part of His original nature; the latter humbly, fearfully, and almost passively obeying the dictates of a secretly controlling power, and avowing that they "had nothing to glory of, for necessity was laid on them."†

His limited power of imparting Spiritual gifts.

III. Among all the Miraculous acts in which our Lord and His Apostles may be contrasted, the one wherein an equality between them is most likely to be presumed, is the power of imparting the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Of this, more particular notice will be taken by and by. At present it deserves attention merely in the light of a Miraculous power, as distinctly superior to all others, as the power of imparting life exceeds the privilege of partaking it. Yet it is obvious, that in their use of this, as of the other powers, the Apostles were restricted, whereas our Lord's conduct exhibits no signs of any limitation. As no one would suppose the Apostles to be the authors of life, because they were occasionally permitted to recall the dead to life; so, the office of imparting the gifts of the Holy Spirit did not imply that these gifts proceeded originally from them, or that they were any but the instruments and agents of communication.

Distinction between their Prophecies.

A similar character (as has been already pointed out) pervades our Lord's Prophecies, as distinguished from all others, whether of the Old or the New Testament.

The exercise of the predictive power proved in all cases alike, that the Prophet was commissioned by God. But the constant and unvaried employment of that very Prophetic spirit for doctrinal instruction—its use, in short, for purposes not Prophetical, could only have been designed to indicate, what it does most

* As if to denote that the difference was not to be sought for in Superiority of Power, He expressly told his Disciples, "He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and *greater works than these shall he do*; because I go to my Father." John, ch. xiv. v. 12.

† 2 *Tim.* ch. iv. v. 20. ‡ Ibid. ch. v. v. 20.

§ E. g. Luke, ch. xviii. v. 35. Matt. ch. xv. v. 27.

‖ E. g. The case of Lazarus, that of the Widow of Nain's son, &c.

¶ Luke, ch. xxii. v. 35. Mark, ch. vi. v. 8, and more particularly Matt. ch. xvii. v. 27. The provision for the Passover which proceeded His death, may perhaps be classed among these.

* Matt. ch. xxvi. v. 53. † 1 *Corinth.* ch. ix. v. 16.

History.

plainly, that the Prophet wielded that divine instrument at pleasure, and not as one "who spake only as the Holy Ghost moved him." In Christ the Prophetic faculty was exercised as His own, in his Apostles and others it was only exhibited as through them. The language of the inspired mortal is, "I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord, to do either good or bad of mine own mind;"* that of the author of inspiration, "If I will that he tarry till I come what is that to thee?"†

It would be easy to pursue this subject further, but it may be sufficient merely to add, that in considering the secondary use to which Christ applied the divine agency as an indication that He was a divine person, it deserves notice that it was of Himself, or of His kingdom, or of His work—of Himself, in short, either immediately or remotely, that He caused His Miracles to speak. So that each Miracle, each Prophecy, is used by Him for some purpose beyond its specific and appropriate one, and that purpose one connected with Himself, "The works that my Father hath given me to finish, *the same works* that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me."‡

General character of his Discourses.

His sermons, exhortations, precepts, commandments, all lead us forcibly to the same conclusion. All are addressed to Mankind, no less than the Law from Mount Sinai, in the person of God himself. As to the *language*, it is "a new commandment *I* give unto you." "It was said to them§ of old time, Thou shalt not kill; but *I say unto you*, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, is in danger of the judgment." Still more may the matter of His discourses be appealed to for marks of a difference occasioned by the same cause. Our Lord did not, indeed could not preach the whole of Christianity to His Disciples and to the world, because the subject was incomplete until He had suffered on the Cross, risen from the dead, and ascended into Heaven. The most essential points of Christian instruction were precisely those which could not yet be given; for the simple reason, that the events out of which they arose had not yet taken place. Hence His assertion, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come, but if I go I will send him unto you."

Christianity begun by the Apostles.

Christianity then, strictly speaking, commenced with the preaching of the Apostles. It is the dispensation of the Spirit, and by the Spirit only has it been conducted. Our Lord is the subject, the foundation stone,‖ not the founder of it. It holds up to us as the object of our faith, "God manifested in the flesh;" but the world is directed to this truth, and assisted in embracing it, and acting on it, by God manifested in the Spirit. The Apostles accordingly were expressly forbidden to begin their Ministry until the formal sign was given, that the Comforter had descended amongst them. Until that event the world was no more under the Christian dispensation, than Israel was under the Mosaic before the Law was actually given,—whatever insight previously either Moses, on the one hand, or the Apostles, on the other, might be supposed to have had into the Revelation which was preparing. That the Apostles were imperfectly acquainted with the leading principles of Christianity, may be made evident beyond a doubt. Why else, indeed, should it be necessary to send one—not only to bring all things to their remembrance—but "to teach them all things." Why that expression of disappointment and despondency, "we trusted that it was He who should have redeemed Israel," if indeed they knew ought of the doctrine of Redemption by his death? None, surely, who understood the nature of Christ and of Christ's Kingdom, can be supposed to have put such a question to Him as, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel?" a question which goes the more to prove, that our Lord was not fully qualifying His disciples to instruct the world, that manifestly as it arose from ignorance and error He did not attempt to correct them, but only referred them to the coming of Him whose proper office it was to do so; and reminded them of the only part which He had qualified them to assume—to be his Witnesses. "He said unto them, It is not for you, (or as it may be rendered,) you cannot be expected to know the times or seasons, which the Father hath placed in his own power. But ye shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost, ye shall be my Witnesses."

Introductory Remarks.

Even after that first descent of the Holy Ghost, Christianity was in its infancy. The illumination of the Spirit was gradual, and as more light was required, then and then only was the supply given. It is easy to trace three distinct periods in the Apostolic History, in the first of which the Church was kept in ignorance of the second, and had advanced far upon the second before the third was declared to them—and each by a special revelation. Their Ministry commenced with the Jews alone. It appears certain that the Apostles themselves did not then understand that it was ever to be extended beyond their countrymen. Their ancient national error was not yet removed, that through Judaism the world must be admitted to the benefits of the Messiah's advent—must be saved, not as the Sons of fallen Adam, but as the children of righteous Abraham. Under this impression they taught through Judæa, Samaria, and at last at Antioch. (From A. D. 33 to 41.)*

Three periods of Apostolic History.

The Gospel preached to the Jews.

Then it was, that by a special Vision sent to Peter, his scruples were first removed, and he was made to understand, by the conversion of Cornelius and his household, that a door was opened to the Gentiles. But to what Gentiles? Not to all indiscriminately, but to such as, like Cornelius, were "devout Gentiles," "fearing God," otherwise known as "Proselytes of the Gate."—Gentiles who, without becoming altogether Jews, had adopted their belief in the one true God, and sought acceptance with Him by alms, by fasting, and by prayer. Yet of the Baptism even of these, St. Peter's report to the Church of Jerusalem is but an Apology. "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift, as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God?" (A. D. 41 to 45.)

To Jews and Devout Gentiles.

Lastly, a further light broke forth on the Church, when, by another express revelation, Paul and Barnabas were separated for the conversion of the Idolatrous Gentiles. Of all the wonderful counsel of the Lord, this was considered the most wonderful. This it is

To Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

---

* *Numbers*, ch. xxii. v. 18. ch. xxiv. v. 13.

† John, ch. xxi. v. 22. ‡ John, ch. v. v. 36.

§ Matt. ch. v. v. 21; and Whitby, *in loc.*

‖ Thus St. Paul, in his use of this very metaphor, addresses the Ephesian Church, as a building whose "chief corner stone was Jesus Christ, in whom," adds he, "ye also are builded together for an habitation of God *through the Spirit*." Eph. ch. ii. v. 22.

* *Acts*, ch. xi. v. 19.

History. which is especially styled "the mystery of Godliness," the revealing of which produced a sensation both within and without the Church, of which no one who would understand the writings and the history of the great Apostle of the Gentiles should be ignorant.

These three classes of converts; the Jewish, the Devout Gentile, and the Idolatrous Gentile; continued to be addressed and treated as in certain respects distinct, until "the end of all things," the grand consummation which took place in the destruction of Jerusalem, and the downfall of the nation, (A. D. 70.) By this act of divine visitation the Jewish Society was dissolved, and the Jews were no longer entitled to be treated as a distinct Civil Body. With this event, accordingly, ceased that scrupulous regard which previously the Christian Preachers had paid to them as such. The converted Jew was henceforth under no Civil obligation to retain the customs of his fathers; and the Proselyte of the Gate was released from obedience to a Society which was extinct, and was henceforth no more bound to abstain from things strangled and from blood, than was the Idolater who had never entered into a compact with the worshippers of the Temple. Christ's Kingdom was come.

§ *What preparation Christ had made before his departure for the establishment of Christianity.*

Notwithstanding the assertion, that the establishment of Christianity was the province of the Comforter—of God the Holy Ghost—that assertion by no means implies that our Saviour's Ministry contributed nothing towards the forming of that institution of which He was properly the subject. During His abode on earth, he had sent forth Twelve of his followers, and again Seventy, with a commission to baptize and to proclaim "the Kingdom of Heaven at hand." He had instituted the Sacraments, and had appointed a form of Prayer. All which may be considered as preparatory to what was peculiarly the work of the Spirit, and analogous to that preparation which had been made for His appearance on earth as our Redeemer, by the previous manifestations of God. Accordingly, although his teaching, it may be, embraces all the essential doctrines of Christianity, yet from the very form adopted, that of Parables, symbolical Miracles, and didactic Prophecies, the truths so deposited with His followers were plainly not designed to be understood, until the Holy Spirit should not only have brought all Christ's Ministry to their remembrance, but taught them also all things implied and intended by it. Until such assistance was given, they were in possession of a Revelation which they did not understand; and without this assistance there can be no question, that the Christian doctrines could never have been understood, explained, and preached. So, likewise, the Mosaic establishment had continued in its most important features inexpressive, ineffectual, and useless, until our Saviour's fulfilment of the Law displayed it in its true character, and explained its chief meaning. In short, from Adam until Christ the scheme of Man's Redemption was prefigured; in Christ's Ministry it was accomplished; by the Spirit it was explained. From Adam until Christ, the Religious knowledge of the world was like the gradual dawning of light which precedes the sunrise, and from which we infer the existence and anticipate the approach of the Sun itself. Christ came; but his coming was as when the Sun has risen in mist and cloud, and can scarcely be discerned. And then came the Spirit, like the breath of heaven which blows aside the cloud, and enables us to look upon the source of all the day-light with which we have been gradually blessed. So, also, our present condition as a Church may have some latent connection with futurity, which we shall then only be qualified to perceive, when God shall again manifest Himself, and we see Him even as He is. Introductory Remarks.

What is now to be considered therefore is, How far the Ministry of the Spirit had been anticipated by our Saviour.

I. His promulgation of the Christian doctrines has already been noticed as conveyed in a form not designed to be understood until the illumination of the Holy Ghost should be applied; many of them depending on events which had not as yet taken place; as *e. g.* the doctrine of the Atonement, which arose out of His death, and the Resurrection, which was assured by His rising from the grave. The most remarkable anticipation, however, was the command to Baptize in the name of the Holy Ghost as well as of the Father and the Son, inasmuch as God, in the person of the Spirit, had not yet assumed the government of the Church. Prophetic character of His teaching.

II. With a like prospective view, the Twelve Apostles had been commissioned, first, by Baptism and preaching repentance, to prepare men for the new era; secondly, in His last interview with them, to be His Witnesses. Their former commission (as from its nature might seem natural) expired on their return to resume their attendance on Him; but this latter (as appears from its character and from His own words) they were intended to bear throughout under the new dispensation. Hence the office of Apostle was really two-fold. He was a Witness of Christ, and he was a Minister of the Holy Ghost. By virtue of his former appointment he was invested with the power of working Miracles, which power he accordingly received from Christ Himself. In the latter capacity he was furnished with those extraordinary endowments of the Holy Ghost, which are therefore called peculiarly the Gifts *of* the Spirit. Of these, it is, the Psalmist speaks, when he describes our Lord as "ascending up on high to receive gifts for men." For thus Christ also said, "Unless I go away the Comforter will not come, but if I go I will send him unto you." As Witnesses, then, the Apostles performed those Miracles which are termed "signs" (σημεῖα) and "wonders" (τέρατα,) and inasmuch as this office was of our Lord's appointing, to Him perpetually, and not to the Spirit, they refer them.* Thus Peter The Apostles. Witnesses of Christ and Ministers of the Holy Ghost.

---

* The Scriptural expression is "*in his name*," and "*in that name*;" a mode of speaking which seems to denote an anxiety to avoid conveying the notion of Tritheism in teaching the doctrine of the Trinity. It reminds the Christian, that He of whom the Scriptures are speaking, was the same God in whose former name the old Revelations had been made, and the Miracles of old had been wrought, that it was "God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." (*2 Corinth.* ch. v. v. 19.)

Accordingly, when the Apostles were forbidden to preach Christianity to the Jews, the prohibition is said to have been "that they speak henceforth to no man in this Name." (*Acts*, ch. iv. v. 17.) No one acquainted with the Scriptures of the Old Testament can suppose that the Jews in making use of this expression, were pointing to Jesus either as a preacher, or as a worker of miracles. To the term used in *a second intention*, which is here denoted by the emphatic pronoun *this*, they attached a solemn and mysterious meaning from the days of Moses. The origin of this is plainly set forth in *Exodus*, (ch. iii. v. 13,) "And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come to the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say unto me, *What is his*

History. bids the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, "Arise in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ;" and to Æneas he says, "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole;" because in each instance he was proving his credibility as a witness. But when he passes sentence on Ananias and Sapphira, he is acting as minister of the Holy Ghost, and therefore so expresses himself as to imply that their death was a Miracle wrought by God the Holy Ghost, for the purpose of proving and vindicating the reality of his agency. "How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? Behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out." The second point of Christ's preparatory Ministry then was, His ordaining an Order of men, *viz.* his Apostles, for the special purpose of being witnesses to what He had said and done, and also, His qualifying them to become agents and ministers in the new state of Religion which was to commence after His departure.

The Seventy III. Besides this, He had appointed Seventy disciples, apparently with the same temporary commission as that with which his Apostles were first sent. Perhaps by this time a greater number of missionaries might have been required, or the Apostles might have been detained about the person of our Lord on account of some passages of His life which rendered their presence necessary, as His Witnesses—their permanent and peculiar duty. However that may be, the commission of the Seventy had expired before the descent of the Holy Ghost; indeed, as far as we can see, immediately on their return to him. Meanwhile they, as well as the Apostles, had scattered abroad much instruction, which God's blessed Spirit was sure to render effectual in all honest and good hearts. And although they were found on the descent of the Holy Ghost without any commission, yet it is highly probable that the first appointments to Ministerial offices in the infant Church were made from this class, as from persons already prepared and practised by our Lord in a portion of His Ministerial service, and, like the Apostles themselves, peculiarly fitted for a second commission from the Holy Ghost. To this number, indeed, Tradition has assigned more than one of the primitive worthies of the Church—Barnabas, Stephen,* and others.

Introductory Remarks.

The other Disciples. IV. In addition to these, Christ had left behind Him a body of Disciples—adherents pledged to the good cause by the Sacrament of Baptism, and prepared by the instruction which they had received from Him and His Apostles for the Christian truths with which the world was now to be enlightened. Of their number and precise character as a body, there is little to be learned beyond the fact, that one hundred and twenty were found assembled on the election of Matthias. Some have supposed them to have constituted a peculiar assembly; and consider them to be intended by "the Apostles' company," to which Peter and John retired after their appearance before the Sanhedrim. Whether this were so or not, certainly they must have been so far prepared by their admission into the train of our Lord, as to have furnished capable and ready Ministers for the Spirit, at that peculiar season, when the harvest was greatest and the reapers fewest. Here, then, was a third Order of faithful and experienced men, who, like the Apostles and the Seventy, were left qualified for a commission from that Comforter whom He had promised.

The Sacraments. V. The Sacraments form another portion of the Christian Institution which was embraced by our Lord's preparatory Ministry. Their object and character have already been pointed out. Why they were instituted by Him, and not, like all the other forms and ceremonies, left to the Holy Spirit, and to the Church under its guidance, is worthy of inquiry. Looking to the character of the Apostles as appointed by our Lord, they appear only in the light of Witnesses. Is there, then, any thing in the Sacraments which rendered these men under that character peculiarly fitting to be trustees, as it were, of those sacred rites? If there be, an answer may be thereby given to the inquiry, the question being always considered with that diffidence and humility which the wisdom of Christ in his arrangement of the scheme of Salvation claims from every Christian. Now such a connection is discoverable. Baptism, first, is the symbol of a covenant between two parties—between the Christian and his Lord. On the part of the Saviour, it was instituted as the means whereby grace was given; and, as a proof of this, in the primitive Church it was always perhaps accompanied by some extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. On the part of the redeemed, it was a pledge that he *believed*. Thus, when the Eunuch requested to be baptized by Philip, his answer is, "*If thou believest* with thy whole heart thou mayest." To the Gaoler at Philippi, St. Paul made the same reply, when asked what was the requisite qualification to fit him for

Baptism.

---

name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM That I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, 'I AM hath sent me unto you;' and God said moreover unto Moses, 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel,' The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: *this is my name for ever*, and this is my memorial unto all generations." God orders Moses to announce to his people, that He had appeared in a new *name;* but God said moreover to him, that he must caution his people, that He was still the same God of their fathers, &c. In a subsequent interview Moses was reminded of this in these terms, "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, *by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah* was I not known unto them."

The expression thus adopted to denote a *new manifestation* of the Godhead naturally enough became an object of scrupulous veneration to the Israelites. They studiously avoided all mention of the name which denoted God in his new dispensation, a scruple which may be considered as sanctioned by the commandment, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Through every successive period of their history the same feeling is recorded. It was the *name* of the Lord that dwelt at Jerusalem, in that *name* the pious are said to walk, His *name* it is which is praised, and in His *name* their enemies are to be destroyed.

When, therefore, the Messiah was foretold, Isaiah had not only used the term Immanuel but this expression, which to the Jews equally indicated another manifestation of the God of their fathers. The promise is, that "He would give them *a name, an everlasting name;* that they should be called by *a new name;*" and Christ himself is spoken of as one "whose name is Holy."

The Jews who attempted to stone Him for making Himself "equal with God," because He had said, "My Father worke h *hitherto* and I work," must (with these prophecies before them) have understood Him as claiming to be this new manifestation of the Godhead, applying to Himself this additional name under which God was to appear for the purpose of establishing a new dispensation. (John, ch. v. v. 17.) Our form of Baptism is an obvious allusion to it, and is equivalent to a command to baptize unto the Father as God, unto the Son as God, and unto the Holy Ghost as God. By this, too, may be explained (what is elsewhere remarked) that our Saviour's command to address prayer to the Father *in his name*, appears to have been fulfilled by the Apostles and early Christians, by addressing their prayers *to the Lord Jesus*.

* Clemen. Alexandr. *Strom.* lib. ii. Eusebii *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 1. Epiph. *Hæres.* xx.

History.

admission into the covenant of Salvation; "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," (i. e. made a Christian.) Baptism then was, on the part of the Christian, the pledge that *he believed*. Now the Apostles were the especial Witnesses of what was to be believed—they were the persons whose report was to be credited; and to them, therefore, most suitably was committed the Sacrament of admission into the Church, "the keys of the Kingdom," as to men already intrusted with the pass-word into it. Thus, the appointment of Witnesses and the rite of Baptism seem to be naturally connected, and to belong to one and the same period of the Institution.

The Lord's Supper.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is emphatically termed a memorial. It was enjoined on the Apostles, and through them on all Christians, as a symbolical rite to be observed for ever in remembrance of Christ; in remembrance of Him in his fulfilment of the most important part of His Ministry. Being, then, in itself a sort of monument, or histrionic record, of the most mysterious of those events to which they were appointed Witnesses, a reason presents itself why the institution of this Sacrament also should have been assigned to the same period of the new dispensation as the appointment of the Witnesses themselves. *They* could surely best understand and explain its origin who were chosen to bear testimony to the event which it was to call to remembrance; and who, if not all present like St. John at the awful scene, were yet present on those various occasions when it had been prefigured and foretold by words and by signs, by allusions to mysterious prophecies, by Parables, or by typical Miracles.

The Lord's Prayer.

Beyond these, no institution of the new dispensation was anticipated by our Lord, unless we except the dictation of that one Prayer which on that account is called His. Why this should have been done, especially as the suggestion of Prayer seems so accordant with the other offices of Inspiration by the Holy Ghost, and more especially as it actually did make a prominent feature amongst Spiritual endowments, is a question which will perhaps seem not to admit of so obvious a reply as the foregoing inquiries. In truth, there is no

Its object.

little uncertainty as to the precise object of this Prayer. To some it has appeared only in the light of a sanction and a model for Prayer in general. Others have received it as a particular form of words, enjoined on Christians to be used according to the letter of the commandment whenever they prayed. The question has seldom perhaps appeared of moment to the Christian inquirer, and hence, generally, all these are acquiesced in as legitimate objects of the Lord's Prayer. With reference to the present consideration, however, it will be necessary to be more accurate and determinate in our view of it. Adopting the literal and obvious import of the passages in each Evangelist, which contain the account of its first being taught, we should certainly say, that our Lord was enjoining that very form of words exclusively or especially. In the Church, too, from the earliest times the Prayer has been used as it was given, and certainly has never, as far as we can judge, been regarded as a *model* or a rule for the com-

Not given as a model.

position of other Prayers. Far from it, its character in some respects is very distinct, although the difference is likely enough to escape our notice, from the very circumstance that we become familiar with it earlier than we do with any other composition. But it may be safely asserted, that as a *model* for prayer it was not received by the Apostles and Primitive Church. If we doubt it, let us refer only to the first Prayer recorded in the *Acts*, that, namely, which was offered up before the election of Matthias, and we shall find it impossible to trace any special reference in this to the Lord's Prayer. Again, it may with equal confidence be said, that as a sanction for Prayer it could not be intended, because it was not requisite. The very words with which it is prefaced, "When ye pray," implies that prayer was already understood and practised as a duty. To which we may add another weighty consideration. Our Saviour, in His directions concerning the Prayers of Christians, expressly commands that they should be offered up *in His name*—a command which we know has in all Ages of the Church been most religiously observed. How comes it that the only Prayer framed by Him who gave the rule should violate it? It cannot be said, that this was because He was Himself to join in that form of Prayer, for it was evidently a Prayer for the Disciples only, the request being, "teach *us* to pray," and the reply, "when ye pray." Nor was it because He was not yet glorified, and seated on the right hand of God to make intercession for sinners, if, at least, we claim for it the character of a perpetual appointment.

Introductory Remarks.

Nor as a sanction for Prayer.

Without denying, then, that in the record of this singular Prayer the Christian of all Ages finds the highest authority and sanction for Prayer in general, perhaps to a certain extent, a rule and guide, still the primary and specific object of this particular form of words must be sought for elsewhere—in some reference to the office and condition of the Apostles and Disciples, or in some other connection with the infant state of the Church. In suggesting, then, that this Prayer was composed and intended for the Apostles and the other Disciples, considered as attendants on our Lord and helpers in His Ministry, it will not, we hope, be thought that we are lessening the character of the Prayer, or attempting to make its universal use among Christians seem less becoming or less a duty. Far from it, the conclusion to which it should lead us is the very reverse. That such is the case, then, is probable from the contents of the Prayer.

Composed particularly for His Ministers jointly with Himself.

1st. It is addressed to *God the Father*, and yet, notwithstanding Christ's repeated declaration, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father *in my name*, He will give it to you," this important omission is made in the only form which He dictates. Now supposing this Prayer to have been composed for His Apostles and Disciples, *in the character of His companions and helpers while on earth*, this is exactly what we should expect; for it is not until He should be glorified that prayer was to be made to Him or in His name. Accordingly, when that time was now approaching, He tells His Disciples, "Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name, ask and receive." Which amounted to this, "Henceforth ye are to pray in another character and another form. I go to be myself the object of Prayer, and even to the Father must Prayers be addressed in my name." Look, too, at the first Prayers of the Church, and you will observe precisely this charge. Take, *e. g.* that before the election of Matthias, "Thou, *Lord*, who knowest the hearts of all:" or that of Stephen, "*Lord Jesus, receive* my spirit; *Lord*, lay not this sin to their charge." This last is most to the point, because it is obviously an imitation of the Prayer which the blessed Jesus made on the cross for His murderers, "Father, forgive them," &c., the precise change to which we have been alluding

Not addressed in His own name.

History.

being adopted. It is not any more "Our Father," but "Lord Jesus."

With this, very strikingly accords the testimony of Pliny, whose careful inquiry into the Christian rites for the purpose of reporting them to Trajan, cannot but command credit, although he was no Christian. "They sing a hymn," he states, "*to Christ*" as to God. Indeed it may be worth considering, although it is immaterial to the present argument, whether the Primitive Church did not, in addressing Prayer to Christ glorified, consider themselves as fulfilling His command to pray *to the Father in His name*, understanding that command as if its tenour was this, "Hitherto ye have only learned to address God as the Father, now you must address Him *as the Son, in my name*, under my character, in my person." It cannot be denied, at least, that such is actually the form of the Scripture Prayers, as just quoted.

Let us then suppose, that *as attendants on and coadjutors with the Lord during his abode on earth*, they were instructed to address God in the name and person of the Father; and then let us see whether the matter of the Prayer will confirm us in this supposition.

The clauses examined.

Our Father which art in Heaven.—This expression, if it had any reference to the point in question, must be intended to mark the difference between God manifested in the flesh and the invisible God, God the Father in Heaven—in which character the address was made to Him. But pass we on to the petitions themselves, and let us see whether they are not chiefly, whether they are not exclusively, appropriate to *the state of Christ's dispensation as it then was*. So much so, indeed, that bearing the suggestion in mind, little more seems requisite than to allow the several clauses to pass in review before the mind without comment:—"*Hallowed be* thy name."* "*Thy Kingdom come.*" The expressions cannot fail to bring us back most forcibly to a time when the Gospel Kingdom was not yet established, but was the one great object of Christ's preparatory labours, and the labours of those His attendants who were sent from time to time to preach that Kingdom at hand. It was a petition for that moment to be hastened when these preparations should be completed, and when He should be able to say, "I have glorified thee upon the earth, the work which thou hast given me to do, I have finished. *I have manifested thy name* to the men whom thou gavest me."† But to Himself—to God in his name, were Prayers to be addressed when that work was finished, and their petition granted. Therefore, he adds, "And now, Father, glorify thou *me* with Thyself, (παρὰ σεαυτῷ) with the glory which I had before the world was with Thee, (παρὰ σοί.)"

Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven.—This brings us still nearer to the closing scene of that mysterious work which was laid on Him. When in agony in the garden of Gethsemane, and His mind was full of the cup of bitterness prepared for Him, it was, "Thy will be done" which closed His meditations.* Doubtless, then, to that mysterious and awful fulfilment of God's Will, this clause of the Lord's Prayer related. It was that Will against the fulfilment of which human nature revolted,† Satan tempted the Saviour, and His boldest Apostle remonstrated until our Lord rebuked him with a severity of expression denoting the extraordinary seriousness of the subject. "Get thee behind me, *Satan*, for thou savourest not the things that be of God but those that be of men." As if He had said, "This is the will of God,—Pray that His will be done, instead of seeking conjointly with the Evil One to thwart it." In the same strain spoke Peter of the Crucifixion, in his first address to the Jews, "Him being delivered by the determinate will and foreknowledge of God,‡ ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Thus, too, the Prophetic Spirit by the Psalmist, "Lo, I come, to do thy will, O God."

Introductory Remarks.

Matt. xxvi. 39. Mark, xiv. 36. Luke, xxii. 42.

Not that the Disciples used this Prayer with a full comprehension of its import. They may have offered it up in humble faith; instructed, perhaps, as in the case of Peter, that the sacrifice of Christ was eminently and peculiarly the Will of God, but not understanding how to reconcile it with their hopes, their affections, and their tenets respecting Him. Still they might have used it, going on like Abraham with his son, and preparing for a sacrifice, which, as in his case, seemed to put an end to their best hopes, as well as to wound their tenderest affections, but supported by a confidence like Abraham's, that God would provide himself a victim—would find some way of doing what to them seemed impossible and inexplicable.

Give us this day our daily bread.—This might seem at first to be equally applicable to the destitute condition of the Apostles and Disciples under the Dispensation of the Spirit, as it was to them during the abode of the Lord amongst them. But their situation was, in truth, very different. Whilst our Lord was with them they were miraculously provided as often as they stood in need, afterwards they were left to the ordinary means of maintaining themselves. Thus St. Paul boasts of working with his own hands, that he may not be chargeable to the Society; but our Lord's Disciples whilst He was with them were continually supplied, in their Ministry more particularly, by the extraordinary interposition of God. It was the occasion of more than one Miracle. Food, and even money was thus provided; their garments in their journeys waxed not old, and their purses never failed. But nothing can more clearly mark the distinction, than our Lord's words to them immediately before His apprehension,

* See Note on the secondary meaning of the word Name, p. 708.

† Add *inter alia*, John, ch. xii. v. 28, "Father, glorify Thy name. Then came a voice from Heaven, saying, *I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again*. The people that stood by and heard it, said that it thundered; others said that an angel spoke unto Him." What voice was this which sounded like the thunders of Mount Sinai? and what did it signify, but that as from amidst those thunders God had glorified His name as Father and Creator, so would He again glorify it as Son and Redeemer. "This voice," added Jesus, "came not because of Me, but for your sakes."

* His reproof to the Apostles on this occasion was, "could ye not watch *with me* one hour?" as if the object of their watching and of His was to a certain extent the same. In like manner, He sometimes prayed *with them alone*; and although in this remarkable scene He withdrew from them to pray, preparatory to a portion of His ministry in which He was the sole agent, and according to the prophet's image, "trod the wine press alone," yet His injunction to them seems addressed to them as ministers and fellow-labourers. "Watch and pray, *lest ye enter into temptation*."

† "O, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!" What an agony of thought is conveyed in these words! scarcely less affecting is His request to Peter and James and John to "tarry with Him," as if even their presence was a comfort to Him in that tremendous hour of trial "And He took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith He unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death, *tarry ye here and watch with me*."

‡ Βουλῇ, our Bible translation is "counsel."

History.

and when He was in the act of taking leave of them, "When I sent you forth without scrip or purse or shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, 'Nothing.' Then said He to them, *But now*, he that hath scrip let him take it, and likewise his purse: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one."

Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.—Forgiveness of injuries, as the means of fitting us to receive the forgiveness of God for our trespasses against Him, is a precept which, so far from being confined to the Apostles and Disciples during our Lord's life, was evidently inculcated as binding on all Christians in every Age. "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive you your trespasses." A petition for forgiveness therefore having reference to such an injunction, seems to form an exception to the general character of the Lord's Prayer, as it has been here drawn. But although the duty of forgiveness be of universal obligation, and although it be a preparatory requisite in the case of all, before they can properly ask God to forgive them, still it is not usual in Prayer, one might almost say that it is not becoming, to set forth the possession of this or any qualification, but rather humbly to suppress it as better known and judged of by God than by his self-partial suppliant. Such was the difference between the Prayers of two whom our Lord Himself once described to His disciples, the one for their imitation, the other for a warning: the one recounting alms, fastings, and if not forgiveness of wrongs received, yet more than reparation for wrongs done; the other regarding himself only as he was an offender, and expressing all in "God be merciful to me a sinner. A Prayer, then, setting forth any qualification in the suppliant would not perhaps be consistent with this view, unless there were some special and extraordinary reason for it, such as the particular character of the Lord's Prayer may be expected to furnish. It is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that this and the two next clauses, "*Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil,*" related to those parts of Christ's work, in which, although His Apostles and coadjutors required much assistance, yet the trial and difficulty were most apparent in their Lord's course. He was most obviously exposed to Temptation, Satan employing every wile to turn Him aside from the preparation, which was going on through Him and His agents the Apostles and other disciples, for the establishment of that Kingdom which was to come. But were the agents and ministers themselves likely to be unmolested in their part of the same work by the same Tempter? What says our Lord? "Watch and pray that ye enter not into *temptation*"—and at the last, "Ye are they which have continued with me in *my temptations*; and I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." Besides the ordinary attempts of Satan, Jesus was expressly *led into* the wilderness to be tempted. What He there withstood no mere human being can be thought capable of withstanding. Well, therefore, might those who had joined Him in that work from which the Devil wished in that mysterious interview to seduce Him—well might they be taught to pray "Lead *us* not into Temptation." The meaning of such a request, indeed, can only be understood by reference to our Lord's peculiar case, for ordinarily "no man is tempted of God." Our Lord had been *led into Temptation*, and left alone with the Evil One. But He was more than man. With Him it was a necessary trial. In His case therefore it was ordained. But how could His followers and coadjutors have escaped, if the same exercise of Infernal art and power had been employed against them? Such an opportunity Satan we know did desire, and against such our Lord interceded by Prayer, in the case of one at least. "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (ὑμᾶν) that he may *sift you as wheat*, but I have prayed for thee (περὶ σοῦ) that thy faith fail thee not." Why Peter most needed his prayers, the event sufficiently shows. That Peter escaped this extraordinary trial by the intercession of his master, we know. That the Temptation was connected with his Ministry, as preacher of Christ crucified, is highly probable. His strong prejudice in favour of a temporal Messiah has already been noticed as accounting for the severity with which our Lord on one occasion rebuked him. In the present instance, too, this warning was soon followed by his attempt to rescue Jesus by force, and probably to assert his right to Temporal supremacy. "Put up thy sword," were the words with which Jesus recalled him to himself—he instantly obeyed. Christ had prayed for him, and his faith even against hope failed him not. He submitted to see his Master led to death, and Satan was disappointed of his victim. Still, as he followed and looked on, and saw no divine interposition in behalf of the forsaken Messiah, his heart misgave him, his better resolution failed. The Tempter was at hand, and the Apostle had already denied Him whose Kingdom was now seen to be not of this world, when a look from Jesus roused and rescued him. In all this there is doubtless every appearance of an attempt directed by Satan against Peter, not merely as a member of the human race, but as the first foundation stone of that work against which the chief agency of Evil was directed. In his efforts to prevent or interrupt this work, the other Apostles may be supposed likewise, although in different degrees, to have been the objects of his malicious schemes; and hence this clause of the Lord's Prayer, as well as the one following, "*Deliver us from evil, or from the Evil One.*"

Introductory Remarks.

The same principle will lead us to the true meaning and intent of the former clause, "*Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.*" Most sinned against was the Lord Jesus, and most conspicuous was His office of forgiving; when asked to heal, He forgave sins; when suffering on the cross, it formed the last act of His ministry—it was this, in short, for which He lived on earth, and for which He died. While on earth, the Apostles were fellow-labourers with Him in preparing men for that forgiveness. But although joined with Christ thus far in His merciful work, and thus far partaking of His ministerial character, there was one especial difference. They needed of God that same forgiveness which they were subordinate agents in procuring for mankind, and which they as such preached. Christ might pray simply that the scheme of forgiveness may prosper amongst the *objects of his ministry; they* were bound so to express their Prayer for this, as to *include themselves*. The spirit of the petition from their lips might be, "Grant us that forgiveness which we in our capacity of agents and fellow-workers with the Lord are proclaiming to others."—Their forgiving others was not assigned as a reason or claim on God's forgiveness of themselves, but renders their Prayer more humble, by setting them on a level, as far as the right to salvation went, with those who

History.

were obstinately refusing it; who were resisting their Ministry, trespassing against them as Ministers of Christ and stewards of the grace of God.

Objection to this hypothesis.

It would be uncandid, however, not to notice, that against this explanation one objection is strong, nor do we at all desire to detract from its force. In St. Matthew's narrative of the institution of the Prayer, it is followed immediately by the observation, that in order to render our prayers for forgiveness effectual we must first forgive all others, and to strengthen the connection the particle "for" is used. This is strong, although not by any means conclusive. Other passages may be readily pointed out in which sentences are thus strung together by one Evangelist, which, by comparison with the other narratives, we certainly conclude not to have been uttered together. In St. Luke the Prayer is found disjoined from the precept. In St. Mark, again, the precept is given and the Prayer omitted. St. Mark, indeed, introduces it as part of a regular exposition of that frame of mind which is suitable for a Christian prayer, and which is summarily described by faith in God and charity to man.

The concluding sentence, which ascribes to the Father the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory, certainly points to the character of the divine economy, out of which the ministry of Christ and of His agents proceeded. This was the period when Christ had veiled His Glory; for Power had chosen subjection, and for Reign and Rule the form of a servant and the office of a Minister. To that brief manifestation of the Godhead was attached neither Kingdom, nor Power, nor Glory. What belonged to Christ was, a Kingdom from above, Power from on High, a Glory which He had with the Father before the world was, and which was *at that time* to be ascribed only to God as the Father.*

Introductory Remarks.

In assenting to this view of the Lord's Prayer, the pious Christian cannot but use it with a peculiar feeling of devotion. Although its original object and designation has been accomplished, still, like what befel the Prophet's mantle, a new devotional spirit has been attached to it by the Apostolic Church, and by God who has guided it. If the Temple of Jerusalem had been converted into a House of Christian Prayer, could any other edifice have furnished the like accidental excitements to devotion? Much more may we be allowed and expected to attach to a form of Prayer so adopted, a character of sanctity, beyond all which have been subsequently framed for our peculiar use.

Besides, a further application of the Lord's Prayer (or, as it may be called, on the above principle, the *Apostles' Prayer*) is quite in unison with the general tenour of Christ's *temporary* measures; they were generally also *prospective*. This has been pointed out in the view of His *Miracles* more especially; and in the present instance, if the institution of this Prayer involved, as has been suggested, a Prophetic allusion and adaptation to the successive trials of the Church, its Divine Author must have intended it to be preserved. In what way, the Church and the Holy Spirit within it knew best, and has best determined

* So St. Paul, (speaking of the exceeding greatness of God's power,) "which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places; far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come. And hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church; which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all." (*Ephes.* ch. i.) To the *revelation* of this glorious state of Christ's power, the same Apostle may be supposed to allude in his 2d Epistle to the Thessalonians, (ch. i. v. 9,) when speaking of the condition of the disobedient at the last day, he describes them as undergoing ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXXII.

APOSTOLIC AGE.—PREACHING TO THE JEWS.

FROM A. D. 33 TO 41.

History.

SHALL we say, then, that the period of the Christian dispensation, of that dispensation under which we now live, commences where our Lord's Ministry closes? Such appears to be the case, that Ministry being only preparatory: first, as forming and furnishing the subject of Christianity; secondly, as providing certain instruments, and making certain arrangements to facilitate the first measures of the Holy Spirit, whose office it was to Christianize the world.

The History of that great work naturally falls into a twofold division; the former portion extending through the period in which the Holy Guide and Governor of the Church effected His purpose by a manifest interference, by extraordinary gifts and endowments bestowed on His agents, and an extraordinary and sensible reception, and welcome, as it were, of all, who by their means were introduced into the new Kingdom of God. In due season, this manifest and sensible interference of the Holy Spirit was withdrawn, and has continued to be so unto the present day. The History of the latter period will be therefore treated separately from that of the former, because of this great line of division. In *that*, the extraordinary display of the Spirit was a necessary guide and beacon to direct men to the Church, and to keep them from wandering in their progress to it. It served a similar purpose with the Pillar and Cloud, which for a time were manifested to guide the Israelites to the earthly Canaan. In *this*, the Kingdom being settled, although the God of the true Israel still resides amongst his people, that residence is secret and invisible—within a Holy of Holies—within the hearts of the faithful. Like the Jews, we only for a short season enjoyed the open and palpable symbol of God's guiding presence, but, like them, we were not left comfortless. "We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty on high: a Minister of the Sanctuary of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man," and through Him, and by Him, we have access unto God.

It is to the first of these periods, however, to which our attention must be now confined; that is, to Christianity as it was taught and conducted by the Apostles and other *inspired* Ministers of God. And here it will be proper to mark distinctly the breaks by which even this brief period is itself subdivided. For the new Dispensation was not communicated to Mankind at once, but gradually, and, it would seem, just in proportion as their weak and prejudiced minds could bear it. According to St. Paul's illustration, they were at first fed with milk, and as they gained strength truths harder of digestion were presented to them. It is quite necessary, therefore, to consider the records of the infant Church with reference to these stages, else we shall be continually startled by apparent inconsistencies: what is the subject of a command in one part, in another appearing, perhaps, as the subject of a prohibition; and what is at one time spoken of as a portion of Christian Law, at another being disclaimed and disowned. What indistinctness and confusion, for instance, may be occasioned by the want of some such principle, in attempting to reconcile the Decree of the Council of Jerusalem, respecting the obligation of Gentile converts to adhere to certain portions of the Jewish Ceremonial Law, with those passages in St. Paul's writings which expressly condemn such a compliance as sinful?

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews.

Some allusion has been already made to this distinction of Periods, which we will now therefore more fully point out.

Three Periods.

I. *The Gospel preached to the Jews only.*

I. Period.

The first instruction of the Holy Ghost was, like that of our Lord, addressed only to the Jews. Of this, the Apostles were informed by our Saviour before He left them. "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be Witnesses unto me, both in *Jerusalem*, and in *all Judæa*, and *in Samaria*, and unto the *uttermost parts of the Earth*."* Precisely in this order was the course of their Ministry directed. They preached at Jerusalem until Stephen's martyrdom, and the persecution which ensued dispersed the brethren through the rest of Judæa and Samaria, in which places the word was of course next preached. (A. D. 33 to 41.)

II. *The Gospel preached to the Devout Gentiles.*

II. Period.

Notwithstanding the frequent allusions of our Lord to this event, notwithstanding His last words respecting the extent of their preaching and witnessing even to the uttermost parts of the earth, the Apostles were still as much in the dark on the subject, as they had before been about His death and resurrection, after all His repeated declarations concerning both. As they formerly wondered what the rising from the dead could

* *Acts*, ch. i. v. 8.

History.

mean, so they now marvelled, what would be the explanation of the prophecy concerning the call of the Gentiles.

Of these Gentiles, be it understood, there were two descriptions; the Idolatrous and unbelieving Gentiles, and those who were termed by the Jews Proselytes of the Gate. These latter are designated in the New Testament as "devout men," "fearing God," "testified by the Jews." They were those who, in consequence of the dispersion of the Jews through their respective countries, had renounced Idolatry, and had become worshippers of the one true God. As a sign and pledge of this change of belief, they conformed to some few observances of the Jewish Law. Like the Jews and Proselytes of Righteousness, they abstained from things offered unto Idols, and never used blood as food, or the flesh of any animal strangled, as retaining the blood. In opposition, perhaps, to a very general corruption of the Moral perception in this respect, they also bound themselves to consider fornication as an offence against the Law of God; and, of course, as such to abstain from it. Other portions of the Moral code being already acknowledged by the Gentiles in common with the Jews, were probably on that account not formally enjoined on them.

Next in order to the Jews, it was reasonable that the Gospel should be preached to these, both as better prepared than the Idolaters to receive it, and also because the prejudices of the Jewish converts were less likely to be startled, than if all the Gentiles had been at once called. For, if the Apostles themselves were at first unable to bear this hard truth, what may we suppose to have been the case with the great mass of Christians? The event, indeed, fully justifies the wisdom of God in this gradual disclosure of his scheme. Although it was not until the seventh year of the Holy Spirit's descent, that any steps were taken for the admission even of the devout Gentiles, yet it was necessary to prepare one Apostle especially for the opening of this commission; and this, too, after having so frequently exercised him by divine impulses, as to render him of all others the least liable to mistake, or to distrust its suggestions, and the rest more likely, from the conspicuous part he had taken, to confide now in his assurance. Even at this late period, then, it was necessary that the Gentile Cornelius, although a man who "feared God and all his house," and could appeal for his character to the Jews themselves, should be emboldened by a special revelation to seek for admission into the Church; and that Peter, by a corresponding vision, should be required to lay aside his scruples, and be taught then for the first time to see, that God having cleansed the Gentiles, they were to be received on a footing with the clean and holy Israelites. The pains which he was at to justify his conduct to the Church of Jerusalem, and the opposition which he subsequently encountered, prove the delicate nature of his commission, and the need of some extraordinary and special interference of the Holy Ghost to enforce it. The time which elapsed from the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost to the conversion of Cornelius, forms what may be termed the first period in the dispensation of the Spirit. From this, again, to the further extension of the Gospel Kingdom, forms a second distinct period, extending from A. D. 41 to 45.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews. III. Period.

III. *The Gospel preached to the Idolatrous Gentiles.*

At that time Paul and Barnabas were called on by a special revelation to undertake an extension of the spiritual conquest and dominion, far beyond that with which Peter had been commissioned. It was then seen that the fulness of the time was come for the offer of salvation to the Gentile Idolaters. What preparation Barnabas had made for this great attempt, we are not informed. It is only said, that he was a "good man, full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." But of St. Paul, as of St. Peter, a special and distinct revelation is recorded: one, indeed, more solemn and mysterious, because involving what he describes as "the mystery, which in other Ages was not made known unto the sons of men," whereof he was made Minister. This was the dispensation of the grace of God which was given unto him, for a right view of which he was taken up into the third heaven.

That his Apostleship to the Gentiles was conferred on him in his second visit to Jerusalem, and by the revelation which he describes as having then received in the Temple, is evident from the terms of the command addressed to him. "Make haste and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem, for *they* will not receive *thy testimony* concerning me:" and again, "Depart, for I will send thee *far hence* to the Gentiles," delivering thee from the Gentiles, *to whom I now send thee;* to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God;" allusions which are manifestly applicable to the Idolatrous Gentiles only. For, as to the Devout Gentiles, Peter and Paul himself had for many years been preaching to them; nor could they be said so properly to be in darkness and under the power of Satan. His appointment, in conjunction with Barnabas, by the Church of Antioch, took place not long after, and, as we know, by the especial command of the Holy Ghost.

From this time the Ministry of the Spirit appears to have been directed to three distinct Orders of persons, each of which required some slight difference of discipline and government, although the doctrines of Christianity were alike imparted to all. First are the Jews, whether by birth or proselytism. To these, and it would seem to these alone, ministered all the Apostles, except Peter, and Paul, and Barnabas, who had also special commissions. Secondly are the Devout Gentiles, who were first intrusted to the Ministry of Peter, and afterwards included in Paul's charge also. Last are the Idolatrous Gentiles, to whom Paul and Barnabas alone of all the Apostles were sent, but more especially, as it would seem from the memoirs of their labours, Paul.

This stage in the administration of the Spirit will be found to comprehend a period of twenty-five years, extending from A. D. 45, when St. Paul received his Apostleship, to A. D. 70, when Jerusalem was taken, the Jewish Polity dissolved, and the grounds on which the above-mentioned distinctions were founded were for ever removed.

History.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews.

The Appointment of Matthias to be an Apostle.

Between the ascension of our Lord and the coming of the Comforter, a short interval of ten days occurs, during which the only measure taken for the furtherance of Christianity was the election of an Apostle in the room of Judas. This pause in the work of God may have been intended to mark more strongly the distinction between the former and latter ministration—that of Jesus which was now completed, and that of the Comforter which was to succeed. That this intermission was not accidental, at least, but part of the general scheme of Providence, was expressly declared to the Disciples by their Master. They remained inactive by His command.

This interval, then, was only marked by the repair of that portion of the Church's preparatory structure which had been injured by the fall of Judas. An Apostle was wanting to complete "The Twelve," as they were emphatically styled. Peter accordingly proposed to his fellow Apostles, and the other disciples, (who, to the number of one hundred and twenty men, were collected in an upper room, for fear of the Jews,) the expediency —or shall we rather say, he explained to them, that it was the will of Heaven—that another disciple should supply the vacancy? As yet, it must be borne in mind, of the two offices of an Apostle, that only with which they had been invested by Christ was known. As yet they were only Witnesses, or, as they are often called, in allusion to the most material circumstance in their evidence, "Witnesses of the Resurrection." Two, therefore, qualified for this office by their constant attendance on the Lord, were presented as candidates, and the choice fell on Matthias in preference to Joseph, who was surnamed Barsabas.

Mode of Election.

The mode in which this election was conducted has not been viewed in the same light by all,—the sacred narrative admitting, certainly, great variety of interpretation. Some, among whom is the learned Mosheim, have supposed that the election was made by the suffrages of the assembled Christians, the Apostles having previously nominated the candidates. Others understand the nomination to have been made by the assembly, and the decision by the rival candidates drawing lots. This latter being the more usual view of it, seems also, on a careful consideration of all the circumstances, to be the true one. For,

First, the election is expressly referred to the Lord, who had Himself appointed all the other Apostles, and who, even after the dispensation of the Spirit had commenced, manifested Himself when a further Apostolic appointment was to be made. They prayed and said, "Thou Lord who knowest the hearts of all men show whether of these two *Thou hast chosen*." Add to this, that the assembly was not inspired, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, and therefore could not know what was the divine will and pleasure. Mosheim's conjecture throughout proceeds on a forgetfulness of this circumstance, which makes this so materially to differ from any congregation of Primitive Christians assembled after the descent of the Spirit. Whether the Apostles or the assembly proposed the two candidates—a point which the narrative leaves doubtful—cannot with this view of the case then be of any moment.*

Another still more cogent reason there is for considering the question of the nomination immaterial, as to any argument which may be founded on it respecting the constitution of the primitive assemblies. *The rule was laid down*, according to which the qualification for a candidate was to be ascertained. So that whether the expression "they appointed" (ἔστησαν) refers to the Apostles, or to the whole Assembly, it seems certain, that they did no more than ascertain who, out of all then present, possessed the great qualification for an Apostle,—the claim of having been constantly in attendance on the Lord from His Baptism until His death. What if Matthias and Barsabas were the only two of that whole assembly who, besides the Apostles, were so circumstanced? This is indeed extremely probable. First, because the number of those who had been constantly with Jesus from the very beginning of His Ministry could not have been very great. Secondly, because those few, being from that very circumstance more known and marked by the Jews, and more certainly obnoxious to persecution, would be the most likely to flee and disperse on the crucifixion of Jesus so far as not yet to have returned to their little society. The Apostles (independently of that very constancy which might have qualified them for the office) were detained by an extraordinary sense of duty, by affection, and by other motives which could not so forcibly operate on the rest. Supposing, then, that two only were found, these two had given proof of possessing, beyond the qualification mentioned by Peter, a superior constancy, faithfulness, and disregard of personal risk, which were qualities equally essential to the office which was to be filled. Of these, then, Matthias was chosen and Joseph left. But both would seem to have been tried and proved for the situation. And if the general report of the early Church be true, Joseph indeed was only rejected for a season. Barnabas, the fellow-labourer and fellow-apostle of Paul, has been commonly identified with this same Joseph, who was also called Barsabas. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose that tradition highly likely to be true which states, that of all who were competent Witnesses besides the Eleven, the only two who gave proof of Apostolical faithfulness and fearlessness became advanced to the rank and office of Apostles,—the one supplying a vacancy in the number of those more

* The terms of the narrative strongly favour the popular opinion and militate against Mosheim's, notwithstanding his proposed accommodation of the text to his view. In the phrase ἕνα τῶν συνελθόντων ἀνδρῶν he reads αὐτῶν. But the chief obstacle lies not here, but in the construction of the sentence contained in ver. 26. In our translation it is, "the lot fell on Matthias, *and* he was numbered with the eleven." The meaning of the former part of the sentence in the original is more properly, perhaps, "the office fell to Matthias." But this does not affect the point to which we are adverting, which is, that the two acts are given as separate. First comes the choice or election of Matthias, and then his being numbered with the eleven. Now the Greek word, which has been rendered "numbered with," is συνκατεψηφίσθη: a word which expresses the act of an assembly, and that by vote, ψῆφος. Is it not, then, natural to conclude that St. Luke meant to say, that Matthias having been first chosen by the Lord's extraordinary interference, the assembly *joined in* or *followed* up the election, (for that is the force of the σὺν in συνκατεψηφίσθη.) Their proceeding with certain *forms* after the election had taken place, no more implied that they were the *electors*, than the usage of the Holy Ghost's descent after Baptism authorizes us to explain away the account of Cornelius's Baptism, because in this instance it preceded it. A case directly in point is that of St. Paul, who was, like Matthias, an Apostle especially appointed "by the will of God and not of man," yet it was, doubtless, after that appointment that he was invested with the office by the Church of Antioch, and by prayer and imposition of hands commended to the grace of God.

History.

especially sent to the Jews, the other joined in a commission to the Gentiles.

It appears then that this interruption in the Sabbath time, as it were, of God's great work, the interval between the ascension of Christ and the coming of the Holy Ghost, was not properly a continuance of that work, but only the repair of what was broken by the sin and death of Judas. It was appointed, perhaps, that the election of Matthias should take place in this interval, in order that the Holy Ghost might on the day of Pentecost fall on him with the same effects as on the other Apostles; they, as will appear in the sequel, being affected by the descent of the Spirit differently from the great body of Christians.

Descent of the Holy Ghost, (A. D. 33.)

The descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost naturally leads us to call to mind the object and design of that holyday among the Jews, presuming, that as their Passover contained so much instructive allusion to the death of Christ, we may learn from this also a similar lesson respecting the descent of the Comforter.

Analogy between certain Jewish and Christian festivals.

Fifty days from the Paschal sacrifice was the Feast of Pentecost; the same period intervened from the sacrifice of Christ to the descent of the Holy Ghost. In the former, the rite of the Passover reminded the observers of a temporal salvation and deliverance; the Feast of Pentecost, of the Law given to those so rescued and saved by God himself speaking from Mount Sinai. Christ had been the new and the true Passover, and, in like manner and after a like interval, our Passover was followed up by the promulgation of a new Law, delivered also by God Himself.

By means of this contrast, we may see more clearly the distinction which has been drawn between the Ministry of Jesus and of the Holy Spirit. With the delivery of the Law from Mount Sinai commenced the Mosaic Dispensation; with the Christian Pentecost that under which we now live. In each case all that preceded was *preparatory*—the signs, miracles, and other acts which authenticated the commission of Moses, and those which bore witness to that greater prophet who "arose alike unto him," the blood of the lamb which saved the Israelites from the Destroyer, as well as the Sacrifice of Him who by his blood has saved us all from Destruction.*

With the records of that day the Christian reader needs not to be instructed here; nor does it enter into our plan on this or any other part of the inspired history to attempt a substitute for the narratives of the Bible. Ours is the office of a guide, to point out the remarkable features of that venerable portrait, and to place the observer in the most favourable light for seeing them, but not to make sketches or copies for persons who may not have opportunity or inclination to visit the original. This kind of assistance the present occasion more especially requires. For the History of Christianity being the History of the Dispensation of God's Spirit, it is proper that together with the notice of the Holy Ghost's first manifestation as the guide and dispenser of Religion, there should be given whatever hints may seem useful to show the connection between the incidents recorded in that History, and the guiding wisdom of that Holy One,—in other words, to clear away all that might hinder the events preserved in the Scriptures from being contemplated as parts of the scheme of the divine Dispenser, and that scheme itself from appearing fully adapted to the purposes for which it was framed, and which it has so signally answered. The first point to which with this view we would advert, is

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews.

I. *The distinction between the modes whereby the Holy Ghost was communicated, and its effects manifested on the members of the Primitive Church.* Now, this was done in two ways, either, as in this first instance, *immediately and visibly*, or *by the laying on of the Apostle's hands*, when the communication was *secret* and *invisible*. In the former case, a flame shaped like a tongue was seen to descend, and rest on the persons so favoured, and the descent is therefore said to be *visible*, that is, *accompanied with a visible* sign. For God Himself no man hath seen at any time; and these fiery tongues, like the flame in the bush at Horeb, and that of the Shechinah, only denoted a *peculiar character* in the several communications which were accompanied by such tokens. Simple and obvious as is this view of the subject, it is requisite to keep it distinctly before us, because there has arisen much confusion of thought, not to say impiety of doctrine, from mistaking, as it would seem, the various modes in which it has pleased God to provide an intercourse between Himself and his creatures, for views of his real nature. In the old World it led to Idolatry; men associating, and gradually blending in idea, the God of Nature with those of His works, which were His most conspicuous witnesses, or tokens of His presence—the Heavens and the Earth—the Heavenly bodies, and the Seasons.* Each successive Revelation has been employed in dispersing the error and obscurity with which Man has thus contrived ever to darken the light of the preceding one. But, with the progress of each new day-spring, fresh clouds have gathered, nor has the Christian Dispensation itself escaped. From the earliest controversies, even to those of the present day, disputes have been blindly carried on concerning the Divine essence, by parties alike acknowledging that it is incomprehensible, and alike forgetting that God reveals not *Himself* properly, but His will, to Man: that what is said to be a Revelation of the Divine Nature, is often rather a warning not to seek after the knowledge, inasmuch as it chiefly tells us what God is not, and that what positive knowledge of God is to be found in Scripture, seems to be placed there, like the forbidden tree of Paradise, not to gratify man's presumptuous curiosity, but to try his obedience, and to animate his exertions; not as an object of present fruition, but of future reward. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us, and to our children for ever, *that we may do all the words of this law.*"†

Modes of dispensing the Spirit.

Immediate and visible.

Thus, when it is written that God appeared to Moses in the bush, our first, unthinking apprehension may be, that *an object of sight* before *invisible* was then *made visible*. But then a moment's reflection reminds us, that "No man hath seen God at any time;" and we learn to consider the expression as a similar accommo-

* As if to impress the importance of the analogy on our attention, we are told not simply that the descent of the Holy Ghost took place on the day of Pentecost, for then might the reader have overlooked the coincidence as casual; but the narrative is prefaced in a pointed and particular way. "When the day of Pentecost was fully come," and thence St. Luke proceeds to detail the glorious and gracious manifestation of the Spirit in this solemn entrance on its office.

* Thus, the brazen Serpent, which Moses set up in the Wilderness by the command of God, was converted into an object of Idolatry. See 2 *Kings*, ch. xviii. v. 4.

† *Deut.* ch. xxix. v. 29.

History.

dation of language to that wherein "the wrath of God," "the counsels of God," and even the "eye" and the "arm" of the Lord are mentioned. On the other hand, if we chance to overlook this, it is impossible to say how far we may go wrong. To return, however, to the immediate point of inquiry.

The descent of the Holy Ghost, when accompanied with this sign, must have been what our Saviour meant when He spoke to the Apostles of being Baptized with fire and the Holy Ghost. It was manifested only on some great occasion, and appears to have produced effects, if not always greater in kind, certainly greater in degree, than when the communication was made through the mediation of the Apostles. Those who were thus favoured were, by way of distinction from the others, said to be "filled with the Holy Ghost," and probably, from their superior spiritual endowments, formed the class out of which all elections were made to the higher offices in the Church. It was so, *e. g.* in the case of the seven Deacons, whose appointment is recorded in the sixth Chapter of the *Acts*, and in that of Barnabas. Through this "Baptism" all the Apostles (St. Paul, it would seem, no less than the others) passed; and by virtue of it *they* certainly obtained gifts greater, not in degree only, but in kind, as we shall presently observe.

Five occasions on which the Holy Ghost manifestly descended.

There are only five occasions on which the Holy Ghost seems to have been thus communicated, and in each there was some great object to be effected, some signal event to be marked. First, it occurred on the Day of Pentecost. Next, on the return of the Apostles from the Jewish council to their brethren, (τὸν ἰδιὸν.) The third extraordinary descent was on St. Paul, for, although this is not expressly stated, it may be certainly inferred, as well from the expressions, that he was "filled with the Holy Ghost," and was "not a whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles," as from the uniformity in the mode of appointing and empowering the Apostles in other respects. If our Lord thought it good to return to the earth, in order that St. Paul's appointment to be a Witness might be altogether the same as was that of the others, it is more than likely that he was invested with his second Apostolical office, the Ministry of the Spirit, by the same peculiarity of the Spirit's manifestation as were his fellow Ministers. The fourth occasion, was the admission of the first Devout Gentiles or Proselytes of the Gate into the Church. The fifth, and last time of its occurring, as far as sacred testimony goes, was at Antioch, in Pisidia, on the first fruits of the Idolatrous Gentiles. In this case, also, as in St. Paul's, it is only to be inferred from the occasion being strictly analogous to that of the conversion of the first Devout Gentiles, taken in connection with the peculiar expression which is used in the narrative of that event, *viz.* that "they were filled with the Holy Ghost," an expression which certainly seems to have been appropriated to this mode of communication.

Insensible communication of the Spirit.

On all other occasions, the descent of the Holy Ghost was such as our Lord alluded to, when he said to Nicodemus, "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." In other words, its operation was not accompanied by any impression on the senses. It was known only *by its effects*. But, the effects themselves being partly sensible and extraordinary, it was still in one sense a palpable communication. The Apostles laid their hands on the disciples, and the Holy Ghost was given. The gifts which followed in this, as in the former case, were various, and imparted in different degrees, as will be more distinctly pointed out as we proceed. It does not appear, however, to have been attended with all the effects or gifts of the Spirit; as, for instance, the power of conferring the Holy Ghost, which was confined to the Apostles, and therefore conveyed by the former manifestation of the Comforter. The gifts which it did convey were moreover, as far as we can judge, imparted in a lower degree.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews.

This communication of the Spirit appears to have been dispensed indiscriminately to all believers. All who were Baptized, either at the time of their Baptism, or as soon afterwards as an opportunity offered, were favoured through the Apostles with "some spiritual gift." Hence the desire so earnestly expressed by St. Paul, to be with the Romans, in order to impart to them this their right and privilege.* The members of the Roman Church had been baptized, but not by an Apostle, and had as yet therefore no opportunity of receiving this seal of their Baptism—this evidence which it was thought good to grant to every member of the early Church, to satisfy him that he was indeed a portion of that edifice which was the Temple of the Holy Ghost—that the descent of the Spirit, the natural, ordinary and proper descent, was real, although insensible. So to the Israelites, the Pillar of fire, and the Flame of the Shechinah, were long left visible even to all, until a belief in the divine existence amongst them had been not only proved as an object of faith, but familiarized into an habitual impression.

Gifts thereby conferred.

Various terms occur in the New Testament expressive of the offices and powers with which the Holy Spirit thus invested the members of the Primitive Church. We read of the word of Wisdom, and the word of Knowledge, of Prophecy, Discerning of Spirits, the Utterance and the Interpretation of languages, besides Teaching, Faith, and several other names which served the temporary purpose of marking a minute subdivision of Ministerial qualifications, which it would be impossible, as it is unnecessary, for us now to ascertain. To a certain extent, however, this enumeration of gifts is not unedifying to succeeding Ages. In the number of persons gifted, and still more, perhaps, in the distribution of endowments, we are presented at least with a fact, which makes it morally impossible that the inspired persons could either have imposed on themselves or on others. When enthusiasm and fanaticism spread themselves, the symptoms are uniform. That morbid sympathy, which is, as it were, the *Moral Conductor* of the delusion, requires that it should be so. One man's pretension to "discern spirits" may act on the heated imagination of another, until that other supposes that he too is endued with the same faculty; but this would never lead him to fancy himself learned in a foreign language. On considering the manner, too, in which the various terms are used, together with their previous and ordinary import, we are not a little guided in our view of the economy of the Christian Society.

Advantages of their enumeration.

* "I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some Spiritual gift, *to the end that ye may be established*." *Rom.* ch. i. v. 11. Many other texts of Scripture may be added, in confirmation of this view, *e. g.* the same Apostle, in *Ephes.* i. 13, 14, speaks *generally* of believers, that they "were sealed with the Spirit of Promise, which is the *earnest* of our Inheritance." St. John's words are still more applicable: "Hereby know we that we dwell in Him, and He in us because He hath *given* us of His Spirit." Ch. iv. v. 13.

History.

during this interesting period of its incompleteness and infancy, and are enabled to distinguish the characteristic endowments of those at least who held the highest rank. Some occasional use will accordingly be made of this source of information. The word of Wisdom, for instance, may be fairly interpreted to mean that insight into the true import of Christ's Ministry which it belonged to the Apostles more especially to possess, and which, as was before observed, they were without until they received it of the Spirit. Such an interpretation is fair and reasonable; because St. Paul speaks of it as "the hidden Wisdom," as if to intimate, that its subject was those things which had been hidden even from the Apostles. One of these points, and the most remarkable, is called, by the same Apostle, "the Wisdom of God." "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, but unto them which are called, the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God."—Again, there can be little doubt that the word of Knowledge was an expression used to denote Sacred Lore—knowledge of the scheme of past Revelations recorded in Scripture, their reference to Christianity, and, perhaps, their connection and extension through futurity, such as appears in the *Revelations* of St. John. This gift is accordingly described, both as unlocking the Scriptures of the Prophets, wherein was the Mystery that was kept from Ages, but was then made manifest, and also as that whereby the ancient Prophets had foreseen this Mystery.

Without pursuing these remarks further, it may be sufficient to observe, that these two gifts seem to have been peculiar to the Apostles, and to have been distinguished, the former from Teaching, the latter from Prophecy, on this very account; the Apostles possessing so much clearer views of Christ's Ministry and of the future state of the Church, as to entitle their endowments to names distinct from Teaching and Prophecy.

Descent on the day of Pentecost.

And this leads us back to the topic which suggested these remarks, the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, filling the Apostles and their company each with his proper gifts. This then being the first, not only of the five manifestations of the Spirit, but of all its manifestations as Guide and Comforter, the propriety of a visible and symbolical descent is easily perceived. It has been already observed that the office of Apostle was twofold: first, he had an appointment from Christ as His Witness; secondly, he was ordained by the Holy Ghost as Minister of the Word—expounder and preacher of the word of Wisdom and the word of Knowledge. In his former capacity he bore testimony to *facts*, which he was qualified to do whether he understood the import of those facts or not. In his after character he became also an expounder of the *true character* of those facts. To qualify the Apostles for the former, it was requisite for their own satisfaction, that they should be in constant attendance on the Lord;* for that of others, that they should possess the power of working Miracles. Both these qualifications therefore they derived from our Lord Himself. At His command they left all and followed Him while on earth, and before His departure received the power of performing signs and wonders. Still, as the office of *testifying* was not to begin until the new Dispensation was opened by the Spirit, they were commanded to wait for that event. So that the first descent of the Holy Ghost appears to have been made in its most illustrious and striking form, first as a sign that that great period was come, and next for the purpose of ordaining the Apostles as the chief Ministers of the Spirit. To this ordination Jesus may have alluded, when He told them and others that they should be Baptized with the Baptism wherewith He had been baptized, and also when He spoke of a Kingdom for the Apostles, as His Father had prepared one for Him, and that they should sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews.

From this period the Apostles and their fellow-labourers appear in their full course of duty. On a single address from Peter three thousand were converted, Baptized, and gifted with the Holy Ghost, and thereby admitted to the constant instruction of the Apostles, and the Communion of the Church. These religious duties were performed in private houses,* and by them

* What good end was probably attained, by qualifying them to be Witnesses of the Facts before they were even moderately acquainted with the Doctrines depending on them? The question may be partly answered, by considering how important it was that the Apostles should not begin to preach Christianity too soon. With this object in view, whenever our Lord was more than usually explicit with them or with others, His disclosure was accompanied with a charge "that they should tell no man."

* Κατ' οἶκον, as opposed to the Temple service, of which mention is made immediately after.

The expression, taken in connection with the existing circumstances of the Church, may however imply more, as the following considerations show. At this time the believers were more in number than three thousand, and besides the regular increase which was going on from day to day, about five thousand were shortly after added at once. Now it is impossible that any one private house, (and those of the Christians must have been among the humblest,) could have had an upper room, or any place within its precincts, capable of containing so large a number. And if any such house there were, still it is equally difficult to understand, how such a crowd of suspected persons should have been allowed, in the irritable state of the Jewish Antichristian spirit, to assemble thus regularly for prayer and other Christian intercourse.

Is it not likely, or rather certain, that the Church almost from the first must have been divided into several congregations? If so, each must have had one at least to preside, and also some one place of worship.

This supposition furnishes a key to many expressions of the New Testament, some of which are of no very obvious import. St. Paul is said before his conversion to have entered κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους, haling men and women to prison. Now, where was an inquisitor so likely to go in search of Christians as into their ordinary places of meeting, and what would more naturally express these than the term τοὺς οἴκους —*the* houses, *i. e.* the houses of Prayer. St. Paul sends to the Corinthians the salutation of Aquila and Priscilla and of "the Church which is in their *house*." May it not here too be meant that theirs was a house so used, that it served the purpose of a Church, and was appropriated to a particular congregation? Similar expressions suggesting the same interpretation will readily occur to the reader of the New Testament.

But, now, if this be so, what shall be said of the assembly of the whole Church, such as took place at Jerusalem when the famous Decree was issued? Supposing such an assembly to have been held *sub dio*, (for no private room could have contained them,) still it is almost absurd to suppose that their meeting would have been allowed to proceed without molestation; and the more public we suppose such a meeting to be rendered from the numbers composing it, the greater the difficulty.

One solution naturally presents itself, Why may not some one Order in the Church have been called the Church κατ' ἐξοχήν, —have conducted the internal affairs of the whole Society of which they were a part,—have represented it in its intercourse with other Churches. Perhaps each presiding Elder took the sense of his own congregation, and then the matter in question was decided by a meeting of these Elders and the Apostles. The Apostles themselves might either have belonged to some one privileged congregation, such as the original one hundred and twenty, or have been divided. The latter is the more probable; Peter and John are said to have returned after their release from prison εἰς τοὺς ἰδίους, and perhaps their preaching together may have arisen from this very circumstance, that they were attached to the same meeting.

as *Christians*. Nevertheless, as *Jewish* citizens they continued to frequent the Temple. Thus Peter and John when they wrought the celebrated Miracle on the man lame from his birth, did it as they were entering the Beautiful Gate at the hour of prayer. This and other instances which will occur to the reader of the History of the Apostles, clearly show that for a time, that is, as long as Jerusalem and the Jewish polity remained, Jewish converts were expected to conform to the ceremonials of the Law, not indeed as *Christians*, but agreeably to the spirit of Christianity, which interfered not with existing institutions, further than they were incompatible with the Gospel faith and practice. The Jew remained, as far as regarded conformity to the customs and habits of his country and sect, still a Jew, even after his conversion. The Devout Gentile likewise, although received into the Christian Society, was still not only permitted but enjoined to retain his customs as Proselyte of the Gate, and as such to abstain from things offered to idols, from fornication, and from blood. The converted Idolater, on the other hand, was left free to eat of meat offered to Idols, and to violate also the mere ceremonial parts of God's superseded dispensation. To have attached any spiritual grace to these ordinances would, indeed, in the Jewish convert have been a sin, and was forbidden; to have sought a fuller participation in the Jewish ceremonies and ritual communion, under an idea that they could render "the comers thereunto perfect," would have been equally sinful in the converted Proselyte of the Gate; and the converted Idolater also, although free to eat of meat offered to Idols, and, in short, to enjoy from the first the full "liberty" of the Gospel of Christ, sinned, if there were so much of the taint of old superstition remaining on his mind, as to make him feel that while he eat and associated with the revellers an evil being was receiving his homage—or that while he was indulging in any act indifferent and innocent in itself, it was too strongly associated in his mind with guilty meaning, to be indifferent and innocent *to him*. Regard to the feelings of weaker and more scrupulous brethren might in some instances render more restraint requisite, but these were the main clauses of the charter of Christian Liberty as it stood before the destruction of Jerusalem.

§ *Second extraordinary manifestation of the Holy Ghost.*

Peter heals the lame man.

The wonderful success of Peter's first address, and the effect of the Miracle which had been wrought by the hands of John and himself, soon aroused the attention of the Jewish Rulers. The cripple whose limbs had been restored, clinging round the Apostles, detained them as they were proceeding to join the public service, while the people as they arrived for the same purpose flocked round and formed a crowd. The High Priest and chief Police officer hearing the disturbance came out, and, assisted by the Sadducees, seized the persons who appeared to them to be the cause of all the tumult, and interruption of the public worship. Peter was already far advanced in a harangue, in which, as in the last, he was fulfilling his office of Witness, and inviting his countrymen to Baptism in the name of Jesus, when John and himself were arrested and imprisoned. Next morning they were brought before the Rulers and Elders, who had assembled at Jerusalem for examination of the culprits. The lame man was in attendance, and his evidence secured them from the charge of imposture. But the influence which their doctrine was gaining, was more alarming to the Council than any crime which could have been laid to their charge. Three thousand converts had been made by their first appeal; by this second, notwithstanding the interruption, five thousand more were added: and in the interval no day had passed without the Holy Spirit giving proof of divine power and care in bringing those qualified into the Church. They were dismissed therefore from the Council with repeated warnings, that if they continued to preach "as Witnesses of Jesus" they did it at their peril. It was on their return to their party, and while all were engaged in prayer and thanksgiving, that the symbol of the Spirit's communication was recognised, and his second descent was manifested.

An extraordinary display on this occasion was obviously in unison with the rest of that divine Person's Ministry. Thus it fell on the first Devout Gentile converts. Thus it fell also, (as we have endeavoured to prove,) at Antioch in Pisidia, on the first Idolaters who embraced Christianity. The first fruits of the Jewish conversion would naturally seem to require a corresponding blessing and honouring of the Spirit.

Of those on whom this descent of the Comforter (τοῦ παρακλήτου) produced the most striking effects, Barnabas was so conspicuous as to derive his familiar name from the circumstance, (υἱὸς παρακλήσεως,) and to deserve especial notice from the brief Historian of the event. Beyond the rest, perhaps, he then received the full endowments of an Apostle, and was thenceforth qualified for the occasion when he was called on to act as one, in conjunction with St. Paul. That his qualifications as a Witness had been already ascertained, was suggested as probable in the remarks on Matthias's election. In the present instance, the application of that singular title to him, "the son of consolation"—the record too of certain little circumstances of his history, such as that he was a Levite—of a Cyprian family—all seem to denote, that something had at this time occurred, and was alluded to respecting him, which was important in the History of the Church—something which distinguished him from the number of those, who no less than he, sold their possessions, and laid the money at the Apostles' feet. The interpretation subjoined to the word Barnabas explains this, and serves perhaps to point out, what is not elsewhere alluded to, the time and occasion of his Inspiration and Appointment as an Apostle.

The case of Ananias and Sapphira.

Among those who, like Barnabas, converted their possessions into money, and placed the amount at the disposal of the Apostles, appeared Ananias and his wife Sapphira. They, however, are said to "have kept back part of the price," and thereby to have "lied

But, again, if the assemblies of the Primitive Christians were held in separate houses, what shall we say of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the return of Peter and John from the Sanhedrim? Was it a partial favour and not extended to the whole Church? This follows necessarily, and is in itself not unlikely. A particular manifestation of God's Spirit, in which the endowments conferred were of a superior kind, was likely to be limited. Certainly the term τὸν ἴδιον, which is used to denote the congregation to which they returned, seems to imply a particular class of Christians. Those who consider it to have been formed out of the original one hundred and twenty, will see an obvious reason for the privilege in the circumstance, that they were fellow-labourers with the Apostles and fellow-disciples of the Lord Jesus Himself. At all events, it would be nothing strange that this sign should be given only to that congregation to which those Apostles were attached whose ministry was the occasion of it.

History.

to the Holy Ghost." For which crime the Spirit of God, as if to vindicate His authority as ruler in the new Dispensation, smote them publicly and separately with death.

As their case involves two interesting questions, in the solution of which all are not agreed, it may be as well to pause, and to consider the incident with reference to both of these inquiries. The one is, the Community of Goods among the Primitive Christians, the other, the Sin against the Holy Ghost. As the two subjects are by this event accidentally thrown together, so by their concurrence they seem to illustrate and explain each other.

Community of Goods among the Primitive Christians.

Most commentators and Ecclesiastical writers have represented this Community of Goods, as implying a literal resignation of all private and individual property,—each surrendering his all to the public, and all receiving from the common stock what was requisite for their support. What end would have been gained by this, it is not easy to understand; and to meet the question concerning its inutility, and also its impracticability, it has been conjectured, that the custom was from certain peculiar circumstances rendered necessary in the Church of Jerusalem, but did not extend to other Churches. But that such was not the custom, even of the Church at Jerusalem, may be proved from this very instance. For Peter expressly reminds Ananias, that he had no temptation to commit this crime of falsehood, inasmuch as he was not called on merely as a member of the Christian Society to sell his property, or, if sold, to bestow any of it on the Church. "While it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" The XXXVIIIth Article of the Church of England, in opposition to the mischievous tenets of the early Anabaptists, merely disavows the obligation of Christians as such, to surrender their property to the Church, without adopting, (as was indeed uncalled for,) any explanation of the Primitive custom. The difficulty, however, under which the ordinary view of it laboured, has not escaped the learned Mosheim, who, in a separate Treatise published among his smaller works, attempts to prove that St. Luke's account implies a community of *use*, and not of *possession*,—that the supply of what was needed by the Society and by individuals, was *acknowledged* by all as a bounden duty and unanimously complied with. But here, again, the case of Ananias, of Barnabas, and indeed all the others proves, that from whatever motive they contributed, they resigned not a part, but *all* of their property. Else, wherein the offence of Ananias? The following suggestion then may perhaps be more satisfactory.

Explained.

Nothing is more certain than that the Ministers of the Word, including the Apostles, were maintained out of this public purse. If some, like St. Paul, relieved it by daily labour, his own words prove that they were not required to do so. And why were they thus maintained? Because, no doubt, *they* had in strict conformity with our Lord's words forsaken lands, houses, and all their goods for His sake, for His service. "Sell all that thou hast, and follow me," may perhaps aptly describe the first qualification of one who was to have, for the most part, no certain abode, and whose time and attention were necessarily to be withdrawn from the pursuits of gain, and even from the ordinary cares for the morrow. From the character, then, in which the original preachers of Christianity present themselves to our notice, from the promise of our Lord to those who should forsake lands, houses, &c. for His sake and the Gospel, and from the fact, that they all did receive support from the public fund—from these circumstances taken together, does it not seem likely, that a resignation of all individual and separate property into the Apostles' hands, was the first step taken by those who devoted themselves to the Ministry?—the pledge, that they having now forsaken all, were ready to follow the standard of the Cross? On this pledge, perhaps then, they were put into office by the Apostles, their other qualifications having been at the same time ascertained by the power of discerning Spirits.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews.

One remark there is, certainly, in St. Luke's account, which may be considered by some to stand in the way of this suggestion. He states, that on the second manifestation of the Holy Ghost, "*All* who had lands and houses sold them, and brought in the amount." But, when we remember the Prophetic exclamation of the Psalmist, "The Lord spake, and great was the number of the Preachers," and consider how many were required now for the dispersion of the faith, this in a *society of poor men* cannot imply a very disproportionate number. Add to this, that the statement of their bringing in their money to the Apostles, by no means implies that it was in all instances accepted. In the general excitement, produced by two rapidly successive manifestations of the Holy Ghost and of its Gifts, all may have rushed eagerly to claim employment in a service so evidently divine, and so gloriously sanctioned by God. All who had property would naturally have thrown it up, as a pledge that they were ready to be employed, leaving the Apostles and the Holy Spirit who guided them to decide whether the offer of themselves would be accepted.

Sin against the Holy Ghost.

So considering the matter, the crime of Ananias and Sapphira assumes a very peculiar character. They sought to obtain the office of Ministry, and the Spiritual gifts and privileges attached to it, under a false pretence. The pledge which they gave, in offering, as their all, only a portion of their property to the Apostles, as the Agents of God the Holy Ghost, was a bold test applied to the omniscience of God in his present government of the Church, a practical lie unto the God of Truth. Theirs was not a *negative* but a *positive* offence against the Holy Spirit; not, like other sins, an act of *disobedience*, but one of *aggression*; and as such perhaps falling under that Denomination of which Christ had said, that they should not be forgiven, "neither *in this world*, neither in the world to come." Their awful sentence might have been twofold in its effects, the one temporal, the other eternal; the one for the crime of treason, in attempting to corrupt the pure constitution of the Church, the other for the sin of blasphemy against the omniscient God.

That, besides this consecration of the whole of the Ministers' property to the service of the Church, frequent and large contributions were made by others cannot be doubted. Mosheim's interpretation, therefore, as applicable to the great body of Christians, is undoubtedly true, that with them it was a community of *use*, not of *possession*. Besides the Ministers, the Poor were supplied from this fund; and especial mention is made of "the Widows," if indeed these were not rather an Order of Ministers than part of the Poor. More properly, perhaps, they belonged to both classes. As Deaconesses were early required in the Church, it seems most natural that those females who, from their poverty and widowhood, were deriving support from the Church,

should be employed in this capacity, according to the Apostle's precept, "he who labours not, neither shall he eat." The name of Deaconesses might not have been given them for some time after they exercised the duties belonging to that Order, for they are called Widows before the term Deacon even appears in the *Acts*. Wherein their service consisted, may be sufficiently understood from the office of Deacons, which will be next considered. It may be enough to observe, that their Order was requisite in the first promulgation of Christianity; because the frequent intercourse between Male Catechists and the young Female Catechumens might have brought a scandal on the Church. In the East, where the strict separation between male and female society was then as now proverbial, this measure was quite indispensable.

§ *Appointment of the Seven Deacons.*

The terrible display of the Holy Spirit's power, in the death of Ananias and Sapphira, was succeeded by many illustrious Miracles, performed through the Apostle Peter. In frequency, and perhaps in their extraordinary character, they equalled our Lord's, agreeably to His promise, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do."* For the line of difference between them, the reader is referred to our former remarks, as well as for the probable reason, why, during this first period of the Holy Spirit's dispensation, this Apostle's Ministry was so prominent. This latter point, as one of some importance, will be again adverted to. The effect of all this was what might be expected. The number of converts daily increased, and the spirit of persecution was exasperated. The Apostles were again imprisoned, scourged, and threatened with heavier vengeance. But God released them by his Angels; and, in proportion to their need, His Spirit emboldened and guided them, and "His strength was made perfect in weakness." But the storm was now only gathering.

Discontent respecting the Grecian Widows.

Meanwhile within the Church itself were displayed some slight symptoms of discontent, which deserve to be noticed particularly, on account of the measure to which they gave rise. The complaint is called "a murmuring of the Grecians (or foreign Jews) against the Hebrews, (or native Jews,) because their *Widows* were neglected in the daily ministration." Who these widows were has already been suggested; and if the suggestion, that they were Deaconesses, be admitted, the grounds of the complaint may be readily surmised. As the greater share of duty would at this time devolve on the Hebrew Widows or Deaconesses, they might have been paid more liberally, as their services seemed to require, and hence the discontent.

Order of Deacons.

This, it is true, supposes that the Order of Deacons and Deaconesses already existed, and may seem at first to contradict the statement of St. Luke, that in consequence of this murmuring Deacons were appointed. It does not however really contradict it; for evidently some *dispensers* there must have been; and if so, either the Apostles must have officiated as Deacons, or special Deacons there must have been, by whatever name they went. That the Apostles did not officiate, is plain from the tenour of the narrative, which indicates that the appeal was made to them, and that they excused themselves from presiding personally at the "ministration," (as was probably desired by the discontented party,) alleging that it was incompatible with their proper duties. "It is not reason that we should *leave the word of God*, and serve tables." This very assertion, then, is proof certain that they did not officiate. Again, on reading over the names of the seven Deacons, we find them all of the Grecian or Hellenistic party. Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas, the last of whom is expressly described as a proselyte of Antioch. Now this surely would have produced a murmuring of the Hebrews against the Grecians, unless they had already some in office interested in looking after their rights. With these presumptions in favour of a previous appointment of Deacons, we should rather say then, that these seven were added to the former number because of the complaint.

All that is thus far intimated of their office is, that they were employed in the daily distribution of the alms and the stipends due from the public fund. Whether even at the first their duties were limited to this department of service* may be reasonably doubted. Of this portion of their duties we are now informed; obviously, because to the unsatisfactory mode in which this had been hitherto performed it was owing, that the new appointment took place, and that the subject was noticed at all. It is, however, by no means improbable that the young men who carried out the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira, and who are described as "ready" in attendance, were of the same Order; in other words, Deacons by office, if not by name. What may serve to confirm this view of it is, the opposition between what would seem to have been their original title, and another Order in the Church. They are called "Juniors" and "young men," (*νεώτεροι* and *νεανίσκοι*,) terms so strongly opposed to Presbyters or Elders, as to incline one at the first glance to consider them as expressive of the two Orders of the Ministry, the Seniors and the Juniors, the *πρεσβυτέροι διάκονοι* and the *νεώτεροι διάκονοι*, the two Orders, in short, which at length received the fixed and perpetual titles of Presbyters and Deacons.†

Accordingly, there is no just ground for supposing, that when the same term Deacon occurs in the Epistles of St. Paul a different Order of men is intended; first, because an office may preserve its original name long after the duties originally attached to it have been changed; and, secondly, because whatever duties may have been added to the office of Deacons, (and that they were added is only a doubtful inference, drawn from no mention being made of them before the writings of St. Paul,) it is certain that the duty of attending to the Poor was for several centuries attached to it. Even after the Deacons ceased to hold the office of Treasurers, and the Bishops began to receive the revenues of their respective Sees, the distribution of that portion which was allotted to charity still passed through

* St. John, ch. xiv. v. 12.

* *Διακόνια.*

† It may be objected, indeed, that although the terms might have been different at different periods, yet the Writer would have adopted *one only*, because that one would now have been expressive of the class as it existed at all times. But the case is not necessarily so. There might have been some distinction coincident with the change of names, which occasioned him to adopt the one to a certain period of his history, and the other subsequently. So he has applied the name of Saul to the great Gentile Apostle in the early part of the *Acts*, and afterwards as invariably that of Paul, although no one can doubt the identity of the person.

History.

the hands of the Deacons.* Hence in a still later period, the title of Cardinal Deacon; and hence, too, the appropriation of the term *Diaconiæ* to those Churches wherein alms used to be collected and distributed to the Poor.

Not that it is possible to point out with any thing like precision, the course of duty which belonged to the Primitive Deacons. That it corresponded entirely with that of our present Order of Deacons is very unlikely, whatever analogy be allowed from their relative situation in the Church. The Church itself during the greater part of the Ist century was a shifting and progressive institution, and their duties probably underwent a corresponding change and modification. If we were to be guided, for instance, by the office in which we find the "young men" (*νεώτεροι*) engaged when the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira were removed, we should say that they performed the business which in the present day would devolve on the inferior attendants of our Churches. If, again, we were to judge of their character from the occasion in which we find them acting as stewards of the Church fund, a higher station would be doubtless assigned to them; but still, one not more nearly connected with the Ministry of the Word, nor approaching more to the sphere of duty which belongs to our Deacons. On the other hand, the instances of Stephen and Philip prove, that they were from the first engaged in the higher departments of the Ministry, although not in the highest.

After all, it is most likely that the word Deacon was originally applied, as its etymology suggests, to all the *Ministers* of the Gospel establishment.† But the Apostles having from the first a specific title, it more properly denoted any Minister inferior to them,—any, however employed in the service of the Church. Between these, also, there soon obtained a distinction. If we suppose, then, that the *Seniors*, or superior class, were distinguished by the obvious title of Elder Deacons, (*πρεσβύτεροι διάκονοι,*) the generic and unappropiated term "Deacon" would devolve on the remaining class. And thus the present Order in the Church, to which that name is applied, may be truly asserted to be Deacons in the Apostolical and primitive sense of the word; and yet, nevertheless, much may be said about Deacons, both in the New Testament and in the writings of the early Fathers, which will not apply to them.

Mode of appointment.

The mode in which the present appointment was made must not pass unnoticed. The Apostles are said to have called to them "the multitude of the Disciples," to have specified the qualifications for the office, and to have ordained them, when elected and presented for that purpose, by prayer and the laying on of hands. The assembly is described as vested with the power of Election, the Apostles with the office of Ordaining.

General Assembly.

But of whom, it may be asked, was this general assembly composed? Was it made up of all the Disciples who chose to attend and vote; or of certain, whose privilege or duty it was to represent the whole body? The literal import of the Greek favours the former supposition; the circumstances of the case itself, the latter; and this so greatly as to render it by far the most probable. In the first place, that there should be either a place found, or permission granted, in Jerusalem, for eight or ten thousand suspected persons to assemble, and unmolested to discuss the very questions which rendered them obnoxious, is very improbable. Equally improbable is it, that so mixed a multitude should be able, under any circumstances, to transact business such as this; except, indeed, by means of some miraculous interference, of which there is no intimation. Some other meaning then must be sought for in this expression, "the multitude of the Disciples;" and why should it not mean the *full* assembly of *the Disciples appointed for forming such assemblies?* Such a phrase would not be more harsh and unnatural than when we speak of "the *Commons* of Great Britain in Parliament assembled," applying in the latter as in the former case, to the representative body the term which properly belongs to the body represented.*

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews.

In the narrative of their proceedings, then, what more natural than that these should be called "the Disciples," in opposition to the Apostles, who were likewise present. The term multitude (*πλῆθος*) may then be understood, either as indicating that the meeting was a *full* one, or, what is certainly more in accordance with the general analogy of the original language, it may be used for "the great body of the Disciples," by the same obvious figure of speech which we employ when we call the representatives of the commonalty of England "the Commons."

* Lud. Anton. Muratori *Antiquitates Italicæ medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 571. Also Du Cange, in *Glossar. Latin. medii ævi: ad v. Diaconia, Diaconites, Diaconus.*

† Thus the Apostles on this very occasion are represented as speaking of their own office under the titles of Deaconship, "*ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ* ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΑ *τοῦ λόγου προσκαρτερήσομεν.*" So also St. Paul writes to the *Corinthians* (1) ch. xii. v. 4, 5, *Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσι, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα· καὶ διαιρέσεις* ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΩΝ, *εἰσι, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος.*

* St. Luke, in describing the assembly in which Matthias was elected, employs, apparently as an equivalent phrase, *ὁ ὄχλος τῶν μαθητῶν.* As this is not the only coincidence of expression in the two passages, and as the forms and proceedings described likewise very strikingly correspond, it may throw some light on both to place these points of coincidence in a scheme side by side. The difference between these will be found to arise out of the circumstance before noticed, *viz.* the absence of inspired wisdom from the one, and its presence in the other.

I. *Election of Matthias.*	II. *Election of the Seven Deacons.*
1. Ἀναστὰς Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν μαθητῶν.	1. Προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ οἱ δώδεκα τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν.
2. Εἶπεν——ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί.	2. Εἶπαν——ἀδελφοί.
3. Δεῖ τῶν συνελθόντων ἡμῖν ἀνδρῶν κ. τ. λ. μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ, γενέσθαι σὺν ἡμῖν ἕνα τούτων.	3. Ἐπισκέψασθε οὖν ἄνδρας ἐξ ὑμῶν μαρτυρουμένους ἑπτὰ, πλήρεις, κ. τ. λ. οὓς καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης.
4. Καὶ ἔστησαν δύο.	4. Καὶ ἐξελέξαντο—οὓς ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων.
5. Προσευξάμενοι.	5. Προσευξάμενοι.
6. Ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτοῖς κ. τ. λ. καὶ συγκατεψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν ἑνδεκα.	6. Ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας.

In the proceedings of the two assemblies the only material difference is in the last point. In Matthias's case no laying on of hands is mentioned, because the Holy Ghost not having then been given, (or we should perhaps rather say, the gift of conferring the Holy Ghost,) this sign, whereby it was afterwards communicated, would have been a mere empty form. What in other ordinations was effected by the laying on of the Apostles' hands, in Matthias's was effected by the descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, with a view to which it is likely that his election was made to take place before that event. Again, in the election of Deacons only a single office was conferred, and that they held from God the Holy Ghost, or his Agents, who as such laid their hands on them. But in the election of Matthias, his first appointment preceded the dispensation of the Spirit. Like the other Apostles, he was ordained a witness by the Lord himself, and his ordination by the Spirit was a subsequent procedure. Thus, St. Paul appears first to have received his Revelation and Apostleship, his appointment *as Witness* from the Lord Jesus Christ at Jerusalem, and then, after a considerable interval, the imposition of hands, as a servant of the Church and a Minister of the Spirit

History.

§ *Effects of Stephen's Martyrdom.*

It was, obviously, an important feature in the Divine scheme, that the Sceptre should depart from Judah soon after the coming of the Messiah. Had the Jews continued to possess the right of inflicting capital punishment, an effectual check must immediately have been given to the progress of the Gospel. Even as it was, the Disciples had to dread every thing which calumny, intrigue, and tumultuary violence, could effect. Imprisonment, stripes, and menaces, had proved of no avail. The populace thirsted for blood, and Stephen was the first victim.

His death was preparatory to the preaching of the Gospel beyond Jerusalem and Judæa. In exact conformity with the words of the Son of God to His Apostles, "Ye shall be my Witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and even unto the ends of the world," His Holy Spirit directed the course of that Light which He was dispensing. To escape further acts of outrage, all the Disciples once more forsook Jerusalem and fled. But the dispersion was not as on the day of the Crucifixion. They were no longer comfortless, no longer dispirited, no longer at a loss what to do, or what to expect. As in the former dispersion, the Apostles, and it may be some few besides, remained in Jerusalem, whilst the Holy Spirit guided the flight of the others through "all Judæa and Samaria." Philip, he whose name appears second in the list of the seven Deacons, no less than Stephen, justified the wisdom of his appointment. Samaria being already prepared for the Gospel, gladly heard the Word from him. Here the far-famed Simon, who was endeavouring, as it would seem, to impose on his countrymen under the pretended character of the Messiah, if not converted, was defeated in his scheme of imposture. Philip, however, could only Preach and Baptize. The privilege of receiving some extraordinary gift of the Spirit, as a pledge to the young and inexperienced Church, that that unseen Spirit had indeed taken up its abode with them and within them, could only be conferred by an Apostle. Philip's Baptism, no doubt, conveyed all the beneficial effects of Christian Baptism; and the Holy Ghost was as really and fully communicated thereby, as if it had been performed by an Apostle. The descent and operation of the Holy Ghost was then, as now, unseen, unfelt,—the object of faith only. But while this doctrine was yet strange and new, some assurance of it was requisite, in order to induce each believer to be satisfied that the Comforter was present *to him*,—that these effects, though impalpable, were real. For the purpose of granting this sign of assurance then to the Samaritan converts, Peter and John were sent to them from Jerusalem. The form, as has been already noticed, consisted in the laying on of hands and in Prayer, and must have corresponded to our present ceremony of Confirmation, which latter, doubtless, arose out of it. As the Apostles were gradually removed from the earth, those on whom their *perpetual* ministry devolved, might have continued this *temporary* custom, from a view of its expediency for other purposes beyond its original and specific one; and thus *Confirmation* may have rightly and reasonably retained a place among the Ceremonies of the Church for ever, although the *sign of Confirmation*, to which it owes its name, has been long withdrawn.

The fact, that the Apostles only could impart the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, may serve to guide us in an inquiry, which has never perhaps been satisfactorily concluded, as to the precise time when those gifts ceased. For, if the above assertion be true, they must of course have ceased with the generation which was contemporary with the last of the Apostles. If St. John, then, continued to the close of life to exercise his Apostolical power of imparting the Holy Ghost, his life being prolonged to the end of the Ist century, *some* workers of Miracles may have been found as late as the middle of the IId century, but we cannot account (on Scriptural grounds) for the existence of any beyond that period.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews. Time at which extraordinary gifts ceased.

That the Holy Ghost may after this have interposed, and empowered its agents to perform Miracles, cannot certainly be denied, any more than we can now pretend to affirm, that the same power will never again be granted. It would seem, too, from the writings of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Cyprian, that they were familiar with the exercise of such a power in the Church. Gregory, Bishop of Neocæsarea, who lived as late as the IIId century, received the title of *Thaumaturgus* from his Miracles or pretended Miracles. And, if we may credit Ruffinus, Theodoret, and Sozomen, there were instances of well attested Miracles later than his. The earliest positive testimony to their cessation, perhaps, is to be found in the writings of Chrysostom, especially in his XXXIId *Homily on St. Matthew*. In this, particularly, he notices and answers an objection urged by the Pagans against the divine authority of the Christian Revelation, *on the ground that no Miracles were performed*.

In *Homily* XLII., also, he suggests the reason why this power should have been withdrawn from the Church. This is a species of evidence which outweighs any more direct assertion to the contrary. When we read accordingly in Augustin, and other writers, that at the very period when Chrysostom was thus writing and preaching, Miracles were commonly wrought at the tombs of the Saints, such testimony only tends to make us look back with suspicion and distrust on the the accounts given of those of an earlier date, and to attribute a similar inaccuracy and rash credulity to Ruffinus, Theodoret, Sozomen, and others, which is proved against Augustin and many of his contemporaries.

Indeed, even during the latter part of the Apostolical Era, instances cannot be supposed to have been common, when we consider the true character and probable intent for which such a power was lodged for a time with the Church, and put to ourselves the questions, Why was such extraordinary assistance granted for a season, and then withdrawn, not at once, but gradually? Why were the Apostles themselves, who certainly possessed the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit in a degree beyond that which they could impart to others, restrained in the exercise of them, so as to employ them, not at their own discretion, but as the Spirit moved them?

Philip's labours in Samaria having been superseded by the arrival of the two Apostles, he was sent by the Holy Spirit to meet the Ethiopian Eunuch in his return from Jerusalem to his home, and to baptize him. Who this person was, and whether he was afterwards employed amongst his own people by the blessed Spirit, and for that purpose converted and baptized thus early by an especial mission, are points left untouched. It may be observed, however, that he was by Religion a Jew, a Proselyte of Righteousness, and not merely a Proselyte

History.

of the Gate, for to this latter description of persons the Church was not yet thrown open. That he was so, appears both from his being found by Philip busied with a passage in the Jewish Scriptures, and also from the very remarkable circumstances which afterwards attended the conversion and Baptism of Cornelius.

§ *Conversion of Saul.*

The Holy Comforter rendered the murder of Stephen subservient in another way to the furtherance of His great work. He who out of the stones of Jerusalem could have raised up children unto Abraham, chose to form the noblest champion of His cause on earth out of its earliest and bitterest persecutor.* The most conspicuous in the scene of lawless violence to which we have been alluding, was Saul of Tarsus. Beyond all the rest he had distinguished himself in searching out, and finding grounds for imprisonment against those Christians who still lurked in Jerusalem. Having exhausted his misguided zeal there, he departed for Damascus with a sort of inquisitorial commission from the High Priest. It was on his journey thither, that his miraculous conversion took place.† Although the details of that signal event must be familiar to all, and although the subject has been often thoroughly and ably discussed, still the following notices may not be unacceptable to many.

Two Revelations given to Saul.

1st. On his Conversion.

The point which is perhaps the most likely to be overlooked, is, that this first Revelation was totally distinct in its object from that which Saul afterwards received at Jerusalem.‡ All intended by the first was, to convert him to Christianity; by the second he was appointed an Apostle. That he immediately began to propagate the Faith which he once destroyed, is no proof to the contrary. For this was the privilege, if not the duty, of all Christians, as it had been before supposed to be of all Jews. Besides, although not yet appointed a *Witness*, he was at his Baptism "filled with the Holy Ghost," and thereby ordained a Minister of the Spirit. Certain it is, that although after his conversion he began forthwith to preach, and preached first at Damascus, then, perhaps, in Arabia,* and then again at Damascus, even so as to endanger his life; yet on his going ultimately to Jerusalem, he needed the introduction and assurance of Barnabas, to remove from the Apostles their suspicion of him. Possessing as they did the gift of discerning Spirits, this could hardly have happened if St. Paul were then an Apostle.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews.

This will be more apparent from a slight consideration of the narrative of his conversion. He was struck blind by the glorious Light which shone round about him, and he heard and answered a Divine voice, but it does not appear that he then *saw the Lord*. The contrary indeed is implied. Now his appointment to the Apostleship is described by him, as taking place in a visible interview with the Lord, with God manifest in the flesh, in the person of Jesus Christ. Again, Ananias was sent to him, for what purpose? Not, surely, to appoint him an Apostle: Ananias was not himself an Apostle, and could not therefore, as we suppose, confer *any extraordinary* gifts of the Spirit, much less the greatest of those gifts. He was sent to restore his sight, and to Baptize him. This is, clearly, all that Ananias was commissioned to do, and all he is represented as doing. He laid his hands on Saul, and Saul recovered his sight. He Baptized him, and the Holy Ghost descended on him. That the descent was marked by the peculiar symbol of the Comforter, and consequently conferred on him gifts of the highest order, has been before pointed out, as an inference fairly to be drawn from the sacred records of his Ministry. Ananias's declaration alone may be taken as strong presumption of the fact. "The Lord hath sent me that thou mayst receive thy sight," and "*be filled with the Holy Ghost.*" It is in itself, we say, a strong presumption of the fact, because (independently of the consideration that he did possess extraordinary gifts) the latter expression does not ever seem to have been extended to a communication of the Spirit by the imposition of hands. St. Luke, to whose writings it is peculiar, uses it from the first only on those occasions when the *immediate agency* of God is his subject, *e. g.* the appointment of John the Baptist, and the Baptism and manifestation of Christ. Observing this same phrase in his account also of the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, his sparing use of it subsequently, and the very remarkable occasions on which it does occur, the conclusion is inevitable.

2d. On his appointment as Apostle.

* He states, in his Epistle to the *Galatians*, that "God separated him from his mother's womb, and called him by His grace;" on which, and other the like expressions, has been founded the doctrine that the salvation of every individual is a matter of arbitrary election. But to what was St. Paul "separated" and "called?" Clearly not to eternal life, but to a particular station of duty, which he filled with the most anxious sense of *extraordinary* responsibility, lest, as he tells us, "when he had preached to others, he should himself be a cast away."

† A. D. 35.

‡ A. D. 44, or according to some 38. See the reasons for assigning the former date in note, page 729.

* Although from the narrative of the *Acts* taken alone, it would appear that he went immediately from Damascus to Jerusalem, yet by comparing the passage with his own account in the *Galatians*, it is certain that he went first into Arabia, returned to Damascus, then, after an interval of three years, proceeded to Jerusalem. See *Acts*, ch. ix. compared with *Galatians*, ch. i.

History.

the Devout Gentiles were called, as He had before given to the unbelieving Jews, in favour of their converted brethren. "And accordingly those believers of the Circumcision who had come with Peter, were amazed at the gifts of the Holy Ghost having been poured out even on the Gentiles; for they heard them "speaking in divers tongues and magnifying God." Lastly, St. Peter's words are decisive of the fact, that the mode of the Spirit's descent was the same as on the day of Pentecost, "The Holy Ghost," said he, "fell on them as on us at the beginning," putting no difference between them and us.*

It was further observed as a solitary instance on record, that the Holy Ghost descended on the candidates for Baptism before the ceremony was performed. This strongly confirms the view already taken of the extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit. They were for *confirmation* of its *real* but *unseen* and *perpetual* descent, and residence in the heart of every member of the Church in every Age. They were the appropriate *Miracles* of God manifested by the Spirit; as healing the sick, cleansing the lepers, walking on the sea, raising the dead, and the like, were the miraculous evidence of God manifested in the flesh. And accordingly, when the Apostles healed the sick and raised the dead, they did it by virtue of their appointment by Christ as His Witnesses; but when they exercised the gifts of "tongues," of "Wisdom," &c., or imparted any divine powers to others, they did so by virtue of their appointment by the Spirit. Thus, the one class of Miraculous evidence corresponds to the other. Nor is this correspondence diminished by the circumstance, that these gifts were also the means whereby the Holy Spirit taught and spread Christianity, but rather increased thereby; for a like purpose did even the testimonial Miracles wrought by our Saviour serve, as has been already, we trust, sufficiently proved and illustrated.

§ *Foundation of the Church of Antioch.*

This second period of the Holy Spirit's dispensation does not require that we should pause long on any of the transactions which it embraces. Whilst the conversion of Cornelius was taking place, and indeed after Peter had made the Church acquainted with the new enactment of the Spirit respecting the Devout Gentiles, those Christians who were scattered abroad still continued to call and to Baptize only Jews. At length, certain converts of Cyprus and Cyrene having, doubtless, heard of Peter's revelation boldly followed his example, and obeyed the command of their divine Guide, in attempting the conversion of the Gentiles also. Going to Antioch of Syria, they there commenced their labours; "and the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great multitude believed and turned unto the Lord." On tidings of this being brought to the Church at Jerusalem, they took the matter into their own hands, and gave directions for the formation of the first Gentile Church. The commission was intrusted to Barnabas, although, from the sacred narrative, it does not appear under what precise character he went. Little more is specified, than that he exhorted them to perseverance on his arrival, and, (as a reason probably for his appointment,) that he was a good man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." This description

First Gentile Church founded by Barnabas.

A. D. 40.

might merely imply, that being more highly and fully endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost, than the above mentioned Cyprian and Cyrenian preachers, he was better fitted for the work of conversion. But when we also read that the hand of the Lord was already with these, and that the work prospered greatly under their management, this could hardly be the reason. What seems more likely is, that they had no Presbyter among them, and that therefore their Church establishment was incomplete without one. Barnabas then might have been sent to them in that capacity. Beyond this, we would submit to consideration this question, whether there be not some ground to suppose that he went in the character of an Apostle? in which case this higher office might supersede, and for a time render unnecessary, the inferior one of Presbyter. What gives some show of plausibility to this, is that we know Barnabas had the title of Apostle. If appointed as such, and in the same manner as the others, that appointment, as was before suggested, must have taken place at a period preceding this. Now we know that when Samaria was first converted, although he who instructed and Baptized there was no less a person than Philip the Deacon, yet the Church of Jerusalem sent thither two Apostles. The reason for sending these has been explained. It was because none but Apostles could confer the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and these gifts or some of them were probably granted to all members of the infant Church. The instance of St. Paul regretting that he had not been able to visit the Roman converts for this purpose, was noticed in illustration of the truth of this statement. On so important a conversion then, as this at Antioch, we are naturally led to expect the same procedure on the part of the Church of Jerusalem, as was observed in the conversion of Samaria. Finding it recorded that, as on that occasion an official embassy was appointed to Antioch, we naturally expect that he whom they sent (ἀπέστειλαν) should be an Apostle, and that he should be sent for a similar purpose as Peter had been to Samaria. In Barnabas accordingly we find much which renders it by no means improbable that he was one, especially if viewed in connection with the presumption arising out of that embassy. To all that has been already suggested, in accordance with this view, it may be added, that, for no reason assigned, Barnabas's name always precedes Paul's, although the latter was equally proved to be full of the Holy Ghost," until by inflicting blindness on the sorcerer Elymas he displayed his evidence, that he was not only a Minister of the Spirit, but one bearing a commission also from the Lord Jesus,—in short, an Apostle. Does not this then seem to intimate, that up to that period Barnabas was treated as Paul's superior? Afterwards, we may observe, the order is not reversed, but sometimes the one name, sometimes the other, takes precedence. Doubtless, Paul's is thenceforward more frequently placed first; but this, if it affect the argument at all, only renders the circumstance noticed more remarkable.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to Jews and Devout Gentiles.

Probably as an Apostle.

Supposing Barnabas to have been an Apostle, a reason obviously suggests itself, why in preference to the others he should be chosen for this mission. "A Levite of the island of Cyprus," is the character under which he is first introduced to our notice. Belonging then to the numerous settlement of Jews in that island, he was naturally fixed as the most proper to Apostolize converts who had received their first instruction and

* *Acts*, ch. xi. v. 15

History.

with the heavenly vision, as to entertain no momentary doubt as to its reality, however much the import of its message should astonish and confound him. "Rise and go with them, *nothing doubting*," because *I* have sent thee, *I* the voice with which thou art familiar. It might have been requisite for the better assurance of the Church, that the Apostle had not been deluded, that they should be accustomed to regard him as the chief agent of the Spirit, and the great worker of Miracles. With their strong disposition to revolt against the unexpected turn which the New Dispensation was taking, it might have been necessary that he who was the agent in so unpopular a work, should, by this course of eminent Ministry, and especially by acting as the mainspring in the regulation of such affairs, as were left to their uninspired decision, acquire an authority and weight of official character, which might of itself repress or soften down the spirit of murmuring. That all this might have been requisite, the event proves. For although it was Peter who converted the first Gentile convert; although he pleaded in his defence an express Revelation; although that Revelation had received a counterpart in a vision to the Devout Gentile, who was to be the first fruits of his Order; although the Holy Spirit had, as it were, reproved his backwardness, by descending before Baptism on the destined converts: still, on this subject, there long lurked in the bosoms of the elder members of the Church a stubborn and implacable feeling. This ill suppressed jealousy at length showed itself in the disputes at Syrian Antioch, concerning the conformity of these converts to the Jewish Law, and subsequently so far prevailed over the firmness of their own Apostle, as to subject him to the well known rebuke of St. Paul.

Some few circumstances attending this opening of the Gospel commission to the Devout Gentiles, will be now considered. At the same time, in confirmation of the remarks which have just been made on the preparatory discipline of Peter for this work, it may be observed, that with the conversion of Cornelius, all that exclusive or peculiar regard to him in the narrative of the *Acts* ceases.* Henceforward he is not represented as forming a more prominent feature in the scene than others. The object of his having been made to do so was accomplished, and with the same view the remainder, and by far the greater portion of the *Acts* is occupied with St. Paul. In his Ministry was henceforth developed the Mystery of Godliness, to trace the progressive stages of which is the main object of St. Luke's history. Merely judging from the result of their collective Ministry, we know that the other Apostles and Ministers of the Spirit must have been actively engaged, each in his own course of duty; but St. Paul's line was the main road in the course of Christianity, into which St. Peter's gradually widened, and to which therefore the brief Historian of the Holy Spirit's progressive dispensation naturally and judiciously confined the residue of his narrative.

It afterwards ceases.

And is attributed to St. Paul.

Revelation, of the admission of the Devout Gentiles to St. Peter.

It was asserted that St. Peter, at the time he was sent to the Devout Gentiles, had no more intimation than the great body of the Church, that the Gospel was ever to be preached to the Idolatrous Gentiles also. It may be observed, that Cornelius is particularly described as a Devout Gentile, "who feared God with all his house." The representation under which he was announced to Peter, is that of "a righteous man, and one who feared God, and could appeal for his character to the whole nation of the Jews," (*μαρτυρούμενόν ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων.*) Peter, knowing all this, and having communicated personally with the good Centurion, yet prefaces his address to those assembled in his house by saying, "that he had hitherto considered such as him shut out from communion with God's people, but that God having declared* the contrary, by telling him to call no man common or unclean, he had come to them without scruple. This shows that he understood his Revelation as intended only to remove the barrier between the Jew and the Proselyte of the Gate, or mere believer in Jehovah. That he certainly considered the extension as proceeding no further, may be made more clear from the words which he exultingly uttered on the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Cornelius and his household—words spoken in the rapture of the moment, and therefore the more likely to convey the liveliest impression which his mind had conceived of the liberality and unreservedness of the Spirit's dispensation. "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation *he who fears God and works righteousness, is accepted by Him.*" This unquestionably limits his view to those of the Gentiles who had already renounced Idolatry—in short, the Devout Gentiles. It explains, also, in what sense he had understood the divine communication made to him, that "what God *had cleansed*, it was not for him to call unclean;" namely, "that in every nation he who already feared God, and worked righteousness, and he only, had been cleansed and accepted by God. With the same sentiment, the Church of Jerusalem received his statement of what had taken place, "glorifying God and saying, Why then God hath given *even to the Gentiles* repentance unto life." In this sense, then, it will be necessary to consider the admission of the Gentiles to be spoken of, until the period when it shall appear that the Church became acquainted with the design of the Holy Spirit to offer Baptism to the Idolatrous Gentiles also.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to Jews and Devout Gentiles.

Another assertion was, that on this occasion, as on one of the greatest moment, the Holy Ghost manifested his descent by the same visible signs as on the day of Pentecost. To this conclusion we are led by remarking, first, in the narrative of the event, "that the Holy Ghost *fell on them*," and was "poured out on them;" expressions which could only properly apply to the above mentioned extraordinary descent of the Holy Ghost. Again, as on the day of Pentecost, it was followed by an involuntary display of the gift of tongues, that gift which was especially denoted by the visible symbol of "tongues of fire." By this, no doubt, God gave now the same proof to the Jewish Christians, that

Visible Descent of the Holy Ghost.

* His imprisonment is indeed subsequently recorded in full detail, but only, it would seem, in order the more fully to illustrate the effect of his new commission on all parties. Herod imprisoned him, and designed to take away his life, because he saw that it was *pleasing to the Jews.*

* Ἐλυξε. Is there not some probability that Cornelius, and the Centurion whose sick servant Jesus healed, were one and the same? Several points in the brief description of the latter coincide very closely with Cornelius's character and circumstances; *e. g.* that he was anxiously careful of his household, and was held in very high estimation by the Jews. Otherwise, too, it seems strange, that nothing further should have been noticed of one so promising, as to receive the Saviour's praise, "I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel."

History.

the Devout Gentiles were called, as He had before given to the unbelieving Jews, in favour of their converted brethren. "And accordingly those believers of the Circumcision who had come with Peter, were amazed at the gifts of the Holy Ghost having been poured out even on the Gentiles; for they heard them "speaking in divers tongues and magnifying God." Lastly, St. Peter's words are decisive of the fact, that the mode of the Spirit's descent was the same as on the day of Pentecost, "The Holy Ghost," said he, "fell on them as on us at the beginning," putting no difference between them and us.*

It was further observed as a solitary instance on record, that the Holy Ghost descended on the candidates for Baptism before the ceremony was performed. This strongly confirms the view already taken of the extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit. They were for *confirmation* of its *real* but *unseen* and *perpetual* descent, and residence in the heart of every member of the Church in every Age. They were the appropriate *Miracles* of God manifested by the Spirit; as healing the sick, cleansing the lepers, walking on the sea, raising the dead, and the like, were the miraculous evidence of God manifested in the flesh. And accordingly, when the Apostles healed the sick and raised the dead, they did it by virtue of their appointment by Christ as His Witnesses; butwhen they exercised the gifts of "tongues," of "Wisdom," &c., or imparted any divine powers to others, they did so by virtue of their appointment by the Spirit. Thus, the one class of Miraculous evidence corresponds to the other. Nor is this correspondence diminished by the circumstance, that these gifts were also the means whereby the Holy Spirit taught and spread Christianity, but rather increased thereby; for a like purpose did even the testimonial Miracles wrought by our Saviour serve, as has been already, we trust, sufficiently proved and illustrated.

§ *Foundation of the Church of Antioch.*

This second period of the Holy Spirit's dispensation does not require that we should pause long on any of the transactions which it embraces. Whilst the conversion of Cornelius was taking place, and indeed after Peter had made the Church acquainted with the new enactment of the Spirit respecting the Devout Gentiles, those Christians who were scattered abroad still continued to call and to Baptize only Jews. At length, certain converts of Cyprus and Cyrene having, doubtless, heard of Peter's revelation boldly followed his example, and obeyed the command of their divine Guide, in attempting the conversion of the Gentiles also. Going to Antioch of Syria, they there commenced their labours; "and the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great multitude believed and turned unto the Lord." On tidings of this being brought to the Church at Jerusalem, they took the matter into their own hands, and gave directions for the formation of the first Gentile Church. The commission was intrusted to Barnabas, although, from the sacred narrative, it does not appear under what precise character he went. Little more is specified, than that he exhorted them to perseverance on his arrival, and, (as a reason probably for his appointment,) that he was a good man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." This description

First Gentile Church founded by Barnabas.

A. D. 40.

* *Acts*, ch. xi. v. 15

Apostolic Age. Preaching to Jews and Devout Gentiles.

might merely imply, that being more highly and fully endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost, than the above mentioned Cyprian and Cyrenian preachers, he was better fitted for the work of conversion. But when we also read that the hand of the Lord was already with these, and that the work prospered greatly under their management, this could hardly be the reason. What seems more likely is, that they had no Presbyter among them, and that therefore their Church establishment was incomplete without one. Barnabas then might have been sent to them in that capacity. Beyond this, we would submit to consideration this question, whether there be not some ground to suppose that he went in the character of an Apostle? in which case this higher office might supersede, and for a time render unnecessary, the inferior one of Presbyter. What gives some show of plausibility to this, is that we know Barnabas had the title of Apostle. If appointed as such, and in the same manner as the others, that appointment, as was before suggested, must have taken place at a period preceding this. Now we know that when Samaria was first converted, although he who instructed and Baptized there was no less a person than Philip the Deacon, yet the Church of Jerusalem sent thither two Apostles. The reason for sending these has been explained. It was because none but Apostles could confer the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and these gifts or some of them were probably granted to all members of the infant Church. The instance of St. Paul regretting that he had not been able to visit the Roman converts for this purpose, was noticed in illustration of the truth of this statement. On so important a conversion then, as this at Antioch, we are naturally led to expect the same procedure on the part of the Church of Jerusalem, as was observed in the conversion of Samaria. Finding it recorded that, as on that occasion an official embassy was appointed to Antioch, we naturally expect that he whom they sent (ἀπέστειλαν) should be an Apostle, and that he should be sent for a similar purpose as Peter had been to Samaria. In Barnabas accordingly we find much which renders it by no means improbable that he was one, especially if viewed in connection with the presumption arising out of that embassy. To all that has been already suggested, in accordance with this view, it may be added, that, for no reason assigned, Barnabas's name always precedes Paul's, although the latter was equally proved to be full of the Holy Ghost," until by inflicting blindness on the sorcerer Elymas he displayed his evidence, that he was not only a Minister of the Spirit but one bearing a commission also from the Lord Jesus,—in short, an Apostle. Does not this then seem to intimate, that up to that period Barnabas was treated as Paul's superior? Afterwards, we may observe, the order is not reversed, but sometimes the one name, sometimes the other, takes precedence. Doubtless, Paul's is thenceforward more frequently placed first; but this, if it affect the argument at all, only renders the circumstance noticed more remarkable.

Probably as an Apostle.

Supposing Barnabas to have been an Apostle, a reason obviously suggests itself, why in preference to the others he should be chosen for this mission. "A Levite of the island of Cyprus," is the character under which he is first introduced to our notice. Belonging then to the numerous settlement of Jews in that island, he was naturally fixed as the most proper to Apostolize converts who had received their first instruction and

History. Baptism from his fellow-countrymen, perhaps from his friends or acquaintance.*

§ *St. Paul's Revelation and Appointment.*

Apostolic Age. Preaching to Jews and Devout Gentiles.

To the establishment of the Church of Antioch, the first Society which admitted the Gentiles, as brethren and members of one *Christian* body, we may reasonably attribute the second burst of malignant feeling in the Jewish unbelievers towards their believing brethren. A. D. 42. At their instance, Herod put to death James the brother of John; and his imprisonment of Peter, with the intent to execute him also, is said to have been done, because he observed that it was pleasing to the Jews. Peter, indeed, would at this time be naturally the chief object of their vengeance, and could have escaped from the fate which they had prepared for him, only by the interposition of God's Angel. On his deliverance from prison he left Jerusalem, as it is probable all the other Apostles had already done. St. Paul, at least, when he undertakes to show the impossibitity of his having received his instruction from the other Apostles, instead of what he asserted to be the case, from Christ Himself, and for this purpose enumerates his several visits † to Jerusalem, makes no mention of this, which the course of argument required, had there been at that time any one Apostle at Jerusalem.*

Trifling as the circumstance is, it becomes important when connected with the evidence of Paul's immediate and Apostolic Revelation. How it happened that he should go to Jerusalem at that particular juncture will be readily recollected. Soon after Barnabas had been sent to preside over the Church of Antioch, he went to Tarsus, and brought back with him Saul as his coadjutor. Tradition reports, that they were educated together under Gamaliel, which, if true, accounts for the friendly office which he had previously performed in introducing him to Peter and James;† as well as for his now choosing him to be his associate. At the very commencement of their joint labours, the disturbances to which we have been adverting occurred at Jerusalem. Among those who, together with the Apostles, withdrew from the scene of danger, were very probably the Prophets, who then made their appearance at Antioch, and gave notice of a famine which was to take place throughout Judæa. It was for the purpose of conveying to Jerusalem a contribution, which was in consequence raised and sent as a provision against the season of distress, that Barnabas and his companion went thither. They went accordingly, not commissioned to the Apostles—nor to the Apostles and brethren—but only to the Presbyters. The Apostles were absent, and the Presbyters, or those who represented the Disciples at large, were all who composed the assembly.

Revelation to St. Paul.

During this visit, then, of Saul to Jerusalem, he received that Revelation which was hitherto wanting to complete in him the character of an Apostle.‡ Falling into a trance in the Temple, he was permitted, like the other Apostles, to be an "Eye-witness of the Resurrection," to see his Lord and his God manifested in the flesh; and, like the rest, to receive from Jesus Himself the appointment of Witness, and the powers attached to it.§ All that portion of the Apostolical character,

---

* In this view of the Church of Antioch, the reader of the New Testament in the original Greek will perceive, that of the two rival readings given to v. 20, ch. xi. of the *Acts*, Ἕλληνις has been adopted in preference to Ἑλληνιστάς. Waving so much of the question, as depends on the balance of authority between the manuscripts, the circumstances of the record, and the context itself plainly determines the former to be genuine. For the opposition expressed by the particles μεν and δε indicate that the Cyprians and Cyrenians were not doing what the dispersed were doing, namely, preaching to the Jews alone; but that they, on the contrary, were preaching, to whom? Not τους Ἑλληνιστάς, for they *were Jews*, and to them by the dispersed the Gospel had been preached as in the case of Philip, but πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας—to the Gentiles, namely, the Devout Gentiles.

Among the circumstances which confirm this, it would be wrong to pass over the notice, that at Antioch the disciples were first called Christians. Why such a record should be left by the inspired Historian, why it should appear just there, and it should have been wanted and coined just then, are questions which will be naturally answered by reference to the event which had lately and only now taken place. The word Christian is obviously Latin, and the Roman language was now so widely spread, that whether the Gentile converts were natives of Rome or not, the invention of the term by them is likely. Its use by the Jewish Christians too would be natural. Before any Gentile Christians had been made, the "believers" were only a sect of the Jews. But when these Gentiles were added, the strange admixture seemed to call for some associating name, to denote that these last were, in common with the others, members of the believing body—some term was now requisite to class together the converted Jews with the converted Gentiles. The word Christian was expressive of the doctrine, that "there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him."

† St. Paul, after his conversion, appears to have visited Jerusalem five, or perhaps six times.

I. After his return from Arabia to Damascus, at which time he was introduced to Peter and James by Barnabas. See *Acts*, ch. ix. v. 27, 28, and *Galat.* ch. i.

II. When he and Barnabas were sent from Antioch with the contribution. No Apostle was then at Jerusalem, but the management of affairs was left to the Elders. It was during this visit that he probably received his Revelation in the Temple, as mentioned in 2 *Corinth.* ch. xii. This visit is omitted in his Epistle to the *Galatians*. See *Acts*, ch. xi. v. 30.

III. On his return from his first Apostolical Journey, when he went with Barnabas to consult the Church of Jerusalem, concerning the obligation of the Mosaic Law on the Gentile Christians. It was during this visit that he communicated "his Gospel" privately to Peter, and James, and John. See *Acts*, ch. xv. and *Galat.* ch. ii.

IV. When, in fulfilment of a Vow made at Cenchreæ, he went from Ephesus, and returned after a very short stay. *Acts*, ch. xviii. v. 22.

V. This was at the close of his third Apostolical Journey, when he went up to keep the feast of Pentecost, and to declare *openly to all the Church* "his Gospel," or his mission to the Idolatrous Gentiles.

VI. Another visit he perhaps paid at the end of his fourth Journey, after his first Imprisonment at Rome. At least, from the concluding verses of his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, he appears when he wrote it to have been on the point of doing so.

* See the first and second Chapters of his Epistle to the *Galatians*. His statement there is, that he could have had *no opportunity* of being instructed by the Apostles, because on his first visit to Jerusalem he only saw two of them, and that for fifteen days, and no more; and, when again he was fourteen years afterwards in their company, he was employed, not in *receiving*, but *communicating* his revelation to them. The account in the *Acts* agrees with this, but then, between these two visits, occurs the one in question; and, if he had found any Apostles at Jerusalem, his argument was of course open to the objection—How do we know that the borrowed information may not then have been received?

† Only to these, by his own account, (see *Galat.* ch. i.;) and, accordingly, he asserts that after that first visit he was still unknown by face to the Churches of Judæa.

‡ Ἰδὼν τὸν λέγοντα, καὶ ἀκούσας φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. Ὅτι—Ἔσῃ μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ὧν ἑώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας.

§ The period when this took place is not distinctly marked in the New Testament; and it is generally referred to the first visit to Jerusalem. But direct testimony being wanting, it is surely more natural to assign it to the visit which immediately preceded his formal appointment by the Church at Antioch, and his entrance on the course of duty, with a view to which the Revelation was made. This, too, is more agreeable to the train of argument which he adopts in his Epistle to the *Galatians*, and to which allusion has already been made. If he professed to have received his Gospel during the fifteen days of his first visit to Jerusalem, it might have been supposable, at least by his objectors, that it came from Peter and John, and not, as

History.

which it was the office of the Holy Ghost to confer, had been previously bestowed on him. He had now all the endowments of an Apostle, and, thus qualified, he returned with Barnabas to Antioch, ready to enter upon the work with which the third Period of the Holy Spirit's dispensation commences. John (better known by the name of Mark,) accompanied them.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to Jews and Devout Gentiles.

---

he asserts, from Jesus Christ; but, in the absence of all the Apostles from the scene, even this slight ground for suspicion was removed.

It is somewhat surprising, by the way, that any doubt on the subject of Paul's Apostleship should have existed, considering that an Apostle was known by so unequivocal a mark as the possession of *superior miraculous power*. On this, accordingly, he ultimately rests his claims, and prevails over the jealous attempts of his rivals and enemies.—Surprising, we say, but it is, after all, quite consistent with the waywardness of man's heart.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

APOSTOLIC AGE.—PREACHING TO JEWS, DEVOUT GENTILES, AND IDOLATERS.

MINISTRY OF ST. PAUL, FROM A. D. 45 to 67.

I. APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY, A. D. 45 to 52.

ROUTE.

Antioch in Syria; Seleucia; Salamis; Paphos; Perga in Pamphylia; Antioch in Pisidia; Iconium; Lystra; Derbe; Lystra again; Iconium again; Pisidia again; Perga again; Attalia; Antioch in Syria, (second time;) Phœnicia; Samaria; Jerusalem; Antioch in Syria, (third time.)

II. APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY, A. D. 53 to 56.

ROUTE.

Rest of Syria; Cilicia; Derbe; Lystra; Iconium; Phrygia; Galatia; Troas; Samothracia; Neapolis; Philippi; Amphipolis; Apollonia; Thessalonica; Berœa; Athens; Corinth; Cenchræa; Ephesus; Cæsarea; Jerusalem; Antioch in Syria.

III. APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY, A. D. 55 to 60.

ROUTE.

Galatia; Phrygia; Ephesus; Asia; Ephesus, (second time;) Troas; Macedonia; Greece; Corinth; Macedonia, (second time;) Philippi; Troas, (second time;) Assos; Mitylene; Chios; Samos; Trogyllium; Miletus, (in Asia;) Coos; Rhodes; Patara, (in Lycia;) Tyre; Ptolemais; Cæsarea; Jerusalem.

IV. APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY, A. D. 63 to 66.

ROUTE.

Antipatris; Cæsarea; Sidon; Myra; Fair Havens; Melita; Syracuse; Rhegium; Puteoli; Appii Forum; Three Taverns; Rome; Italy; Spain; Crete; Jerusalem; Antioch in Syria.

V. APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY, A. D. 66 to 67.

ROUTE.

Colosse; Philippi; Nicopolis in Epirus; Corinth; Troas; Miletum in Crete; Rome

History.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

THE return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch was followed by their formal mission to the Idolatrous Gentiles. And here we cannot but observe how carefully the Holy Spirit has declared, in its dealings with the early Church, that from the first its operations, as guide and governor, were twofold; that it exercised an occasional and extraordinary authority, by means of visions, and sundry forms of Revelation, inspiration, and endowment; and also a permanent authority, unaccompanied by extraordinary signs, by means of the Church as a body, which Church was and is its Temple. Thus the intercourse of the Holy Spirit with Christians, as a Society, was not unlike its intercourse with them as individuals. Of the Church it required certain established forms, the laying on of hands, prayer, and fasting, and to these attached its ordinary operations. These were indispensable to its authority, and of perpetual obligation, whatever further extraordinary acts were manifested. Notwithstanding that Barnabas and Saul had been appointed to the conversion of the Gentiles by an especial communication of the Holy Ghost, it was necessary, we find, that some further grace should be imparted, some further sanction given to them, which could only be conveyed, according to the system of the Spirit's Dispensation, through certain forms and ceremonies of the Church. Without these forms the Church had no power to confer, and the individuals were incapable of receiving, a portion of the Spiritual endowment.

Separation of Barnabas and Saul for their offices by the Spirit

The mode in which grace was conferred on individuals, was analogous to that in which authority was given to the Church. It mattered not, what extraordinary gifts were bestowed; as *Christians*, as *Redeemed*, they were obliged to be formally Baptized. The extra-

History.

ordinary gifts of the Spirit descended on them as *agents* and *instruments*, employed for the *general welfare;* the ordinary gifts, as objects of Regeneration and Redemption, and for their *individual* welfare. Many individuals are conspicuous in both kinds of endowment, and so it was with the Church itself. There was an ordinary grace or authority in it, which it exercised by means of stated forms, and independently of all extraordinary manifestations. And ever as occasion required, that same divine Person, who dwelt in it, and from whom the authority proceeded, gave some extraordinary display of his government. In both cases, what was occasional has passed away, what was regular and continual still remains.

We are aware that these assertions are liable to two questions, and that he who makes them, must be prepared to answer both.

The first is, How do we know, that there was in the early Church a secret and regular operation of the Holy Ghost exercised in these outward forms?

Secondly, How do we know, that it did not cease with the extraordinary operation?

The Holy Ghost conveyed under particular forms.

The case now offering itself for consideration, namely, the appointment of Barnabas and Saul, is one of several which furnish to every candid mind a sufficient reply to the first question. The bare circumstance, that the forms of fasting, laying on of hands, and prayer, were observed even with persons "full of the Holy Ghost" and already called to be Apostles of the Lord, is a strong ground of presumption that such was the case. But the terms of the narrative render it yet stronger, "Then having fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, dismissed them; *They then, having been sent forth by the Holy Spirit,*" &c. In the original, the connection between the two sentences is perhaps more forcibly marked by οὖν, than by the English illative conjunction "then." Without reference, however, to Grammatical nicety, no one can read the sentences, and attend to the train of thought running through them, and through the whole passage to which they belong, without acknowledging that their being sent forth by the Holy Ghost referred to the ceremony of prayer, &c. Nor does it affect the argument, that the Holy Ghost had specially directed the Church to ordain these men. For, that this was only a revelation of God's will and special interference, and not an investiture of Power delegated to the Church is manifest,—inasmuch as the investiture of Power had already taken place, and the words of the divine message contain a reference to it as already in force, and are, indeed, an acknowledgment and proof that it was so. "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I *have* called them."

The next question was, Supposing this ordinary and indispensable operation of the Spirit to have been exercised in the Primitive Church, how do we certainly know that it did not cease with that which was extraordinary? If the latter was given as a sign of the reality of the former, the sign being removed, what proof have we now that the thing attested exists?

And still continues to be so conveyed.

To this also there is an adequate reply; and it depends on the truth of this proposition, "If we are assured that God has appointed any outward forms as the means of divine grace, divine authority, &c., we are bound to believe that they will continue effectual, until God has annulled the appointment." If instead of the ceremony of Baptism, *e. g.* it had pleased Him to appoint a pool like that of Bethesda, which at certain seasons should be troubled by His Angel, and that all who had diseases should go to that pool on these occasions to bathe for their recovery, we should be bound to rely on the efficacy of the pool, until God should made known that His decree had been annulled. In the case of the pool, this would require no *positive* sign; because the *effects being sensible*, when the water ceased to heal, its failure would be of itself proof that God had ceased to impart a virtue to it. On the same principle, no formal, no positive sign or revelation was necessary to inform the Church, that the extraordinary operation of the Spirit and the power of working Miracles were withdrawn. Their failure was itself the sign that God had annulled the temporary grant. But as the ordinary operations of the Spirit were always unseen and unfelt, the only indication of their failure and cessation would be a *positive revelation.* Until such is given, we are obliged to believe in them as a duty, and have as much reason to do so, as to suppose that tomorrow the Sun will be the means of conveying light and warmth.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

We may perhaps have somewhat digressed in anticipating a question which belongs properly to a later period of the History of Christianity; but the importance must plead its excuse for so early an introduction. To discuss it, after all, as fully as it deserves, will be hardly compatible with our plan in any portion of the work on which we are engaged. To return, then, to Barnabas, Saul, and their assistant Mark, whom we left preparing for their journey.

Route of Barnabas and Paul.

Their course was through Cyprus first, (probably on account of the connection of Barnabas with that island,) thence across to the continent, and through the countries of Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia. As they were about to leave Cyprus, Mark must have become more alive to the risk of the enterprise; for, although thus far their reception had been gracious, he forsook the Apostles and returned. His place seems to have been supplied by Titus, although it is not expressly so stated. Adverting to what has been already observed of the office of Deacons, it is not unlikely that Mark had accompanied the Apostles in that capacity, and that on his refusal to proceed, some one would be wanted to act as Deacon in the performance of the Christian Church service, wherever there might be an opportunity. That Titus was accordingly sent for—possibly from Antioch—is inferred from his being found in their company at the end of the journey.

Mark quits them.

Their method of preaching.

The mode in which the mission was conducted was, as the reader may recollect, to preach first to the Jews and Proselyted Gentiles, and then to the Idolaters. Notwithstanding this marked precedence and preference, all their persecutions arose from the former. From the Gentiles (when the Jews did not prepossess their minds against them) all they had to fear as yet, was a misapprehension of their object,—lest their Miracles might make them appear to the multitude as "Gods come down to them in the shape of men."

Another point to be observed in their proceedings is, that they ordained Presbyters in every Church on their return. So brief a Ministry could hardly have qualified any of the new converts for the office, unless some Miraculous interposition of the Spirit had taken place, such as was supposed to have occurred at Antioch in Pisidia—the first scene of Idolatrous conversion.

History.

A. D. 52.

§ *Decree of the Council of Jerusalem.*

Before St. Paul renewed his labours among the Idolatrous Gentiles, he was commissioned by the Church of Syrian Antioch to proceed with Barnabas to Jerusalem, for the purpose of taking the sense of the Church there respecting a question which was now warmly canvassed at Antioch. Peter's mission, as was observed, received indeed the sanction of the Judaizing Christians; but their old prejudices were still so strong, as to make them expect that these new associates, to whom the Apostles had opened the gate of Christianity, should first pass through that of Judaism. They accordingly insisted on the Gentile converts at Antioch being circumcised, and made to conform to all the Jewish Law. Jerusalem being still the residence of the Apostles, and therefore the chief seat of Church authority, to Jerusalem was the decision of the question referred.

That the Decree of the Christian body there only related to the Devout Gentile Christians is certain, because none but these had as yet been admitted into the Church of Antioch. What confirms this is, that the Decree was obviously framed with reference to their condition as such.

Debate in the assembly.

St. Peter spoke first in the assembly which had been called for discussing the question, and declared his opinion to be, that on the Gentile party the Church ought not to impose a burthen of ceremonies which neither the Jewish party nor their fathers could bear. St. James supported him in his view of the question, and proposed the words of the Decree, in a manner which shows that he fully coincided with St. Peter, and did not think that he was placing any yoke on the neck of the Gentile converts which they had not borne before their conversion. "Wherefore my opinion is not to introduce any thing which may disturb and confound those Gentiles who turned to God;* but to command them to abstain from meats offered to Idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood,"—that is, to command them to observe just so much and no more of the Jewish Law as they had observed before Christianity was preached to them. To this they would hardly object, (as the Apostle probably means to say,) because in every part of the world the Devout Gentiles readily consented to keep these few observances of the Jewish Law, however unwilling to burthen themselves further, and to become Proselytes of Righteousness. "For Moses hath of old in every city those who preach him, being read in the Synagogues every Sabbath."

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

When, therefore, Paul is afterwards represented as distributing this sentence or opinion of the Council of Jerusalem to the several Churches through which he passed in his second journey, it cannot be supposed that he intended to recommend it as a rule binding on the Idolatrous converts also. This, indeed, would be wholly irreconcilable with his own repeated declarations to them in his Epistles,* and is not implied by any statement in St. Luke's narrative. It may be even doubted whether St. Paul's preaching to the Idolatrous Gentiles was at that time known generally to the churches of Judæa, or to that particular Council of Jerusalem. It is said, indeed, that the conversion of the Gentiles was proclaimed by Paul and Barnabas as they passed through Phœnicia and Samaria in their journey to Jerusalem, and that they even reported to the Church there, "what things God had done *with them*."† But still the whole account, considered as a whole, looks very much as if they were understood by all—by all, at least, except the Apostles, to speak of the Devout Gentiles. That there was a good reason why St. Paul should not yet venture to give publicity to his mission, nobody will question, who considers the rancorous persecution which assailed him, when the Jewish Christians, (for the first time, as it seems,) became acquainted with it. Possibly for this very reason the appointment took place at Antioch, and not at Jerusalem. His own account of this transaction, too, as related in his Epistle to the *Galatians*, is expressly that he told the secret privately, and only to Peter, James, and John, "lest by any means he should run or had run in vain." The narrative of the last visit which he paid to Jerusalem tends to produce the same impression. He is represented as explaining his Ministry to the Church, in terms which strongly indicate that the whole Church then for the first time understood the nature of it. On this occasion it is particularly recorded, that *all the Presbyters* were present. His Gospel is then more pointedly declared to be one appropriated to him, the details of it are given one by one, (κατ' ἓν ἕκαστον,) and the assembly glorify God as for some new and marvellous act. Then, too, it is for the first time thought necessary to warn him of the danger to which his mission was likely to expose him from the Jewish party; and it is then, indeed, that he first incurs any risk amongst his countrymen at Jerusalem, although the same reason had long been operating to render him an object of deadly hatred to Jews and Judaizing Christians out of Palestine.

Qualifications of this Decree.

And how did the persecution commence? Not with the Jews residing at Jerusalem; but after he had been almost seven days in the Temple, without incurring any suspicion from them, "*the Jews which were of Asia*, (and who doubtless recognised him as the person they had often seen preaching to the Idolaters, and who per-

---

* This is certainly the force of καὶ. The word συνωχλεῖν expresses that confusion of thought which would almost certainly have been produced in the mind of a convert taught Judaism and Christianity together, as two distinct systems. He was in danger of considering them both necessary and both coexistent, rather than successive portions of the same Religion.

Even as it was, such was doubtless the impression made on the minds of many for the 1st century and longer. That Tertullian, *e. g.* considered it in this light is more than probable, from his character of the Cœlicolæ. (See *Dialogue with Trypho.*)

This non-interference with established usages beyond what was absolutely necessary was, it is to be observed, in exact conformity with the method by which the Jewish Religion had been established. The Jews had been allowed to retain many Egyptian rites, as Warburton points out in his IVth Book of the *Divine Legation*; and hence, the error of assigning a Heathen origin to several of the corruptions of the Christian Church, which, although manifestly resembling Heathen ceremonies, were immediately derived from the Jews. Some, doubtless, were immediately drawn from Gentile practices, but not all which correspond with Heathen rites.

* *Inter al. Romans*, ch. xiv. v. 14, "I known and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean in itself." 1 *Corinth.* ch. x. v. 25, "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no questions for conscience sake." Ibid. v. 17, "The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink." *Coloss.* ch. ii. v. 16, "Let no man judge you in meat or drink." 1 *Tim.* ch. vi. v. 4, "Every creature of God is good and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving."

† This and the like expressions may be noticed in reference to the distinction pointed out between the Miracles of Jesus and those of His Apostles.

haps had before this assaulted him,) when they saw him in the Temple, stirred up all the people, and laid hands on him, Crying out, Men of Israel, help: this is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the People, and the Law, and this place,"* &c.

Objection answered.

One powerful objection, it must be confessed, bears upon this supposition. If it be correct, the most important act of the blessed Spirit's dispensation, and the most remarkable, must have remained a secret from the Church of Jerusalem (the Apostles being excepted) for fifteen years. Whether the well-known want of ordinary methods of communication, such as are now familiar to us, may unduly magnify the objection, especially as that want must have been peculiarly felt in the intercourse between the members of a poor and suspected sect on domestic affairs, the reader is left to consider. However, be it allowed or not, it must be admitted that this would not be a solitary instance of a strange ignorance in one part of the Christian Society of its proceedings elsewhere. What, for instance, could have been a more interesting subject of report than the conversion of St. Paul? And yet, although this took place almost on the borders of Judæa, it is clear that the Apostles themselves could not have known it for certain, when after an interval of several years he visited Jerusalem; else it would not have been necessary for Barnabas to have assured them of it, before they received him to their confidence and fellowship.

But, whatever was the information of the Church of Jerusalem respecting the admission of Idolatrous converts to Christianity, the Decree of the Council could not, for the reasons assigned, have been intended to apply to them also. The Proselytes of the Gate—the Devout Gentiles—were enjoined to observe the rules enumerated, on the principle, that Christianity did not interfere with any Civil or social institution, but left the members of all societies just as they stood originally. On this principle it was, doubtless, that St. Paul circumcised Timothy and not Titus; and on the same principle the Church was not inconsistent in observing the first day of the week, as appears from *Acts*, ch. xx. v. 7, and also the seventh day of the week, as appears from *Acts*, ch. xiii. v. 14, 42, and ch. xvi. v. 13. These they observed as partial adherents of the Jewish Society; and accordingly when Jerusalem was destroyed, its rites overthrown, and the nation *as a nation* annihilated, they, as well as the Jewish Christians themselves, were released from the obligation. Some superstitious observance of the Decree indeed long existed in the Church, although it does not appear to have been by any means generally looked on as binding.† Still, its directions are found in the decrees of more than one Council,‡ and are to this day regarded as a portion of Christian Law by the Greek and Æthiopic Churches.§

Individuals, too, among the most learned and clear-sighted of later times, have maintained its perpetual authority,—Grotius among others. That the introduction of one Moral rule into the list of injunctions might have biassed these, in their view of it, is not impossible. In rejecting it, they seemed to be annulling not only the precept to abstain from meats offered to idols and from blood, but that also which forbade Fornication. Lightfoot accordingly avoids the scruple by making fornication and polygamy synonimous. And that the word translated "Fornication" should embrace under its general signification polygamy and adultery is perhaps admissible, but that it should be applied to either specifically, is more than can be proved. In truth, all the doubts and difficulty may be traced to a false, or rather an indistinct, view of the true character of the Jewish Law, of which this was after all only a portion. As the observance of the whole Law was sanctioned by the Apostle in the case of those Christians who had been subject to it before their conversion, so in the case of the Proselytes of the Gate that portion of it which extended to them received a similar sanction.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Whether the Decree is of perpetual authority.

The Mosaic Law, it is well known, comprises Moral commandments and ceremonial rules all blended together, not only in the great body of Jewish Scripture, but even in the Ten Commandments written by the finger of God. The command to keep the seventh day as Sabbath is there found side by side with those which enjoin love to God and our neighbour, and those which prohibit murder, theft, adultery, and false-witness. Nevertheless, a distinction is drawn by universal consent between the two portions of the Law. It is agreed that the ceremonial part has been abrogated, the Moral left in force. This is true, and for all practical purposes sufficient. It would, however, be a more exact and correct mode of expressing the truth to say, that the whole of the Mosaic Law was done away with, *as far as it was binding because found in the Law of Moses;* but that the Moral portion of the Law continued in force because it was in force prior to the promulgation of the Mosaic Law. If, for instance, the sinfulness of murder depends on its being a violation of the sixth commandment, then was Cain guiltless.*

Why what was already written on men's hearts should have been specified in God's written law; whether it be, that in this, as in the whole course of God's dealings with Man, each succeeding revelation was a comment on the former; or that these were incorporated with the ceremonial or judicial Law, in order to annex to them Civil and temporal rewards and punishments, are questions which need not be discussed. It is enough for our purpose that such was the case. Now, the Gentiles, *as men*, had all the Moral Law engraven on their hearts; "their consciences," as St. Paul tells us, "accusing, or else excusing them." In admitting these, therefore, to a partial fellowship with them, (such as the Proselyte of the Gate enjoyed,) it was not to be expected that the Jews would enjoin on them any rules beyond those which were ceremonial, and of these only enough to serve as a badge of distinction, and a test of sincere proselytism. The observance of the Moral Law would be considered as otherwise binding. History,

---

* *Acts*, ch. xxii. v. 27, 28.

† Eusebii *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. c. 1. See also Justin Martyr, *Dialog. cum Trypho;* Origen, *con. Celsum*, lib. viii. and Tertullian, *ad Uxorem*, lib. and *Apolog.* c. 9.

‡ *E. g. Conc. Gangr.* can. 2, and *Syn. Trull.* can. 67.

§ In like manner, we find the Eastern Churches in the IId century alleging the example of St. John and St. Philip for celebrating Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover, while the Western Churches urged the practice of St. Peter and St. Paul in support of their observance of the day of the Resurrection. The question was not set at rest until the Decree of the Nicene Council on the subject; and even then some refused to acquiesce, and were on that account stigmatized as *Quartodecimani*.

* Tertullian points out the manner in which our first parents may be convicted of having violated every command in the Decalogue by eating the forbidden fruit; and thence argues for the *prior* existence of a law equivalent in authority and import to the Decalogue. Such a law has been communicated and registered on every man's conscience. (See his *Tract. adv. Judæos.*)

History.

however, sufficiently explains, why it was expedient to place among these ceremonial rules one Moral precept, that, namely, which enjoined them to abstain from Fornication. Murder, theft, false-witness, and all other moral offences, were still universally recognised as such by the consent of conscience in all. Fornication, alone, was not merely a common vice, but had ceased to be generally regarded as a sin. In its *excess* only it was held to be blameworthy. What more natural, therefore, than that the Jews should bind the proselyte, by an express law, to abstain from this vice, when they had ceased to feel themselves bound to do so by the Law of Nature.

If this view of the subject be correct, it will appear, that when the authority of the Decree of Jerusalem ceased, Christians were thereby no more absolved from the duty of continence, than they were, by the cessation of the authority of the whole Law of Moses, from the duty of honouring their parents, or abstaining from theft and murder. Indeed, he who is contented to do only what forms an express precept in Holy Writ, and to abstain from that only which is formally forbidden, misapplies the Scriptures. On man's conscience alone it is that the whole Moral Law is written, like the Ten Commandments, by the finger of God Himself, but not, like these, in perishable characters. This was the first Revelation of God to Man, and coexistent with His Creation; and even the last Dispensation was not at all designed to supersede the use of this original internal Revelation. The New Testament does not contain any code of Ethics, it only alludes to the Moral Law as already known and provided; or seeks to correct and reform those parts which, although engraven perfect on the heart by God, had become indistinct, and, in some few instances, nearly effaced. It furnishes *motives* to the observance of this Law, and *promises assistance* in the performance of it. This, and not *a revelation of the Moral Law*, is the instruction which a Christian is to expect from his Bible. As the author of this instruction, our Lord speaks of Himself, and of Him whom he was to send to us, under the title of God *encouraging* us, (that is, exciting us by new motives, and new promises of aid,) and not under that of Lawgiver: "ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν—He shall give you *another Comforter*."

So much for the temporary character of this famous Decree, whatever authority it may be supposed to have had while it remained in force. On this point, indeed, a more controversial difference has existed among the divided members of God's Church. Our estimate of its authority must, of course, greatly depend on the character we assign to the persons who composed the assembly, and the circumstances under which they were acting. Without, therefore, referring to the specific conclusions which have been drawn, either for or against the authority of General Councils, from the various assumptions with regard to this, it will be plainer, and less tedious, to state concisely the leading questions by which those views may be elicited, and to direct the attention to that which appears on the whole to be the most satisfactory reply.

Extent of his Council.

1. The first question is, Was this a General Council? that is, did it represent the whole Church? or only one branch of it, namely, the Church of Jerusalem? To this, perhaps, the unlearned reader will be readier with an answer than one who has allowed himself to be perplexed and bewildered with the subtilties of Theological sophists. There is nothing in St. Luke's account of it to imply, even remotely, that it assumed the former character. It was not so, as composed of the heads of all the Churches, for none were present but the ambassadors of Antioch; and these came to consult, and not to join the Council. It was not so, as composed of all the Apostles; for St. Paul, and doubtless St. Barnabas, too, were Apostles, and they were present, indeed, but it was in the character of *Ambassadors*, and not of delegates.*

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Inquiry into its inspiration.

2. The next question is, Was it an inspired or uninspired Council? The opponents of the authority of General Councils, in later times, have mainly insisted on the former, and point out this circumstance as creating the essential line between this and any that has been subsequently held. The learned and candid Mosheim agrees so far with this view, as to suppose, that all the business on this occasion being left to the Apostles, they, as inspired persons, must have pronounced an inspired decision. Perhaps all inquiries into the Ecclesiastical affairs of this extraordinary period lean too much to the notion, that every transaction in which an inspired person appears, must have been the result of *immediate* inspiration. As far as the narrative guides us, no such intimation is given in the present instance; and it may be safely asserted, that the Apostles themselves were not throughout their ministry passive agents of the Holy Spirit.† The office of that blessed Comforter was to guide them to the Truth, when the Truth could not otherwise be obtained. He watched over the proceedings of that assembly, doubtless, as He has ever watched over the concerns of the Church to this day. Judging from the apparent course of His government, we should say, that had there been error suggested, His presence would have been manifested, or a Divine impulse given to some particular members of the Council—but not otherwise. It was Christ only whose inspiration was perpetual, and who needed no fresh communication as new emergencies presented themselves.‡ What was meant by the

---

* The arguments noticed are those of Paul Sarpi, in his *History of the Council of Trent*, see liv. ii. p. 240, of the French Translation by Courayer.

† Thus St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, "Unto the married I command—not *I*, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband," &c. "But to the rest speak *I, not the Lord*, If any brother hath a wife," &c., see 1 *Corinth.* ch. vii. v. 10, 12.

The greater part of what the Apostles wrote was, doubtless, entirely the suggestion of their own minds and, properly speaking, *uninspired*. Its *authority* is not at all diminished by this circumstance, if we grant (what it would be absurd to doubt) that every wrong suggestion must have been checked by the impulse of the Spirit, every deficiency supplied by actual revelation, and every failure or fault of memory miraculously remedied. *The Revelation was miraculous*, but it was recorded just as any man would record any ordinary information which might be the result of reasoning or report. The Bible is the only book in the world which appeals to God for its authority, without affecting or pretending to the immediate authorship of God. Mahomet publishes, but Allah indites the Koran, and its very style is more than human. The authors of the Bible, on the other hand, write as God's servants act. The modes of thought, the manner, the language, are different in each, and in each, no less than his actions, his own. Here and there are marks of an inspiration which dictates to the very letter; but ordinarily it is only a Divine superintendence, preventing error or omission, and interposing only for that purpose. God has enabled Man to record and to teach His Word, as he has enabled him to do His Will; not by superseding the use of his natural faculties, but by aiding them. With a view to both His Spirit was given, in order to be *called in* when assistance should be needed, and was hence designated by the expressive name ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ.

‡ It was, perhaps, to indicate this that the Bible records the failure

History.

expression, "It seemed good to us and to the Holy Ghost," will perhaps be seen more clearly when we examine the third question.

Character attributed to the Church of Jerusalem.

3. *Under what Character was the Church of Jerusalem appealed to by the Church of Antioch?* Whatever the practice might be in later times, as yet no jurisdiction was exercised by one Christian Society over another—not even by the Church of Jerusalem over her children in Christ. Paul and Barnabas had been sent to convert the Idolatrous Gentiles, (important as this measure was beyond all others which engaged the attention of the early Christians,) solely by the appointment of their own Church at Antioch, without the advice or knowledge of the sister Church at Jerusalem. In the present instance, too, they were commissioned with an embassy, the circumstances of which, if duly considered, must satisfy any candid inquirer, that its object was not perhaps even advice and assistance in deliberation. First, certain members of the Church of Jerusalem come to the Church at Antioch *preaching a new doctrine*—a doctrine of which the Church at Antioch had received no intimation, even although Paul so highly favoured was with them. They taught the brethren, and said, "Except ye be circumcised, after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved."* It was natural, therefore, that they of Antioch should send to Jerusalem, to ascertain whether any credence was to be given to the report of these men who had come from them—whether the Church there, the Apostles or other members, had indeed received any new communication from the Holy Spirit, concerning the universal obligation of the Jewish rites, as necessary to salvation. For a full investigation of the matter the Church was assembled, and it being found that the notion had originated with certain unauthorized persons of the Pharisaical sect,† in their perverse zeal for the Law, Peter and James explained the inexpediency of making any innovation; and Paul and Barnabas were dismissed, together with some members of their own Society, to assure the Church of Antioch, that no new revelation had been given on the subject—that their rule at Jerusalem, the only one sanctioned by the Holy Ghost, was to oblige the converts to observe that which they were accustomed to observe before their conversion, and nothing more.

On General Councils.

If the foregoing remarks are correct, we must seek elsewhere for the origin of General Councils, and find some other foundation for the authority which has since been claimed for them. Elsewhere, also, we must search for an example in the Apostolical Age of one Church exercising jurisdiction over another. As to General Councils, indeed, they obviously cease to be practicable as soon as the unity of the Universal Church has been dissolved. But, in truth, they were before that event impracticable (the History of these Councils prove it) as to all purposes of Unanimity. One Church may ask advice of another, or refer a difficult question to another; but for independent Churches to meet all in one *Council*, is a practical contradiction. It supposes the Church to be one, in the same sense in which each separate Christian Society alone is, and ever was, one from the first establishment of our faith. Christian Unity, the never-failing plea for these measures, has been so often a topic of bitter controversy, that we need not wonder at its assuming at this day a difficult and subtile character. More of it by and by.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

In concluding these remarks, one caution suggests itself, which cannot be too early inserted in a review of the progress of Christianity. It is, not to look at every portion of the Ecclesiastical structure as it appears rising under the hands of the Divine builder, as if conveying a correct notion of the finished work. Objects prominent at first, and resembling in their use the scaffolding or props of a real building, were afterwards removed. Others, by the application of new pieces, became so altered as not immediately to be recognised. One part, without undergoing any alteration, was yet gradually plastered up and removed out of sight. Another, the Divine Architect has left to the discretion of posterity, to be modified from time to time to suit the changing circumstances of those who were to occupy it. In examining this edifice, much more in the bold attempt to repair it, the most judicious method is, not to begin by comparing it with the rude draughts in which it was projected, but rather to survey the Church as it stands, and removing one by one those parts which are detected to be the work of men's hands, and no more; to let the Holy Builder's name appear on those parts alone of the remainder, on which it is visible in his own writing. This only is "not to diminish, not to add thereto;" and this is what our Reformers did.

Caution to be observed in reviewing Ecclesiastical History.

We have conducted Paul and Barnabas through their embassy to Jerusalem, and must now prepare to trace their second mission to the Idolatrous Gentiles. It is probable that they remained at Antioch no longer than was necessary for securing the disputed rights of the Gentile converts at that place, an office which seems to have devolved on Paul alone. Peter had indeed been the especial Apostle of the Devout Gentiles, of whom alone were the Gentile members of the Church at Antioch; and on this account, no doubt, soon followed Paul and Barnabas thither. But his arrival was, probably, only a signal for the zealots to press their point more earnestly. So successful were they that the Gentile advocate shrank from his office, and was ready to yield to their demands. Barnabas followed his example. Paul alone retained his firmness, roused his noble fellow-labourer to a sense of his duty, and for a time quieted the spirit of faction.

Second Mission of Paul and Barnabas.

All was now ready for a second Apostolical journey; the Church was at rest, and the services of Barnabas and Paul were no longer required at home. But the reader will recollect, that henceforth we are to trace their course of Ministerial labour apart. On the grounds of their separation, and on its probable results, it is unnecessary to dwell; but, leaving Barnabas's future history for a subsequent consideration, let us follow the record of the Holy Spirit, and holding the thread which He has left us, pass on through the gradual enlargement of the Covenant, in the agency of the great Apostle selected for this purpose.

One previous observation may not, indeed, be unacceptable to him who feels that it is inconsistent with the character of these good and holy men, friends from their youth, thus to have parted in bitterness, under circumstances which might seem sufficient to have repressed

---

of the Disciples, in their attempt to perform certain Miracles. "This kind," says Jesus, "goeth not out but by fasting and prayer." It is not said, that they were *incapable* of performing these Miracles, but it is intimated, that their endowment was different from Christ's,—that they must first apply for specific powers from God, and then, indeed, these, and greater than these, should they perform. See Matt. ch. xvii. v. 21; Mark, ch. ix. v. 29.

* *Acts*, ch. xv. v. 1. † Ibid. ch. xv. v. 5.

History.

all private differences. Did they part in bitterness? Paul afterwards names Barnabas with respect and affection, and received Mark into his service when he thought him worthy of it. But that zeal which was indeed strong enough to have subdued the mere impulse of anger, had a similar power over feelings of friendship, and even over the ties of nature. Who shall say, that in voluntarily separating their course for ever, as appears to have been the case, each was not submitting to a painful restraint, under the consciousness of doing the best for the great good cause? Who shall say, that each may not, by virtue of this very act, have inherited a portion of the reward promised to those who should forsake father, mother, brethren, or friends, for the sake of Christ and of his Gospel.*

Hence we obtain a further proof, if indeed any such be requisite, that the extraordinary inspiration of the Apostles was not an *abiding* or *continual* endowment, but only occasional. On matters of doubt or difference the Holy Spirit interposed its aid. But here no interference took place; probably, because the result of the disagreement was most beneficial to the common welfare, because both were right. By a division of Ministerial labour between the only two who had as yet been commissioned to the Idolatrous Gentiles, the extension of the Gospel was no doubt promoted. It has been remarked, that Paul only was recommended to the grace of God. St. Luke's silence, however, does not altogether imply, that Barnabas received no such formal dismissal. In Paul's case alone it might be mentioned, because to him now, and to the details of his mission, the narrative was to be limited.

ST. PAUL'S SECOND APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY.

A. D. 53 TO 56.

Attendants on St. Paul.

SILAS and Judas Barsabas were the messengers appointed by the Church of Jerusalem to accompany Paul and Barnabas on their return to Antioch. Here Silas was induced to remain, and, being a Prophet, was fixed on by Paul as the fittest substitute which he could provide for the fellow-labourer of whose assistance he was now to be deprived. Soon after he commenced his journey, he found at Lystra another meet companion in the young and faithful Timothy. At Troas it would seem, from the narrative of the *Acts*, that Luke was added to their company. This, then, is the little band of Christian heroes, whose progress, under the second mission of the Holy Spirit, to the idolatrous Gentiles, we are now to consider.

Probable number of Converts.

In what numbers these were now added, cannot be determined from the sacred record. Mention is made of particular instances at Philippi, at Berœa, and at Athens; and from St. Paul's Epistle to the *Thessalonians* and to the *Corinthians*, it appears that some conversion of Idolaters took place amongst each of them. Probably some in most places were converted, the notices in the *Acts* being evidently limited to the more remarkable instances, such as Dionysius the Areopagite, and "the honourable women" at Berœa.

Apostolic Age.—Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

It is not of course intended to pursue the Apostle through the several stages of his work, but, agreeably with our plan, only to point to those parts of his route at which for any reason it may desirable that we should pause.

Thus, passing over the intermediate points of his journey, at Troas we find him receiving from his Divine Guide an especial communication. As one of the various modes in which God was wont to visit his servants and the agents of his will, this, then, deserves to be particularly noticed.

§ *St. Paul at Troas.*

His vision.

Whilst Paul was at Troas, a vision appeared to him in the night. A man of Macedon seemed to stand before him, and say, "Pass over and help us." From this dream or apparition, the Apostle inferred that the Lord had called him thither to preach the Gospel; and the result proved that he was not mistaken. The Holy Ghost, which had hitherto checked and diverted their course when proceeding contrary to the line marked out in the Divine counsels, now permitted them to pass over, and crowned their efforts with success.

From the words of the sacred narrative, it cannot be certainly determined, whether this were a waking vision or a dream. Supposing it, however, to have been of the latter description, it would be by no means a singular instance of God thus communicating his will to his servants, and even to others. Abraham, Ahimilech, Jacob, Joseph, Pharaoh, Solomon, Nebuchadnezzar, are familiar instances. Of these "latter days," too, it had been expressly foretold, among the ordinary signs, that men should "see visions and dream dreams."*

It is nowhere suggested, that there was any thing peculiar in the manner of dreaming on these occasions. Sometimes, too, as in the present instance, they look like the ordinary result of the circumstances under which they are reported to have occurred. If this were a *dream* of St. Paul, (it may be said,) what ground had he and his company to suppose it a divine impulse, and to class it with the light and the voice sent to him when on the road to Damascus, or the vision of "unutterable things," which he received in his trance in the Temple. Would it not have been more sober and reasonable to conclude, that the approach to the verge of the Asiatic continent, the sight of that famous strait which formed the slight barrier between them and Europe, had carried Paul's meditations to the opposite shores. Musing upon those especially who, crossing here with Alexander, made conquest of the East, even of his own Judæa, and established in Egypt a rival to Jerusalem, he could not but expect to retain in his dreams some impression of a train of thought so deeply interesting, tinged, as every dream of his might well be,

* Both may have done what according to their best judgment was most beneficial to the Gospel. Had one been right, and the other wrong, some special direction would probably have been vouchsafed by their Divine Guide. But in this instance, a division of labour, the result of difference of opinion, was no doubt the most advantageous measure which could have been adopted. It was not, therefore, to be expected, that any divine interference should take place, in order to effect that which would be effected by the ordinary course of things, especially if, as is suggested, the resolution was a trial to each.

* Joel, ch. ii. v. 28, quoted and applied by St. Peter in his harangue on the great day of Pentecost. *Acts*, ch. ii. v. 17.

History.

with the one subject which was predominant in his mind. It must be recollected, however, that the Holy Ghost, (by some mode of communication not specified,) had of late been making known His approval or disapproval of the several steps of their journey as soon as they were attempted. The absence of this check therefore might have formed an appropriate evidence that the call was divine. Still, as the same solution will not serve in other cases, it will be more satisfactory to take a general view of the question, extending it not only to all inspired Dreams, but to all other modes of divine communication. Let us consider then, first, what those modes were, and then, what evidence the persons addressed had, that the communication in each instance was divine.

General observations on divine communication.

Visions.

I. *Visions.*—By which is meant, any communication conveyed through an object of Sight. Of this kind, were the hand-writing on the wall of Belshazzar's banquet room, the pillar of fire and the Cloud which guided the Israelites through the Wilderness, and the like.

Voices

II. *Voices* or revelations conveyed through the sense of hearing. These were the most frequent, and although often accompanied with extraordinary impressions on the other senses, yet were naturally the readiest and most distinct mode of communication. Such was the giving of the Ten Commandments, the call of Moses, and probably all those Revelations designated in *Genesis* by the expression, "The Lord said unto him."

Dreams.

III. *Dreams.*—Under which is included, whatever was addressed to the Imagination only, whether the abstraction from a consciousness of surrounding objects were the effect of sleep, or of some supernatural influence, as in a trance or ἔκστασις. As instances of this class may be mentioned, St. Paul's revelation in the Temple, Peter's Vision of the Sheet, Jacob's Dream, and the like.

Instinctive Impulses.

IV. *Instinctive Impulses.*—This term is used to denote some method of making known the divine will; which does not appear to have been an address either to the senses or to the imagination, but to have borne the same analogy to the desires, affections, and other inclinations, as those others did to the senses or the imagination. Such may we conceive to have been the method, whereby Paul and his company are described in this journey as *hindered* by the Holy Ghost from pursuing a wrong course. By this, it may be, they were enabled to interpret Paul's Vision of the man of Macedon to be of divine origin. This too might have been what the Disciples of our Lord experienced, when walking with him after his Resurrection. For, although at the time they failed to attend to it, they afterwards expressed their surprise that they should have been so dull. "Did not *our hearts burn within us* as he talked with us?" Perhaps this mode of Revelation being then new to them, was not at once recognised.

These will include all the various revelations of God to man, for there is no other conceivable form, except where the mediation of some other being is interposed, and this will require a distinct consideration.

All operated naturally.

To this general statement, the first remark to be added is, that in all the different methods the senses and the imagination were affected only as in the ordinary course of nature—that the exercise of sight, of hearing, and of fancy, was in every case of the same kind as that produced by natural objects, natural sounds, and natural sleep. Thus Samuel is described as mistaking the voice of God for that of Eli; and another more experienced Prophet, as desiring to be certified by a sign, that the impression was supernatural, and being gratified in his desire as reasonable.

Apostolic Age Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Signs of confirmation

This being so, it follows that besides *the vehicle of communication*, whether voice, vision, or dream, some *sign of Confirmation* must always have been provided, in order to satisfy the person visited that he was not imposed on or else imposing on himself—imposed on, as in the case of "lying spirits," or of human contrivances, or of accidental phenomena; imposing on himself, as in the case of enthusiasm. Not that in all, or in most instances any record will be found of the Sign of confirmation; because the revelation only concerns those to whom these records are addressed,—the Sign, the persons visited. Still it is in many instances mentioned; perhaps, in all of very great moment. In some indeed it was unavoidable; in those, namely, which served the double purpose of confirming Signs and Vehicles of communication, as *e. g.* the hand-writing addressed to Belshazzar. In some cases, again, the two are connected together, so as to form what is called in loose phrase one Vision. Of this kind was that which occurred at St. Paul's conversion. The Voice alone was the medium of communication; while the Light served to certify that it proceeded from no human lips.* The same may be observed of the call of Moses at the Bush. Sometimes also the two were so joined, as that the Sign should not become proof until afterwards; it being in this case a sort of prophetic appendage. Of this kind was Zacharias's revelation respecting John the Baptist, that of Cornelius's concerning his own admission into the Church, and the like. The last case is where the two were disjoined; and then the confirmation might be effected in some distinct revelation, or by specific miracle. Thus the budding of Aaron's rod was a sign of confirmation to Aaron, and the miracle of the fleece to Gideon. Thus, too, the power of working Miracles, granted in all Ages to the messengers of God, were signs not only to those to whom they were sent, but to themselves also, that they were really so commissioned.† It is probable, that with those who were in the habit of receiving frequent communications, a Miracle in every case might not have been requisite; or if any, merely what has been described as an Instinctive Impulse,‡ such as was supposed to have confirmed St. Paul's view of his Vision at Troas. Certain it is, that he is said on that occasion to have acted "*immediately*" on the authority of the Vision. The word is introduced, as if for the purpose of marking a case in which no further Sign of confirmation was awaited for. Perhaps then the Vision alone was sufficient for one like St. Paul, thoroughly *accustomed* to the divine communications. For although it is true, that this mode of operating on the senses or imagination was apparently the same, as if ordinary and natural causes were operating, still the eye, the ear, or the mind, would become familiarized to these as

* It is often asserted, that St. Paul then saw the Lord. But this could not have been the case. He was immediately struck blind, and the manifestation of Christ, of which he speaks, took place subsequently in the *Temple at Jerusalem*.

† In very arduous and doubtful undertakings, the prophet or messenger was first assured, as in the appointment of Moses. (*Ex.* ch. iv.)

‡ This would seem to be the appropriate one for *correcting* false impressions, and *checking* wrong measures. By this, probably, the Apostles were prevented from preaching or writing any thing false.

History.

to any other sounds, sights, or even dreams.* Thus, when Samuel is represented, (in the instance already noticed,) as ignorant of the nature of the heavenly call, the expression of Scripture is, that "he did not yet know the Lord;" the natural interpretation of which seems to be, that he had not yet become acquainted with the voice by experience. In like manner, Adam is said to have "known" or recognised the voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden. Whether, even in these cases, it might have been the duty of the inspired to wait for a confirming sign,—suppose such only as the instinctive impulse or prohibition,—and that for neglecting to do so they might have been sometimes misled, as in the case of Balaam, it is scarcely necessary here to inquire.†

Modes by which a Revelation of God is conveyed.

This topic has been already more than sufficiently dwelt on for our immediate purpose; and yet it leads to a consideration so important to Christian Faith, that it is difficult to refrain from pursuing it a little further. Has the reader ever attempted to state to himself distinctly, what he understands by the term Revelation, meaning a Revelation of the Divine Nature? Neither the Voice, the Vision, the Dream, nor the Instinct can be said to be God. All are evidently Vehicles, and modes of communicating His messages to Man. Him no man hath seen at any time. Suppose, then, we wished to convey a *description* of an object of sight to one born blind; (for that is our condition in relation to the Divine Nature.) He may perhaps be made to receive some indistinct idea of it through his sense of hearing, and the Vehicle of this Revelation, as it may be termed, would be a Voice. Some contrivance may be afterwards invented which should convey to him the same description, by submitting to his touch figures representing it, or, as is done in some Asylums, by letters and words strongly impressed, so as to be distinctly felt. If it had so happened, that he was at length favoured with the gift of sight, (as occurred with some in the Miraculous period of the Church,) that same description might be set before his eyes in a painting. Meanwhile, suppose him never yet to have witnessed the object itself, thus variously represented. He would then have become acquainted with it in three distinct ways, and have been enabled to improve and to apply his knowledge of it by means of each; still, he would hardly be absurd enough to make either of these assertions,

1. That the sounds, the figures, the writing or the painting, were the very thing described.

2. That the variety in the mode of conveying the description implied any corresponding distinction in that one object, the idea of which was thus variously communicated to him.

Is the reader sufficiently assured of the truth of these remarks, to apply them to the descriptions Man has received of the Divine Nature? God has been *omnipresent*‡ from the beginning, and cannot be supposed at any time to be more in one place than in another. Yet it has pleased Him from time to time to "lift up an ensign," to which men might come to ask for communication of His will, and to be made sensible of His presence. Such was the Shechinah granted to the Israelites, where God is accordingly said, κατ' ἐξοχήν, to have dwelt. With this flame the voice of communication was so connected, that the Priest was obliged to come to the former, in order to avail himself of the latter. The Flame was the *Sign*, the Voice the *Vehicle* of communication. It afterwards pleased the Most High to set up an Ensign for all the world to resort unto, even "for the nations afar," as Isaiah speaks of it. This Ensign was the Human Nature of our blessed Lord. To Him all were now to come who desired to receive the Divine communications. His words and symbolical Miracles, and other acts, formed the Vehicle of that communication—as much so, and in like manner, as the voice which gave the Ten Commandments from Mount Sinai, or which spoke at different times to Adam, to the Patriarchs, to the Prophets, and others His servants of old. Hence it is written, that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," and that men beheld His *glory*, in allusion to the analogy between Him and the Shechinah. Hence, too, the occasional radiant appearances recalling to the Jews the memory of the well known symbol of divine manifestation. At the same time it must be borne in mind, that the incarnation of the Son of God differed from all other modes of Divine communication, in that Christ did not only represent or personate, and absolutely was God, but Man also. Hence He is called the "only mediator;" and with reference to this peculiarity it is, perhaps, that St. Paul speaking of Him says, "now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one;" *i. e.* Christ as Mediator is at once the mean of communication from God to Man, and from Man to God—the representative of both—God in person, and also Man in person; nevertheless, as God He is One.*

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Permanent Revelation of God to Christians.

But the Almighty has not limited His modes of communication to sensible objects, to voices and visions. He has also addressed Himself *immediately* to the mind, to the affections and understandings of men. In this kind of communication effected by the Spirit, the vehicle is not material, nor an object of the senses. Its effects, indeed, were made visible in the Miraculous gifts of the Apostles, and in the Prophetic monuments of the Church in all Ages; its effects we still see in the behaviour of individuals and of nations, and still hear in those sounds which are going forth into all lands; but, according to our Lord's illustration, like the wind, we cannot tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth.

For Us is this mode of Divine communication ap-

* The experience of many may be appealed to, for the fact that dreams do recur, and are remembered as repetitions of former dreams. Now, a dream ascertained to be divine, might contain some peculiarities which would, doubtless, be remembered so vividly, as by repetition to stamp a sure character on the class of dreams in which they were recognised.

† *Numbers*, ch. xxii. v. 20, *et seq.*

‡ In truth, *Omnipresent* is a relative term. God is said to be Omnipresent, because all things are *present to Him*, not because He is *present to all things*. The original error consists in assigning Him *any place at all*,—in attributing *locality* to a Being who cannot be affected, as we are, by *the distinctions of space*. The same may be observed of Eternity, as applied to the Divine Nature. We can only judge of Time by a *succession of impressions on the mind*; and by supposing an infinite succession we arrive at our notion of Eternity. But why should we presume to say, that any such *succession* is requisite for the Divine Mind? A Savage would instruct a traveller in his route, by a *successive* enumeration of point after point, and line after line in his course; a civilized man would do the same *at once*, by placing a map before him. If then human nature exerts itself so differently, as it is cultivated or neglected, how cautious should we be in framing analogies between the energies and capacities of the most perfect mind, and of God who formed it.

* The text is a difficult one, and no interpretation given of it is perhaps free from objections; the term Mediator is generally referred to Moses.

History.

pointed. To Us the Spirit speaks as the words of Jesus did to His followers; as the voice or vision from between the Cherubim addressed itself to them of older time; as, in short, each varying mode of communication hath spoken at sundry times to the several generations of God's people; for He, says the Apostle, hath spoken "in divers manners." But then, where are we to seek for the appendage to this, as to the other appointed and regular vehicles of Divine communication? Where, asks the Christian, is our Shechinah? Where the Ensign to which is attached this unheard Voice, this unseen Vision? To be sure it may be said, that God is not to be found here or there, but is omnipresent. So He was before the Flame of the Shechinah was lighted, or Christ came in the flesh; nor was He less so during either manifestation. It is not His presence, but the *sign* of His presence we ask for. To the Heathen themselves, from whom the Jewish Ensign was removed, He was indeed present,—"not far from any of them," as their Apostle told them; but the great privilege of being a peculiar people consists in having this Sign to resort to. See then, Christian, whether we have it not as distinct and as accessible, aye, more accessible and more distinct, than ever before was given. Let us remember, that the mode of communication is no longer by sound or by sight, no longer a sensible medium, but Spirit. The corresponding *Ensign*, also, is not addressed to the *eye* nor to the *ear*, but to the *mind*. It is not a Flame, which, however brilliant, illumines only the Holy of Holies. It is not a Man, whom only a small portion of the human race can see, and hear, and follow. But it is, what better suits an unlimited dispensation, it is a MIRACULOUS RECORD. The Bible and the Sacraments are our Shechinah, our Sign; not, indeed, to be recognised as such by gazing at them, nor lifting them up, and carrying them about, but by humbly reading, marking, learning, and inwardly digesting. We, unlike God's people of old, walk by Faith, and not by Sight.

It appears, then, that besides the occasional communications made by God to His servants and to others, He has, in the course of His ordinary and perpetual dealings with His Church or people, appointed three distinct modes of communication, whereby he was to be accessible to those that sought Him; and that appended to each was the sign of His presence in such modes of intercourse. To prevent the error of attributing the Divine agency to three different Beings, in consequence of this difference, we are instructed in the Unity of God, and Baptized in His name as the Father, in His name as the Son, and in His name as the Holy Ghost. Again, as under this threefold dispensation we observe that the Almighty has in each manifestation assumed to Himself certain characteristics, we presume not to confound God the Father who created us, with God the Son who redeemed us, and with God the Holy Ghost who santcifies us; but, agreeably to the sense and language of the Christian Church from the earliest times, we worship Him as one in three Persons.

§ *St. Paul and the Pythoness.*

Concerning our knowledge of the Evil Spirit.

The foregoing remarks may serve to guide us in another question, that, namely, concerning the knowledge we possess of the Evil Being. With his origin and his absolute nature we are wholly unacquainted. Our view of him, like that of the Author of all Good, is chiefly negative. Whence he too is called a Spirit, that is, his real nature is incapable of being perceived by our senses; and even the modes whereby he has been manifested to us are accommodated not to the sight, the hearing, or to any external perception, but only to the immaterial part of Man. But, as God Himself has vouchsafed so also to address Himself to us, it was necessary, in contradistinction to Him, to designate the Author of Evil by the term *Evil* Spirit.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

According to the Scriptures, he has been to us the Author of those two original Evils, the effects of which the whole world still daily experiences, Sin and Death. In perpetuating these, his ordinary and continual agency appears to have been ever exerted; as to counteract the effects of these, has been the objects of God's ordinary dealings with mankind. But the Evil Spirit has also displayed his *extraordinary* and *occasional* operations on the objects of his malice. He has sometimes vexed men's minds and bodies, as in the instances of Job, of Saul, King of Israel, and of those who laboured under that peculiar malady which is called in the Gospels Demoniacal possession. On the reality of these possessions some observations were offered, in treating of our Saviour's Ministry, under the head of Miracles, and under that of the Temptation. But besides the infliction of pain and disease, which was there especially noticed, he seems to have exercised a power of delusion,—inspiring agents, over whom he had obtained controul, to foretell future events. The most obvious, although by no means the only great mischief produced thereby, was, that to him were ascribed the power and praise which were due only to God. Foreknowledge was considered as a peculiar attribute of the Deity; and the Being therefore who enabled his agents to foretell events, was regarded as the one who ordained and dispensed them. Hence, he is called in Scripture "the Prince of this World," and "the Father of Lies." This by no means implies, that with Demoniacal inspiration commenced the various superstitious arts which have obtained in the world, or that they were altogether kept up by this influence. It is more consonant, with what is observed of the rest of the Evil One's agency, to suppose, that finding these corrupt devices to have sprung out of his original depravation of Man's heart, he ever and anon supported them by extraordinary interposition. Why this was ever permitted, the source of goodness being Almighty; why, indeed, such a Being ever existed, are questions which the inquirer of the present day has learned to consider in their true light, as vain, unprofitable, and presumptuous.*

His extraordinary operations.

His power of foretelling future events.

During our Saviour's Ministry, He often exercised His power over the former class of Evil manifestations, namely, Demoniacal possessions. Of the latter class none are mentioned, until we find Paul at Philippi exercising a similar authority over the possession of a Pythoness; a sort of fortune-teller, whose master made a gain of her gift, or rather of her curse; and who, regarded simply from the account of her way of life, might appear in the light of a common impostor. Her interview with the Apostle, however, contains circumstances which render it unquestionable, that in her case, as in that of the Demoniacs, the agency of the Devil was manifested.

The Pythoness at Philippi.

Philippi was the first place in which Paul, after his de

* Johnson has remarked, that the existence of Evil Spirits is not encumbered with greater difficulties than the existence of Evil Men.

History.

parture from Troas, found "a door opened unto him;" and of the results of his Ministry there, this Miracle, and the conversion of Lydia a Devout Gentile, are the main circumstances recorded. It is worthy of remark, that in this, as in the cases which occurred during the Saviour's personal Ministry, the Evil Spirit acknowledged in Christ the agency of the Most High God. Through His name still these Miracles were performed. Agreeably to the account which His commissioned servants gave Him, whilst He was yet with them. "In Thy name we cast out Devils," Paul now addressed the Spirit of Divination, and found it, as Christ had foretold, obedient unto him.

The Believer expects and hopes to find a beautiful propriety in every part of the Christian scheme, and where he does not perceive it still he infers its existence. Thus, observing that of the two kinds of Demoniacal possession our Saviour frequently exercised His power in person over those afflicted with disease, while the exercise of a similar power over those visited by a Spirit of Divination was reserved for His Apostle to the Gentiles; we are tempted to suggest a plausible reason for the arrangement. Such may, perhaps, be found by contemplating the difference of character in the Ministry of Christ, and of His Apostles guided by his Spirit. It was the business of the former to *do the work* of Redemption, of the latter *to instruct men in it*. The former, therefore, would be directed generally against all the evil and hurtful agency of the Devil; the latter more particularly against the propagation of falsehood. The former would naturally counteract the *works* of Satan, the latter his *words*, as conveyed through agents, such as was the rescued Pythoness.

It was during the Apostle's third Journey, however, that his success in this branch of his Ministry appears to have been greatest. At Ephesus, among the extraordinary Miracles (Δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχούσας) which he displayed, some appear to have been of this character;* and to have operated so powerfully on the minds of many who witnessed them, that they came forward and burned publicly their books of Magic. The high valuation of these, marks at once the extent of the evil, and also the wonderful success of the Apostle. This whole portion of his Ministry proves too, that Demoniacal possession was not, as has been often represented, confined to the Jews.

§ *St. Paul at Athens.*

The Apostle and his company, when dismissed by the Magistrates from Philippi, passed through Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, and Berœa; and in each left traces of their inspired agency. At Thessalonica, as we know from the *Epistle* soon after addressed to the converts there, their labours were remarkably successful, even among the Idolaters. Athens is next in the list of places which received thus early a summons from the Holy Spirit to repent, believe, and be baptised. Athens was still the principal seat of Learning, and of those Arts which furnished the chief attraction of Idolatry. It was the University of the Roman Empire and of the World. At Athens therefore it might be expected, that argument, not force, would be opposed to the efforts of the Christian Orator; and that on his part, as dealing with a people accessible in a high degree through their Reasoning powers, the *words* more than the *works* of the Spirit would be employed. It is not, however, merely to point out the propriety of the Holy Spirit's Ministry there, although, like every other instance, it affords a strong presumption of the truth of the Bible narrative, and ought not to be overlooked: but it is not merely on this account, nor yet for the sake of that interest which the name of Athens inspires, that we bid the reader pause; but to notice two circumstances in the account of what occurred there, which, admitting each of different views, may not be regarded at first by all in that which seems to be the correct one.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Preaching, in the first instance, (as his custom was,) to the Jews and Devout Gentiles of the place, his Discourses were so much noised abroad, as to attract the attention, not of the Magistracy, but of the Philosophical idlers. Idlers, we say, because at Athens these speculators formed, as it were, a body of Literary loungers, and presented in the Porches and other places of public resort a whimsical scene of fashionable relaxation, of which the amusements and conceits were Metaphysical and Moral discussions. Surrounded by company like this, and possibly unable, from the variety and number of the questions addressed to him, to make his meaning understood, Paul was conducted, (not as a criminal, for of this there is no intimation, but) as the promulgator of a new system, to *Mars' Hill*, and was there desired publicly to explain his views. His speech, accordingly, bears no marks of a *defence*, nor was it followed up either by acquittal or condemnation, by sentence from the Court or violence from the multitude. At his mention of a Resurrection from the dead, the doctrine seems to have struck his audience as so monstrous and preposterous, that he could no longer proceed for the jests and witticisms which it occasioned. His speech is doubtless, therefore, only a part of what he intended to say to them, and what might, therefore, have proved more generally effectual, had his auditors "had ears to hear" him out.* As St. Paul's examination has been most commonly represented in the light of a judicial proceeding, these remarks will not be useless, if, by determining more precisely the circumstances, they shall make his celebrated harangue appear more natural, more fully adapted to the occasion. Nor, in so considering it, can one fail to observe, that at Athens the chief, if not the only, persuasive which he chose to employ was Eloquence. The very weapon in the use of which the Athenians were most skilful. With *Miracles* he had confounded the people whose boast was "an image that fell from heaven," and he now *pleads* for Christianity in the city of Demosthenes.

Paul attracts the notice of the Philosophers.

His speech at the Areopagus

In the speech itself there is only one topic which will be noticed, it is the allusion to an altar erected to "the unknown God."

Some few, who have considered St. Paul's behaviour here as an eminent illustration of the character which he has given to himself, of being "all things to all men," have so far departed from the common acceptation of the passage, as to imagine that "the unknown

The unknown God.

* The attempt of the Jewish Exorcists to imitate Paul, proves that these cures were wrought, like that of the Pythoness, "in the name of the Lord Jesus." "Then certain vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them that had Evil Spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure thee by Jesus, whom Paul preacheth."

* "Some mocked, and others said, *we will hear thee again* of this matter." This may be understood to imply a division of sentiment among the auditory; some mocking him, so as to render it impossible for him to proceed, others, as Dionysius and Damaris, encouraging him, and telling him that *they at least would continue to hear him.*

History.

God" was no one particular object of worship which the Athenians had adopted; but the true God, whom, he tells them, they *ignorantly* worshipped in the various characters of Jupiter, Apollo, &c. To Jehovah (they understood him to say) are justly due your worship and your altars. It is not your Jupiter who is the God, but the Being who made the Heavens or Jupiter.*

The objections to this interpretation are these: first, the Apostle so expresses himself as clearly to denote that the words, "to God unknown," were inscribed on some altar;† secondly, respectable testimonies have been found of the existence of such an altar; lastly, it is not in accordance with St. Paul's other addresses on the subject of idolatry,—his custom being to point out to the Heathen, not that they were worshipping God under false names, but serving the Devil.

It remains, therefore, to determine what particular God was meant by the inscription on the altar. On this point the remarks already made, on the occasion of the speech, may not a little help to guide inquiry. Nothing is more probable, than that the Athenians, the most inquisitive people on earth, should by this time have heard, and have taken some interest in the report, of a new God which the Christians were represented as proclaiming to the world.‡ In their characteristic vivacity and eagerness for novelty, an altar might have been erected to Him, before they had ascertained His name. On Paul's arrival, their very conversation with him would lead them to surmise that he was one of the promulgators of this new Religion. Hence the eagerness with which he was brought before the public, led purposely perhaps by this very altar, which would on that account be pointed out to him and would form a natural topic for the opening of his speech.

It is scarcely necessary to add to these remarks, that the expression "too superstitious," as it appears in the original, was meant, no doubt, as a compliment, and not as a reproach, by characterising the people as one who displayed a high sense of Religion.

§ *St. Paul at Corinth and Cenchrea.*

Foundation of the Church of Corinth.

At Corinth the Apostle made a longer sojourn than in any other city during his journey. Here were written his *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, perhaps that also to the *Galatians*. Here, too, he probably received from Aquila and Priscilla the first intelligence of Christianity having been preached to the Romans. Here, lastly, (and it is with a view to this that we are arresting the reader's attention to Paul at Corinth,) he founded that Church, which, above all others, engaged his chief personal interest. In the minute internal regulations of this, more than of any other, he appears to have busied himself; and, accordingly, his *Epistles to the Corinthians* contain more information on the Church discipline of the Apostolic Age, than any other part of the New Testament. Indeed, in some few instances the points alluded to have so much the character of domestic detail, as scarcely to admit of illustration from the general history of the times.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Corinth may be considered as the boundary of this Apostolical journey, and the last regular scene of Paul's labours for the present. For, although we hear of him afterwards at Cenchrea, and again at Ephesus, his pause at the former place was only to perform a ceremony which he went through as a Jewish Christian; at the latter, to convey to the Asiatic continent Aquila and Priscilla. We have, however, particularly mentioned Cenchrea, in order to remind the reader that St. Paul here exhibited a striking illustration of the general principle which guided the Primitive Church, in regard to the observance of foreign rites and rules by its members. As a member of the Jewish Society, about to visit his own people, and not as a Christian, or as performing any duty to God, St. Paul on this occasion observed a form wholly Jewish. On the same principle he anxiously hastened to be present at Jerusalem by the approaching Festival, whilst he was insisting on the sinfulness of the Gentile convert, who should add to the Christian appointments the obligations of the Jewish Law. Thus, too, he circumcised Timothy, because his father was a Jew; but, although he was in the very seat and centre of Jewish prejudice, in Jerusalem, and even while the question was hotly agitated, he refused to allow Titus, the Gentile convert, to be circumcised.

Paul's observance of Jewish rites at Cenchrea.

ST. PAUL'S THIRD APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY.

A. D. 55 to 60.

Paul at Ephesus.

Of those places through which the route of the Apostle in his third official journey is marked, Ephesus was the principal scene of his labours. In his return from Greece to Palestine, he had touched at Ephesus, and there left Aquila and Priscilla, with a promise that he would himself soon visit them. This promise he now fulfilled. Passing through Galatia and Phrygia, he made Ephesus, for the time, his chief station in Asia, as on former occasions he had chosen Corinth in Greece. It was here, then, that all who dwelt in Asia, both Jews and Greeks, first heard the word from him. Among these may be numbered Epaphras, who not only became his convert, but probably his missionary to the neighbouring Colossians.* Of all the incidents, however, which mark Paul's residence at Ephesus, the most interesting, perhaps, is his meeting with certain disciples of John the Baptist.

§ *St. Paul and the Disciples of John the Baptist.*

No mention is made by any of the Evangelists of the disciples of John the Baptist, subsequently to their master's imprisonment and death. Probably the greater part of them became followers of Jesus, having been indeed called and instructed by John to this very end. Some notice of this transfer might have

---

* Pope's creed, as expressed in his Universal Prayer, was no other than this:

Father of all, in every age,
In every clime, ador'd;
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, and Lord.

† Βωμὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ.

‡ *Christo ut Deo carmen dicunt*, Plinii *Epist.* May not the remark, that Paul was a setter forth of strange *Gods*, because he preached *Jesus and the Resurrection*, have arisen from his statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, in reply to some question put to him concerning the new God? The opening of his speech obviously falls in with this view. Having first declared Him to be the same God who made the world, he was proceeding to speak of His manifestation in the flesh, *viz.* "the man whom He had ordained," when he was interrupted.

* *Colossians*, ch. i. v. 7.

History.

been intended in the formal embassy on which he sent them to our Saviour, when he found his own removal from them likely to be at hand. But before it actually took place, some might have quitted Palestine; and thus, although convinced by the preaching of Christ's forerunner, might have had no opportunity of attaching themselves either to Him or to the disciples of Him whose way their master had prepared. Such might have been the case with these, who, about twelve in number, were found by Paul at Ephesus. Apollos, one similarly circumstanced, had, before the Apostle's arrival, received Baptism from Aquila and Priscilla; and had already, from his eloquence and knowledge of the Scriptures, become eminently serviceable to the Christian cause in Achaia. As Apollos is said to have been of Alexandria, these others also might have come from the same place. Even so, their total ignorance of all that had occurred at Jerusalem during an interval of more than twenty years, on a subject which so nearly concerned them as the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the preaching and Baptizing of the Apostles; and this, too, notwithstanding their manifest expectation of the events, strongly confirms the remark formerly made, on the extreme tardiness with which intelligence of the several stages of the new dispensation was communicated, even between places the intercourse of which was the most frequent. Between Alexandria and Jerusalem there was at this time nearly as much intercourse, as between the Holy City and the remote parts of Judea itself; and the Passover, at least, was yearly attended by those of the Aramean party, with, perhaps, a more scrupulous punctuality than by the Jews who were resident in their native country.

Difference between the Baptisms of John and Paul.

The rebaptism of these disciples of John the Baptist, first by Aquila and Priscilla, and, in a second instance, by St. Paul, suggests an inquiry into what the difference was between the Baptism of John and that of Paul; which again leads us to ask, what was the difference between this last and that of Jesus Christ Himself.

John Baptized with water *only;* that is, there was no inward grace bestowed on the disciple through the ceremony. Baptism was only a sign of admission into the temporary society over which he presided; and as such, a pledge also that the initiated would conform to the rule of that society, Repentance.

But, while John Baptized, he pointed to the coming of Jesus, as of one who should "Baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire;" meaning, that His *Baptism* should be performed with water indeed, but not with water *only*—that the *immersion* and *sprinkling* should not be merely the sign of admission into a society, or the pledge of conformity with rules, but the appointed means for imparting the Holy Spirit. It was really then a Baptizing with the Holy Ghost, rather than with water; for the same reason as we should say, that he who was sent by the Prophet to wash in Jordan was cured, not by the washing, but by the secret grace attached to it; or, again, that it was not the clay on the blind man's eyes which restored him to sight, but the virtue which went forth from Jesus with the act of putting it on.

"With the Holy Ghost," says St. John, therefore, "He shall Baptize, and with fire;" that is, with the Holy Ghost, whose emblem and attesting sign shall be fire. He speaks of the flame which descended on the day of Pentecost, in proof of the true invisible descent of the Holy Ghost.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Such then was the Baptism of Jesus, as distinguished from that of John. Jesus Himself indeed Baptized not; but such was the Baptism of His followers. At the same time, an evident distinction obtains between this rite as performed by His disciples during his abode on earth, and as performed by those who after the day of Pentecost were enabled to fulfil His commission of Baptizing, not only in the name of the Father and of the Son, but also of the Holy Ghost. It was, doubtless, owing to this very ground of difference, that they were forbidden to enter upon their duties until the descent of the Holy Ghost had taken place. For, until that event, they could neither impart that holy gift to the initiated, nor have properly Baptized them in that name. It is plain, for the same reason, that whatever Baptisms took place during our Saviour's Ministry must have been similarly defective. And yet it would seem, that to that stage of Christian Baptism more especially John's words relate, "*when He shall come*, He shall Baptize you," &c. And, doubtless, they are to be so understood. The Baptism of Jesus, during His abode on earth, was defective; no more internal grace was conveyed at the time through it than through John's. But this was in conformity with the character of Christ's whole Ministry. It was imperfect *for the time*, but so framed as to become perfect afterwards. Those whom He Baptized by the hands of his Apostles and of the seventy, were in one sense incompletely Baptized; because the most important effects of the ceremony did not in these instances immediately follow the performance of it. Still, when He sent the Holy Spirit on them, He may be said to have Himself completed their Baptism, which was thus more honourable than any others could boast of receiving. With them the giving of the Holy Ghost was not by the agency of human Ministers, but immediately by their Lord and their God. Being Baptized too by a manifestation of the Holy Ghost, these had no more need to be rebaptized unto that name, in addition to the form wherewith they had already been admitted as disciples, than had the Apostles to be Baptized unto Christ, when called by Him in person. The presence of the Divine Being in each manifestation superseded and implied all that could be intended by specific Baptism unto that name, which, in each case, designated the person of the Godhead then present. None of Christ's disciples accordingly were rebaptized after the descent of the Holy Ghost;* but with John's, the case was widely different. On the present occasion it is particularly recorded, that Paul explained to them the difference, Baptized them in the Christian form, and imparted to them the Holy Ghost, testified by the gift of tongues and of Prophecy.

§ *Collections for the Poor of Jerusalem.*

(See *Acts*, ch. xvi. v. 22,—compared with *Corinthians*, ch. xvi.)

So repeated mention is made in the Epistles of St. Paul, of contributions for the relief of the Christians of Judæa, that it may be useful to notice this subject also in connection with the Apostle's stay at Ephesus.

* Tertullian mentions certain freethinkers of his day, who argued from this fact, that either Christian Baptism was not necessary to salvation, or else the Apostles were not saved. *De Baptismo*, c. 12.

History.

Whilst he was preparing to make personal excursions into the other parts of Asia, for the purpose of converting or confirming converts in the faith, Timothy and Erastus were despatched to Macedonia, to urge the claims of the necessitous brethren, and to hasten the contributions, so that he might find them ready on his arrival there. It may be necessary to remind the reader, who inquires why the Christians of Judæa especially should need this assistance, that, according to the prediction of the Prophets at Antioch, they had been distressed by a general scarcity of provisions, and that this was only a continuance of those charitable efforts, of which Antioch had set the example. It will be observed, however, that St. Paul advocates the cause of these his distressed brethren, not on the principle of mere benevolence, but as a *peculiar Christian duty;* with a view then of elucidating this principle, and thereby of explaining the true character of the numerous passages which refer to it, the subject has been noticed.

Unity of the Spirit.

Our Lord had, with peculiar emphasis, told His disciples, that He gave them one new commandment, which was to Love one another. This was the first precept which was given to them as a separate society. That it had reference only to their disposition and behaviour towards each other as members of such a body is evident. Else, the commandment could not be called new, inasmuch as His frequent injunctions to humility, and forgiveness of injuries, had much better title to this peculiar and emphatic appellation. So considered, the commandment was altogether new, because the object was new, the circumstances out of which the obligation arose were new. Of its solemn importance, and of its further enforcement by the Holy Spirit, under the expressions of "Unity" and "Unity of the Spirit," it is yet time to speak. Enough has been said to render the principle easily applicable, and, in the present instance especially, to mark its connection with St. Paul's earnestness, in urging the contribution on the brethren of every place *as a peculiar Christian duty*.

This, then, was the first occasion which was afforded to the whole Church of manifesting their Social Love, of evidencing the Unity of the Spirit, and as such we must consider the Apostle to be representing it. In order to be satisfied of this, we need only refer to one or two of the Apostle's injunctions, and either place them side by side with our Saviour's commandment, or consider them alone. Thus, the Lord had said, "A

St. John, xiii. 34, 35.

new command I give unto you, that you love one another. As I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if you love one another." The Apostle in

2 *Corinth.* ix. 13.

speaking of the contribution calls it "*the Experiment*," or "test," by means of which they glorify God for their professed subjection to the Gospel of Christ. To the Galatians before this, he had expressly sent a charge

Galatians, vi.

to "do good unto all men, but specially unto those who were of the household of faith." Those words of another Apostle, too, "whoso hath this world's goods and

1 St. John, iii. 17.

seeth *his brother* (τὸν ἀδελφὸν not πλησίον) in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how *dwelleth the love of God in him?*" seem cast, as it were, in the

Ibid. 11.

mould of the original commandment, "as I have loved you, that you also love one another;" and scarcely requires, that the writer should inform us, as he has done, that it is to that commandment he is alluding.

§ *St. Paul and the Corinthians.*

Apostolic Age Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Before we accompany the Apostle to another stage of his journey, we would advert once more to his connection with the Church of Corinth. The occasion is not unsuitable, because from Ephesus was written his first *Epistle to the Corinthians*, the design of which in part has been already noticed. His second followed after no very long interval.

Authority of the Governors of the Church

It would of course be incompatible with the scale of our inquiry, to discuss generally the matter and character of these *Epistles*. Mention has been made of them with no further view, than to remind the reader of the tone of authority which the Apostle assumes in them, over the offending members of the Church to which they are addressed; and this, not as vested in him alone, but as exercised by the Governors of that Church. There, indeed, it would seem to have been properly lodged, for he would willingly, as he writes, have spared himself the task of interposing his extraordinary right as Apostle, in order to enforce a discipline which of themselves they were competent to preserve, and which, as the event shows, they did maintain without his further interference.

About the same time also, (as may be inferred from his first *Epistle to Timothy,*) Alexander and Hymenæus were made examples to the Church, of the right vested in its Governors of punishing its members. Some few remarks on the nature and origin of this right, therefore, may not be inappropriate here. As, in each instance, the sentence is styled "a delivery of the person unto Satan," the true import of that expression also should be determined.

Its origin

That no Society can exist without some rules, and without some means of enforcing obedience to those rules, is obvious. When therefore the question is asked, whether Christ or the Holy Spirit left any Ecclesiastical Laws, or vested anywhere power to enforce those Laws? if the question is put with a view to ascertain whether Church Government be of divine origin, it is idle; inasmuch as the institution of the Ecclesiastical Society, the Church, implies the design that Rules should be established, and means provided to enforce them.

But another object may be intended by the question. It may be put with the view of ascertaining what those Rules are, whereby this Society, the Church, is designed to be governed. For, it may be said, and plausibly enough, that granting the intention of the Church's founder to have Laws established to be ever so apparent, how are we to know *what kind of government* is intended?

On one point the inquirer must satisfy himself. If, from the nature of the Church, and from existing circumstances, the members were already possessed of the means of acquiring this knowledge, in that case neither Christ nor the Holy Spirit would be likely to leave any code of Ecclesiastical Laws, on precisely the same principle as no code of Ethics was left.

Ecclesiastical offences

Now, is there any thing in the nature of the Church to guide us, as to what are Ecclesiastical offences? Undoubtedly there is. In every Society there must be such a principle, and by reference to it in each, are formed laws for the government of each. Every Society recognises peculiar offences, arising out of, and depending solely on the peculiar nature of the Society; so that in proportion as this latter is understood, the former are defined. Much mischievous confusion

History.

in some instances arises from a want of attention to this connection; and the attention is frequently diverted from it by the accidental circumstance, that the same act often becomes an offence against many Societies. Thus, Theft is at once an offence against the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, against the Political body to which the theft is attached, against some certain class of Society, perhaps, in which he moves, and so on. The act being one, it is only by reflection that we are enabled to separate the different views which render it in each case an offence, and in each of a different magnitude. Again, what becomes a crime because violating the principle of one Society, may be none in another; if, namely, it does not interfere with the object proposed in the formation and preservation of that other Society. Thus, the violation of the Academical Rules of our Universities does not render the offending member amenable to the laws of the land. Thus, too, the very conduct which recommends a smuggler or a robber to his confederacy, becomes an offence against the Political body with which he is associated.

In order, therefore, to ascertain what are inherent offences or crimes in any Society, it is necessary that we should know with what object or objects such Society is formed. If information of this kind then be found in the Sacred record respecting the Christian Society, Ecclesiastical Law by Revelation was no more to be expected than a code of Ethics, to tell men what their own consciences were already constituted by God to declare.

And punishments.

It is certain, however, that if the question need not be answered in the affirmative, in order either to establish the divine origin of Ecclesiastical Government, or to determine what offences come under its cognizance, there is yet a third object which may be proposed in urging it. What *punishments* are authorized, in order to check those offences? Ought not these to have been specified? and, not having been specified, does the nature of the case here also supersede the necessity of a Revelation, and enable us to know what coercion is, and what is not, agreeable to the Divine Will? The inquiry, too, seems to be the more reasonable, because in looking to the methods by which various societies are upheld, we find the punishment even in similar societies by no means the same. Military Discipline, for instance, in different countries, and at different periods, has been enforced by penalties unlike in degree and in kind. In different countries and ages, the social tie between the Master and the Slave has been differently maintained. All this is true, but still, in looking at the question so, we take only a partial view, and lose one important feature in the establishment of coercion,—the Right.

Exclusion from itself an inherent Right of every Society.

Now, this Right is either inherent in the Society, or conventional, or both, as is the case in most confederate bodies. When the Right is limited to what the Society exercises as inherent and indispensable, inherent in its nature, and indispensable to its existence, the extreme punishment is Exclusion; and the various degrees and modifications of punishment, are only degrees and modifications of Exclusion. When the Right is conventional also, (as far as it is so,) the punishment is determined by arbitrary enactment, proceeding from some authority acknowledged by all parties, (whether that authority be lodged in the parties themselves, or in competent representatives, or in other delegated persons,) and therefore styled conventional. Few Societies have ever existed without a large portion of these latter. Hence the anomaly above alluded to, and hence too the vulgar impression, that all punishments are arbitrary, and depend solely on the caprice and judgment of the Government. What is popularly and emphatically termed *Society*, affords a good instance of the first, that is, of a social union regulated and maintained only by a Right inherent. In this, excessive ill-manners and the gross display of ungentlemanly feelings are punished by absolute Exclusion. According as the offence is less, the party offending is for a time excluded from some select *portion* of good Society, or from certain meetings and the like, in which more particularly the spirit and genuine character of gentility are to be cherished. All its lawful and appropriate punishments are a system of Exclusion, in various shapes and degrees.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Now it is obvious, that no *authority* is ever here appealed to in any case; because the Right arises out of, and is inseparable from the Society that exercised it, is implied in the very existence of the Society. In like manner, when the Christian searches the New Testament for positive enactments against offences to which the Church may be exposed, and finds none, it cannot nevertheless be said, that the omission leaves the nature of the punishment arbitrary or conventional. It obviously sanctions those which are coexistent with the Church, and which must therefore claim the same origin and foundation as the Church itself. It does more, *it sanctions only these.*

In applying these principles to the Government of the Church, it is not intended to represent the subject as left wholly to be gathered from the nature of the Christian Society, or as if no reference were found in the New Testament to particular points of Ecclesiastical Government. Not only does the case selected for consideration prove that it is otherwise, but many expressions and passages may be cited from other parts of Scripture, as of similar import. All that is here asserted is, that these are only illustrations of, and allusions to, the principles of the Ecclesiastical Society; which principles, thus exemplified and illustrated, are sufficient to direct us in all cases. So, (to allude once more to the analogous case of the Christian Code of Morals,) rules may be found without number in the Sacred Volume, but they are employed only in *illustration* of the great Christian principles, which, thus acknowledged and sanctioned, were to be our guide.

The Jewish Temple a special Type of the Christian Church.

In determining the true nature and object of the Church or Christian Society, no small assistance is derived from the emblematical character of its special Type, the Jewish Temple. It was formed for the residence of the Holy Spirit, to be the medium of its operations. Look through the Scriptural marks attached to it, and this truth everywhere meets the eye. It may be recognised in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper;* and in those many mysterious allusions which lie scattered throughout the record of our blessed Lord's words, especially in the Gospel of St. John. His writings are indeed inexplicable, unless we assign such a meaning, not to a few remarkable passages, but to a train of recurring allusions to this abode of God amongst His people; allusions in this Apostle's case perhaps the more frequent, because naturally suggested by the recollection of those holy moments, when he used to

* "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have *no life in you.*" John, ch. vi. v. 53.

History.

lean on the bosom of his Master. What other view will sufficiently explain the mysterious expressions of that Prayer, which the Saviour offered up for his future Church, on His approaching separation from those who were to be the founders of it. "Neither for these alone, (prayed He,) but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word. That they all may be one; *as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.*"* And again, "the Glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given them;† that they may be one, even as We are one; *I in them, and Thou in Me*, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me." "If a Man love Me, he will keep my words; and My Father will love him, and We will come unto him, *and make Our abode with him.*"‡

Reference of Ecclesiastical Punishment to this Type.

Here, then, is the principle by which all Ecclesiastical discipline, by whomsoever exercised, must be regulated. To this, accordingly, St. Paul especially refers, when pointing out to the Corinthians, that what had occurred amongst them came under the head of Ecclesiastical offences, and as such ought to be punished by the Rulers of the Church. "Know ye not that ye are the Temple of the Holy Ghost, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" "If any one destroy, (defile) the Temple of God, him will God destroy, for the Temple is sanctified to God, which Temple ye are."

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

All Ecclesiastical offences, then, become such on the principle, that they are inconsistent with the *residence* of the Holy Spirit in the Church, or with his *operations*.* By this, the Apostles were regulated; much more, then, their successors. Ananias's visitation was the first instance of the infliction of Ecclesiastical punishment, and it is expressly said to have been for an offence against the Holy Ghost. Certainly, to determine what behaviour constitutes an offence of this kind, supposes a knowledge of what is inconsistent with the abode of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and also what his operations are; and these are matters of Revelation,—seen, doubtless, with more or less clearness, (as all other matters of instruction are,) in proportion as men exert their faculties to understand, and God sees good to bless that exertion.

Thus much may be sufficient, on the nature of offences against the Church, for the reader to understand the principle which renders them such; and it now remains to inquire, what are the proper penalties?

The same method will be adopted as in the former case, *viz.* first, to consider what practices would naturally result from the principles laid down; and then, to see whether the Sacred writings contain or allude to such a system of coercion, as we may have been thus led to infer. It was observed, then, that *the inherent right* of every Society was exclusion in its various gradations: that every Society must possess this, but nothing beyond this, as an inherent right. Whatever punishments are adopted by any Society, must be founded on a right created by the permission of its members, if its formation was a matter of choice to them, or by the compelling person, if it was a matter of compulsion. Now, apply this to the case of the Church. There is a Society left by its founder without any penal code; and the question is, whether any right of punishment therefore is vested in it, and of what punishment? Exclusion, or Excommunication, in all its shades and degrees, presents itself as a kind of penalty, the infliction of which is an inherent and perpetual right. Referring to the pages of Apostolical History, we see every reason to conclude from the incidental allusions to Ecclesiastical discipline, that such was the mode of coercion sanctioned by the infallible guides and founders of the Church. Our Saviour's direction had been, "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; *but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen*

Excommunication sanctioned by the Apostles.

---

* St. John, ch. xvii. v. 20, *et seq.*

† Alluding to his promise of the Comforter, that Gift for which He was to ascend on high in order that He might give it to Man, and for which it was expedient that He should go away.

This Glory is attributed to whatever, from time to time, was the appointed residence of the Godhead. As this residence was chiefly manifested by the symbol of Light, the word Glory expressed the Light also.

When Moses desired to have a manifestation of the Lord, his request was, "I beseech Thee, show me My Glory," (*Exod.* ch. xxxiii. v. 8.) In like manner, it is said, that "The Glory of the Lord filled the Tabernacle," (*Exod.* ch. xl. v. 35,) and "the House of the Lord," meaning the Light from the Cherubim.

Accordingly, when Isaiah prophecied of the manifestation of God in Christ, he says, "The Glory of the Lord shall be revealed," (Isaiah, ch. xl. v. 5.) And St. John, alluding to the Prophet's vision, "these things spake Esaias, when he saw His *Glory*," (ch. xii. v. 41,) and again, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt, (or tabernacled) amongst us, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father," ch. i.

So, too, when Christ speaks of His Church, as the future residence of the Godhead in the person of the Holy Spirit, he expresses Himself in allusions to this Symbol; although that Symbol was no longer to be given to a people destined to "walk by faith, and not *by sight*." His Apostles continued to adopt the same language concerning the Church. St. Peter writes, "The Spirit of Glory and of God resteth upon you," (1 Peter, ch. iv. v. 14.) St. Paul speaks of "Christ's glorious Church," and, in his comparison between the Mosaic and Christian dispensation, the Divine Presence in each is expressed in the same figurative language. "If the ministration of Death written and engraven on stones, was *glorious*, so that the Children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the Glory of his countenance; which Glory was to be done away: How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather *glorious?*" And, so continuing and explaining the image, he at length proceeds to say that we, the Church of Christ, are not only, as were the Jews, *spectators of the Glory*, but its abode and resting place, as it were. "But we *all* with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are *changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.*" (2 *Corinthians*, ch. iii.)

The latter part of this sentence, in the original, is ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου πνεύματος, of which the former words are, as Macknight observes, "an Hebraism denoting a continued succession and increase of Glory," see Ps. lxxxiv. v. 7, the latter an expression formed obviously in conformity with this Hebraism, of which it is an appendage and explanation; it was used to denote that he was not speaking of any *visible glory*, but of the divine Spirit, of whose indwelling it had been the ancient symbol.

‡ John, ch. xiv. v. 23.

---

* Hence our Lord's words, "He that speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, *neither in this world*, nor in the *world to come*;" that is, he shall be amenable to the Church as a criminal, as well as to God as a Sinner. The assertion is a plain disavowal on the part of Christ, of His being the *ruler of the Church*. The whole passage may be referred to, as deserving the most attentive consideration. Our Lord's remark had been, that His casting out Devils by the Spirit of God was a Sign that the Kingdom of God was coming on them unawares. In this Kingdom, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, was ruler and governor, and blasphemy was treason.

History.

man and a publican." To the Corinthian Church the Apostle's rebuke simply is, "Ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned that he that hath done this deed *might be taken away from among you.*" And a little after, he adds, in explanation of certain figurative expressions with which he had been illustrating the same principle, "I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat."*

Deliverance to Satan.

Among the various terms in which the energetic language of the offended Apostle gives vent to his meaning, occurs the expression, "to deliver over the person to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." In this, then, there would seem to be something more implied than mere excommunication. It is spoken of, too, as a sentence proceeding by peculiar right from himself, and not, as the other, from one vested in the Church as a body. Whether in the present instance it was executed or only threatened is not explicitly stated; that it was actually inflicted on Hymenæus and Alexander, and by St. Paul, is proved by his *Epistle to Timothy*.

Here, then, the inquiry concerning the right of punishment takes apparently a new turn. The inquirer having satisfied himself that the Church has the right of Exclusion, as well from its nature, as from the allusions to the exercise of such a right in the Apostolical writings, perceives, in the course of his search, instances of punishment which seem to wear a different character, and looks for some different principle to which he may refer them. He recollects, that not only those above-mentioned were delivered over to Satan by St. Paul, but, what is more unequivocally expressed, and more awful in its character, that Ananias, the first offender against the Church, was visited with death. And that there may be no misapprehension as to the nature of his crime, it is called an offence against the Holy Ghost—against Him whose Temple we are, as a Church. From the savage and unholy practices which have defiled that Temple of the all-merciful God, in the rash assumption of some other right than the right of exclusion, and to sanction which these instances have been alleged, the member of the English Church turns with abhorrence. He searches for any other principle and any other right in vain. Moreover, these very instances require only a humble consideration to set them also in the manifest light of cases of Exclusion.

Death of Ananias.

To understand this, it is necessary to state what is meant by Exclusion or Excommunication from the Church. Evidently, it is not exclusion from any particular place, for the Church is not such; but from certain common privileges. These are the benefits of the Christian covenant, or of any portion of it. Now let us see whether this, and no more, was not the case with those whom St. Paul delivered over to Satan.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

In those days the *presence* of the Holy Ghost was manifested by extraordinary signs, that is, certain sensible tokens were given in testimony of it. The presence of the Evil Being was in like manner manifested or evidenced by Possession and its various symptoms. Now, what is more natural than that in the same dispensation, as the *presence* of God's Spirit in the Christian was made visible by an appropriate sign, so the removal of its protection, and the abandonment of its object for a season to the enemy, should be evidenced by some corresponding sign of evil agency, such as, for instance, marked the case of a Demoniac. And, as the power of causing the former sign to appear was vested only in the Apostles, the case would naturally be the same with respect to the sign of evil, or the sign of desertion. It is to be remembered, that there was, that there is, no intermediate condition between the absence of the Holy Spirit and the presence of the Evil Spirit; and where the influence of the one ceases, that of the other must begin. "He that is not with me," (said our Lord,) "is against me,"—all is Mammon's that is not God's.

On the same principle, the case of Ananias may perhaps be explained. It was *perpetual exclusion* from God's Church, accompanied by the *only sign which could prove that the Spiritual punishment was such.* Why that offence was so visited is not now important. Most probably, (as was elsewhere suggested,) it was an attempt to elude the extraordinary suggestions of the Spirit; and if so, the more appropriate seems the extraordinary mark of Spiritual punishment.

It is by no means necessary, however, to the correctness of the view here taken of Ecclesiastical discipline, that the nature of Ananias's crime and punishment should be shown not to form any exception to it. Like the pardoning of the thief on the cross, it arose out of circumstances which cannot recur in the ordinary course of the world; circumstances not only extraordinary, but of those so characterised, the most solemn and important. The one was a remarkable specimen of mercy and forgiveness, and as such as fitly appended to the scene in which God was exhibiting himself as our Saviour; the other, an awful instance of severity and punishment, and no less properly attached to the scene in which God was exhibiting himself as the Ruler of his people.

But it may be urged, do not these remarks lead to a suspicious conclusion? If the case be so, Ecclesiastical punishments would be attended with Spiritual privations. For although all extraordinary signs are withheld, still this is no reason for presuming that the sentence of the Church should be less effectual. The extraordinary manifestation in this, as in the analogous instance of the Gifts of the Spirit, was only a *proof* of the reality of that which was invisible and insensible; and it has been already shown, that the cessation of these *visible and sensible signs*, without further proof, leaves the Christian bound to believe in the continuance of all the invisible operations, to which, for a time, they bore testimony. Now would not this be a perverse proceeding which should deprive the culprit of Grace and assistance, at the very time when most he needs it? It does not deprive him of it. It only sets on him the mark of that privation which would at all events have taken place. Thus, Exclusion from good company does not *cause*, but only indicates ill-manners. If God's Spirit prevents and assists the Christian in proportion

* This was an allusion to the *Agapæ*, or Love-feasts, which formed the least important act of Christian communion. It is unreasonable to interpret it of *all intercourse* with the offending brother; which was a prohibition as much beyond the boundary of Church discipline, as it was inconsistent with the Apostle's remark on another occasion, that if a Christian were perversely and superstitiously to abstain from commerce with all but the faithful, he must go out of the world. It was of St. Peter's withdrawing himself from this *test* of communion with the Gentile converts, that St. Paul chiefly complained in the memorable struggle for Christian equality at Antioch, "For before that certain came from James, he did *eat with the Gentiles.*" *Galatians*, ch. ii. v. 12.

History.

to his own exertions, he must always have less and less in proportion as he needs it more. But surely a change of circumstances may make him more ready to attend to the feeble voice, than he was before, when it was louder. Israel may hear in Babylon what it would not hear in Judea. And such, as far as regards the offender, is really the object of Excommunication. If inflicted on an innocent person, it could, of course, have no more evil effect, than Baptism or the Lord's Supper would have a good one on a person who receives either unworthily.

Ill effects resulting from the disuse of Ecclesiastical censures.

Ecclesiastical censures have, however, fallen into disuse amongst us; and whatever be the counterbalancing benefits of this disuse, it has been attended with one ill effect. The wholesome association between the outward form and the inward benefit of Church communion, is no longer generally *felt*. Absence from the Sacraments and from public worship has lost the character of privation; and whilst the Apostles and early preachers laboured only to direct their congregations to a proper behaviour at the Lord's Table and in the public assemblies, with our Ministers now, not the least difficult portion of exhortation is employed in persuading them to attend.

Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

A. D. 57.

For a further account of those offenders in the Church of Corinth, whose case has furnished the ground for these remarks, we may refer to the Apostle's *Second Epistle* to that Church. In order that the matter might be settled without his personal interference, he prolonged his stay at Ephesus; expecting to hear a favourable account of the impression made by his *First Epistle*. Meantime, an occurrence took place which hastened his departure. In his former journey, the cure of the Pythoness excited the ill-will of her master, whose gains were at an end, and caused the first persecution of his party which originated with the Idolatrous Gentiles. At Ephesus, the famous seat of the Temple of Diana, and "of the Image which fell down from heaven," he was exposed even to greater danger, from the tendency of his doctrine to ruin all those trades which depended for their support on Idolatry and false worship. Demetrius, a silversmith, entered into a combination with those of his own trade; and the tumult excited by the appeal made to the superstitious feelings of the multitude in behalf of their tutelary Goddess, whose shrine they represented as likely to be forsaken, was with some difficulty appeased. St. Paul, after having been subjected to one night's imprisonment, thought it prudent to withdraw for the time, and to pursue his journey at once to Corinth. The prejudice, however, which now began to be awakened against Christianity, was not of a character likely to pass away with the occasion. Throughout the world, the livelihood of a portion of every community arose out of the sale of images, the decoration of Temples, and, more than all, the rearing of victims for the Festivals. In proportion as Christianity spread, this circumstance would form an increasing source of opposition in the Idolatrous world, scarcely less active and determined than that which was caused by Jewish prejudice among the more enlightened portion of mankind. The complaints and informations which from time to time were laid before the Magistrates, against this "pestilent sect," as it was termed, although made under the various pleas of loyalty, patriotism, or piety, originated, for the most part, as in the case of Demetrius, out of self-interest Pliny, whose account deserves credit as an official document, and as the result of an investigation made by a highly-gifted mind, evidently saw through all this; and accordingly he mentions, as the best proof and symptom of returning order and content produced by his measures, that the victims were once more brought to market, and that the altars blazed. As yet, however, the Church was too insignificant to attract the notice of the Imperial Government, although the tumult at Ephesus proves that it was spreading fast.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews. Dereliction of Gentiles. Idolatry.

It was not until St. Paul's arrival in Greece, that he received any tidings of the Corinthians; to whom he immediately addressed his *Second Epistle*, to prepare them for his coming. To Corinth, accordingly, he proceeded, and made it, as before, the boundary of his third Apostolical journey. It is not, however, improbable, that but for his anxiety to be at Jerusalem in time for the approaching Festival, he would now have attempted to pass over into Italy, and visit Rome. The information which he had received respecting that important Church, could not but have rendered him anxious to perform his errand as soon as might be amongst them. His *Epistle* to it, written from Corinth, amply testifies this; and explains the cause of his anxiety. Converted as it would seem by Jewish Christians, whose eyes were not yet open to the true nature of St. Paul's mission, they had received the same erroneous impression respecting the obligation of the old Law on the converted Idolater, which still prevailed in the great body of the Church at Jerusalem. Accordingly, the whole tenour of his *Epistle* bespeaks an anxiety to remove this mistake; and the strong terms in which he has, naturally enough, advocated the independence of the Gentiles, by speaking of them as, equally with the Jewish people, "elect" by the foreknowledge of God, are remarkable for the striking transcript which they present of the Apostle's anxious zeal, in endeavouring to effect by letter what circumstances prevented him from doing in person.

§ *St. Paul and the Ephesian Presbyters.*

St. Paul's company on his return was increased by the addition of those deputed from the several Churches to convey their respective contributions to Jerusalem. It was a journey of no small risk. Independently of the Prophetic bodings with which the Holy Spirit addressed him by sundry individuals as he passed onwards, he could not but feel that his mission to the Gentiles had rendered his life unsafe any where among his countrymen. And what could he expect at Jerusalem? His very departure from Corinth was marked with plots against him, which obliged him to change his intention of going by sea, and to retrace his steps through Achaia and Macedonia. Mitylene, Chios, Samos, Trogyllium, and Miletus, formed the next line of his course; and by this time the Feast of Pentecost, at which, for some reason, he earnestly desired to be present, was so near as to render it impossible that he should visit Ephesus, which he thought it equally incumbent on him to do. To obviate this difficulty, he requested the attendance of the Ephesian Elders or Presbyters at Miletus; a circumstance which is here noticed, because in the interview which thereupon took place, he reminds them that the Holy Ghost had made them Bishops, (ἐπισκόπους) a term which has not before occurred in the Sacred narrative. Having, in the last Section, examined into the nature of offences against the Church, and of the

History. penalties due to them, we will take this occasion of inquiring, with whom the power of inflicting and removing these penalties was lodged; and not only this power, but all other authority and administration, whether supreme or subordinate. For other points connected with this subject, the reader may turn to the head BISHOP in our MISCELLANEOUS DIVISION.

Inquiry into their institution and uses. One previous caution may, perhaps, be requisite. Various objections have been urged from time to time against our Church government, against the three Orders of the Church, and the functions which they respectively exercise. To answer these merely by an attempt to prove their existence in the Apostolical Age, and their Scriptural sanction, is to allow the objector an unfair advantage, and to submit our own minds to an unfair view of the question. The proof of the contrary rests with those who object. We find these matters so established, and tracing them further and further back, we still find evidence of them, without any coincident marks of human innovation. Trying them by the *touchstone* of Scripture, they are found to be at least not inconsistent with its records; and we have, therefore, *no right* to annull them. This was the Spirit of the Reformation in England; and on this principle it has taught us, thus far shalt thou go, and no further.

There are two questions which in a discussion of this point require distinct consideration. The first is, what were the Orders of the Primitive Church? The second, were they intended altogether, or partly, or not at all, as models for the formation of Ecclesiastical establishments of aftertimes? As to the first question, it may admit of a different answer from different periods of the Apostolical history; inasmuch as the Church economy was certainly not framed at once, but rose progressively with the exigencies of the Church. At the very period on which we are now dwelling, it will be obvious, that the terms Bishop and Presbyter were applied equivocally.*

1. The Assembly, or ἐκκλησία, must from its nature have been the only Order, besides that of the Apostles, on the first attempt of the Christians to act as a Society. All Christians composed this body, and the term, in short, signified the Church. But whether this general Assembly at any period exercised any elective, legislative, or other powers, may perhaps be questioned. No doubt the Church or Assembly is mentioned as taking part with the Presbyters in the elections and enactments; but when we consider the immense concourse, which a general meeting would suppose in the very earliest times, is it likely that any one *private room* would be found capable of containing all? On the other hand, is it likely that in Jerusalem especially, so large a multitude would be permitted to meet *in public*, openly discuss their affairs, and take measures for the support and propagation of obnoxious doctrines, when even individuals were exposed to continual risk in their preaching and other Ministry? The meetings of Christians for purposes of prayer, and other devotional exercises, must, for the same reason, have taken place in different houses assigned for the purpose. And this (as has been before observed) may illustrate the expression used by the Historian in his account of Paul's search after the Disciples "in every one of the houses," (κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους;) which, no doubt, implies, that he obtained information concerning their several places of meeting, and by going from one to another at the time of prayer was sure of taking some. The same allusion may be perceived in St. Paul's expression of "the Church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla," &c. Such a division of the Christian body into separate congregations would require the appointment of some one, at least, to preside over and officiate in each, and also of some one or more subordinate Ministers, such as have been before noticed. When, therefore, we read that a decree was made, &c. by the Apostles, Presbyters, and the whole Church, one of two things must be supposed to have taken place. Either the Presbyters took each the sense of his own congregation, or the Presbyters and other official persons, it may be, met as the representatives each of his own body, and all of the Church collectively.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

The former supposition is certainly encumbered with more and greater difficulties than the latter. The subject proposed at these Christian meetings seems, from the tenour of the narrative throughout, to have been then first presented to the Church in any shape; and the decisions took place before the meeting was dissolved. There are no marks of any previous notice of the matter to be discussed, so as to enable the several Presbyters to consult the opinions and wishes of their constituents; and the decision took place without any interval to allow of an after consultation.

Against the remaining supposition, namely, that the Presbyters and other official persons, perhaps, met as the plenipotentaries each of his own body, the strongest obstacle lies in the phrase, "It seemed good to the Presbyters and to the whole Church." Now this expression, after all, may imply no more than that it seemed good to the Presbyters, and whatever other members of the Council, in conjunction with them, may be called the whole Church, because appointed to represent it. In like manner, when the Council of Jerusalem declared respecting their famous Decree, that "it seemed good to them *and* to the Holy Ghost," our knowledge of the relation in which these stood to one another, prevents all doubt; but the expression itself, without any such clue, would make it questionable, whether the Council and the Holy Spirit were not recorded as two separate sources of the Ecclesiastical authority from which the Decree had emanated. Now the sentences on which we ground our conjectures respecting the authority of the whole Christian body, are precisely so circumstanced.

Apostolical origin of Episcopacy

The appointment of Deacons has been elsewhere discussed, and the origin of the Presbytery now suggested. The Order of Bishops therefore only remains to be accounted for. At the period of St. Paul's summons to the Church of Ephesus, no such Order could have existed there; and, if not in so large and important a Church, probably no where. The *title* cannot imply it, for it is one used for all the Presbyters of Ephesus; and their number proves that he was not addressing Bishops, for they came from one Church. Again, although the word occurs elsewhere in St. Paul's *Epistles*, it cannot intend one chief governor of any Church; because his *Epistles* are addressed to the Churches, as to bodies of men in whom all the authority was vested. The term Bishop became afterwards appropriated to an Order, of which we cannot infer the existence, certainly from any expression of St. Luke. How such an Order should have arisen, it is not difficult to discover. St.

* Theology, like every other system, has its *technical* terms. In a *system of Theology*, then, we should be startled to find such various uses of the same important term. But the Bible is not a *system of Theology*, and has not any technical language. Its use is to furnish matter which the Church digests—to *prove* what the Church *teaches*.

History.

Paul's *Epistles to Timothy* and *Titus* present us with at least its embryo form. Not only are both commissioned to ordain Ministers, to determine matters left undetermined, and to inflict Ecclesiastical punishments even to Excommunication; but their respective Dioceses are distinctly marked out. Ephesus was assigned to Timothy, Crete to Titus. At the same time it would certainly seem that, in Timothy's case especially, the appointment was rather that of *locum tenens* for the Apostle, and so far a temporary office. But this, far from being an objection to the Apostolical authority of Episcopacy, really supplies us with the clue to trace its origin and object. What was needed for a time at Ephesus or Crete, in the temporary absence of the presiding Apostle, would be permanently requisite, when death for ever deprived these Churches of Apostolical superintendence. The same cause, in short, which produced the appointment of Presbyters, continued, as the number of congregations in each Church increased, to render the rise of a new Order equally necessary. A small Presbytery, occasionally visited by an Apostle, might not require a head; but a large one, especially as the Apostles were removed by death or accident, would soon feel this want. That such an Order was required before the close of the Apostolic era, the then state of Christianity would render of itself nearly certain. Although at the time of the appointments of Titus and Timothy they may not have been general, yet when St. John wrote his *Revelations* each of the Seven Churches of Asia had its own Bishop. And if this were so in that district, which then alone enjoyed the guidance of an Apostle, much more was it likely to have been the case elsewhere. St. John, we know, addressed them as *Angels;* but whether by a figure of speech, or because such was at that time their only designation, no candid mind can doubt that an Episcopal Order is intended; and that to them, as such, commands and revelations were given by God through his last Apostle. Thus, Episcopacy would seem to be the finishing of the Sacred Edifice, which the Apostles were commissioned to build. Until this was completed and firm, they presented themselves as props to whatever part required such support. One by one they were withdrawn; and at length the whole building having "grown together into an holy Temple,"* the Lord's promise was fulfilled to the one surviving Apostle. He only tarried until God's last Temple was complete, and the Lord's second "coming unto it† had been announced by an especial vision.‡

* *Eph.* ch. ii. v. 21.

† See Malachi, ch. iii. v. 1.

‡ The Revelation to St. John, in the close of his life, presents several obvious points of connection with the Prophetic promise, that he should tarry until the Lord's coming. Throughout the Scriptures, and especially in our Saviour's language, the Christian Church is designated by the emblem of the Temple. Its foundation stones, its corner stone, its Holy of Holies, its One High Priest, are images familiar to the sacred writers. Nor is the connection to be considered as fanciful, and merely founded on a convenient source of illustration. The Temple, its uses, and its ordinances were designed, like the other portions of the Older Establishment, as types of the New. It was, therefore, the image in which ancient Prophecy represented the future Church. Of this last Temple it was foretold, that its Glory should surpass Solomon's; and into this, it is, that Malachi proclaimed the Lord's coming. *The final mode of divine residence*, intended by this coming, commenced when the various parts of the Church were completed, and the extraordinary portions removed. St. John was permitted to see all ready for this before his death. He was permitted to do more. The future fate and history of that figurative Temple was revealed to him, at the time his Master came to announce the filling of it with his glory. The Prophetic History is of course all that concerned us, the fulfilment of the promise only him. Yet he has not left the former without a memorandum, as it were, of the import of that Revelation to him. The terms in which it opens are, "Behold he *cometh;*" and the close, "He which testifieth these things, saith "Surely, I *come* quickly: Amen. Even so, *come* Lord Jesus."

There is still another point to be settled. Was this form of Church government intended to be perpetual, and universal,—is it enjoined on all Christian Societies in every Age? Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

On the one hand, it may be urged, that as the constitution of the Church was only what was then most convenient for the support and propagation of Religion, whenever that end may be better attained by any alteration or deviation, the innovators are acting up to the spirit of the original institution, and thereby are more truly followers of the Apostles, than those who sacrifice the *object* to the observance of the *means*, which were only valuable as regards that object. Those who maintain the other side of the question may assert, that these being the means originally appointed by the Holy Spirit, through which his office as governor of the Church was to be exercised, we have no right to alter them, any more than we are authorized to alter the means of Grace, unless some positive permission can be shown; and that it is, moreover, a wicked presumption to suppose, that any other means, (however humanly probable,) would more truly obtain the object of Church government. As a reason why it should not be positively enjoined, we may suggest, that it was not like an abstract doctrine or precept, the only safe form of recording which is by "the written word," but a matter *which is its own record*. Like the Mysteries of the Heathen, it was a practical document; the daily and continual practice of the Church, multiplying continually from one Age to another, superseded all need of other record. Permanency of this Order.

Much of this latter statement is doubtless unanswerable. At the same time, it would be uncharitable and unchristian to pronounce those to be no members of Christ's Church, who regulate their community without Bishops. The particular arrangement of Ministerial Orders is of course the means, and the preservation of the Gospel the end. Whether those, who have in any instance deviated from the pure Apostolic practice, had cause to justify such a departure, (and such a case doubtless is supposable,) must be a point between God and the Church itself. The case of those, too, who find themselves by birth members of such a Society, is to be distinctly separated from that of those, with whom the innovation originated.

Some departure in the form of government, from the pattern of the Primitive Church, has necessarily taken place in every community, nor does this departure of itself imply presumption; else, where is the *authority* of the Church? A very large community, for instance, has everywhere required a new Order above Bishops themselves; and this need being manifest, the appointment of the Archiepiscopal office is as purely consonant to the Apostolical views, as that of subordinate Bishops. Thus, too, Catechists were once needed, and used as long as they were needed. The Choro-episcopi served, in like manner, to meet another occasional emergency.

No Church has ever more anxiously and conscientiously shaped its course by the Spirit, and by the very letter of the Apostolic precedents, than has the Church

History.

of England. And yet even that Church has found circumstances powerful enough to justify a deviation scarcely less momentous, in the transfer of supreme Ecclesiastical authority to the Civil magistrate. It is not merely a variation from the original architecture of Christ's Holy building, which constitutes disproportion and deformity. We must look also to the changing features of the scene around, and see whether these have not demanded corresponding alterations, and let these be the measure of our judgment.

§ *St. Paul at Jerusalem.*

Prophetic warnings to St. Paul.

St. Paul's interview with the Ephesian Elders was rendered peculiarly solemn and affecting, from a feeling of which he himself partook, that death awaited him at Jerusalem.* Still he went on, and the Prophetic warnings which pursued him, and the anxious entreaties of his friends, continued to confirm his fears, and to sadden his pilgrimage, without inducing him to discontinue it. On his arrival at Cæsaræa especially, Agabus came from Judæa, and, by virtue of his Prophetic gift, told him expressly by symbol and by word, that the Jews should bind him, and deliver him over to the Gentiles. So that he arrived at Jerusalem fully apprized of the persecution which he was to encounter, and uncertain whether his life would be spared or not. The terms of Agabus's prediction would be more likely to portend death; For in that he was to be bound by the Jews, and delivered up to the Gentiles, the fate of his Lord and Master could not but recur to him, and seem likely to be now his own: nor was it, perhaps, any slight support to him in his perseverance, that he seemed, in thus pressing on to Jerusalem, in spite of his own forebodings, and of the remonstrance of others, to be imitating Him. The studious imitation of Christ, wherever any similarity of circumstances could be perceived and felt, forms a marked feature in the lives, not only of the Apostles, but of the Primitive worthies who inherited their tone of Christian feeling.†

He declares his Apostleship to the Idolatrous Gentiles.

On other grounds he had reason to surmise that his work was finished. His third Apostolical journey was now ended, and the conversion of the Gentiles far enough advanced, to make it safe and expedient for him to communicate openly to the whole Church, that secret which had been hitherto confided to a select few. For this, probably, more even than to keep the Feast, he had hastened his journey to Jerusalem. Whether the result of this open avowal would be the forfeit of life, might have been concealed from his Prophetic view purposely to try him. At all events, the present might seem to him a seasonable period for the termination of his labours,—in all human probability it would be so. Hence the tender farewell, in which he had told the Church of Ephesus he should see their face no more; hence his anxiety, even in haste to pay then that parting visit; hence, perhaps, that very haste and urgency, that with the enlightened views of a Christian indeed, but still with the patriotic feelings of one whose early habits had been moulded in the "straitest sect" of the Jews, he might once more keep the Festival with his countrymen, and die. His master's example might again, in this particular, have influenced the tone of mind which kept up his resolve to go on to Jerusalem. As he approached, what train of thought so natural and so cheering as the image of the blessed Jesus in *His* last journey to Jerusalem, *His* earnestness to keep the Passover there, unabated by the certain foreknowledge that He was to be bound by His countrymen, and delivered up to the Gentiles?

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Such then was, probably, the frame of mind with which St. Paul disclosed to the rulers of the Church of Jerusalem, the true nature of his extraordinary Apostleship to the Gentiles, and the prosperous result of three journeys amongst them. Like the other marvellous disclosures of the mysteries of the new Dispensation, it called forth that peculiar thanksgiving, which is styled in Scripture "glorifying God." Their joy and wonder were however immediately followed by a sense of the danger to which he stood exposed. One expedient suggested itself. It was proposed that he should join four Jewish Christians in performing the rite of Purification in the Temple. This, it was thought, would convince the Jews of the real design of his mission; namely, that it was not, as far as concerned their Law, to forbid the Jewish Christians to observe it, but only the Gentiles, and especially the Idolaters. So public and unequivocal a testimony of conformity to the Mosaic ceremonies, would, it was thought, remove the worst ground of enmity against him, and at least soften down the spirit of ill-will. It produced however a contrary result. His appearance in the Holy Place was construed into a design to defile it, and the suspicion was confirmed by the accidental circumstance of Trophimus, (the Asiatic deputy and a Gentile convert,) having been seen with him within the hallowed precincts. Lysias, the Commander of the Roman garrison, was obliged to interfere, and rescue him from the fury of the multitude. In vain he obtained permission to address them from the steps of the Castle, whither they were conducting him to imprisonment. Eloquence even such as Paul's, conveying to them the avowal, that the Kingdom of God was thrown open to Gentiles and Idolaters, could only serve to exasperate them; and it was with much difficulty that even then he was preserved from outrage and death.

His Purification.

Here his trial, at least his uncertain apprehensions, ended. That night the Lord stood by him, and informed him, that he was appointed to bear Witness to Him in Rome. In what manner the treacherous designs of his enemies were rendered subservient to this purpose is well-known. His appeal from the tribunal of Festus to that of Cæsar was made not only with the view of defeating the stratagem devised for sending him back to Jerusalem, but in fulfilment of the command of the Lord delivered to him that night. In obedience to this, he embraced the early opportunity, thus providentially afforded, for his visit to the Imperial City.

ST. PAUL'S FOURTH APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY.

A. D. 63 TO 66.

ST. LUKE'S narrative, as has been already observed, was very evidently composed with the design of recording the progress of the Holy Spirit's Dispensation through its several stages: first, as confined to the

* This is another proof, that the Prophetic Spirit was not at his command, but dealt out to him by measure.

† See the description of the martyrdom of Stephen and of James in the *Acts*. A similar remark applies to the account given of the deaths of Polycarp, Ignatius, and others.

History.

Jews; next, as embracing the Devout Gentiles also; and lastly, as unlimited in its application, and open to Idolaters of every caste.* On this account it is, that the first part of his little history embraces the Ministry of all the Apostles; then is occupied chiefly with St. Peter, as the person selected by the Spirit for the first extension of the Gospel scheme; then it follows Barnabas and Paul through the next and last enlargement of the Covenant, for the management of which they had been appointed; and, at length, is confined to the Ministry of St. Paul, in whose hands it was left on the separation between him and Barnabas. With equal propriety, the account closes with the period, when the Apostle of the Idolatrous Gentiles having formally announced the greatest mystery of the Gospel to the Church of Jerusalem, has arrived at the Capital of the World, and the work had been commenced in the Imperial City itself. His voyage thither is accordingly related with an unusual minuteness of detail; not only, perhaps, because of the miraculous circumstances which it embraces, but because it was preparatory to that which the Historian considered the important boundary of his plan, his arrival and first Ministry at Rome.

§ *St. Paul a Prisoner at Rome.*

Acts, xx. 4. Among the faithful friends and assistants who formed his company here, are recorded, I. Timothy, who came with him from Macedonia, and whose name appears joined with his in the *Epistles to the Philippians*, *Colossians*, and *Philemon*.

Philip. i. 1. *Col.* i. 1. *Phil.* 1.

II. Luke, who had been long his constant companion, as appears from the form of his own narrative; and who is mentioned as still with him in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, and in that to *Philemon*.

Col. iv. 4. *Phil.* 24.

Acts, xx. 4. III. Aristarchus, one of his fellow travellers from Macedonia, and it would seem now his fellow prisoner also, (*Coloss.* ch. iv. v. 10.)

Acts, ibid. IV. Tychicus, another of his fellow travellers, and his messenger to the Colossian Church, (*Coloss.* ch. iv. v. 7.)

V. Lastly, Mark the nephew of Barnabas, (*Coloss.* ch. iv. v. 10.) who had now regained the esteem and trust which he forfeited on his first journey with Paul.

Advantages of St. Paul's situation.

The account given by Festus of his prisoner could not but have been favourable; as he was permitted to lodge in a "hired house," with free access to him from all his friends, and sufficient liberty to be able to discuss the subject of his imprisonment, and the persecution which had led to it, with the chief Jewish settlers at Rome. Under these circumstances, he was probably better able to effect the object of his mission in the first instance, than if he had come to Rome free, and more obviously by choice. He was respected by the Jews, as one whose situation placed him immediately under the protection of the Government; whilst the Government was seasonably made acquainted, from the nature of his charge, with the innocent object of his mission, and therefore was unlikely to be excited against him, as "a pestilent fellow, or a ringleader of sedition." For two years the Gospel was thus suffered to take root in the seat of Empire, unmolested and almost unobserved, through a train of providential circumstances, such as the importance of the case seems to have required. A tumult in Rome, like that which had occurred at Ephesus and Philippi, would, humanly speaking, have been fatal to the infant state of the Religion, and as such, seems to have been expressly guarded against by Providence.

Apostolic Age. Preaches to the Jews. Devout Gentiles. Idolaters. Antagonism ceases: with the Soldiery.

The particular mode in which the Apostle made his first appearance at Rome, was serviceable to the cause in another point of view. It brought him into an intercourse with the soldiery. His voyage, with all its perils and the Miracles to which it gave rise, might have been intended to impress the minds of the Soldiers who guarded him, (as was actually the result,) with the conviction that he was an extraordinary man. Its length might have been protracted with the same view; and the record may have been left in exact minuteness to direct our attention to the circumstance. His integrity had been proved by his mode of life with them generally, and especially by his disinterested care to preserve the whole crew in the shipwreck,—his view of futurity, by foretelling that accident,—his support and guidance by a superior power, from the deliverance in which all shared, as well as by the harmless efforts of the Viper, and the healing virtue of his prayer. All this would naturally be related, and even magnified, in the social meetings between the Soldiers returned from foreign service and their comrades and friends at home. The Prætorian guard itself would find in the marvellous prisoner from the East a subject for passing conversation, and his name and acts would be known in Cæsar's Palace, and among Cæsar's household. Curiosity would induce some of all these descriptions of persons to visit him, and of these the conversion of a portion could not but take place. Such then was the case. To the Philippians he sends, in his *Epistle*, the brotherly remembrance of the "saints, especially those who were of Cæsar's household;" assures them, that what had befallen him, instead of being a hinderance, had so far proved a furtherance to his Gospel, that his bonds were made manifest in Christ in the whole *Prætorium*, and to all others. Before the first persecution of Nero, the little mustard seed had become a tree too firmly rooted to be shaken by the storm; and the Roman Historians speak of the Converts to Christianity in the Capital, as an immense multitude of different ages and sexes.

Philip. i. 7. 12, 13.

The Apostle was not unmindful of those Churches, where others were now engaged in following up the Ministry which he had commenced, nor was he forgotten by them. His first *Epistle* from Rome was occasioned by the arrival of Epaphroditus from Philippi, whence he had been sent by the brethren to inquire after him, and to take some supplies for him. Epaphras arrived from Colosse soon after on the same errand.* This was the occasion of his *Epistles* to the Churches of Philippi and Colosse. As Ephesus was so near to the latter city, Tychicus, who was his messenger thither, was commissioned with another for the Ephesians. (*Eph.* ch. vi. v. 21.) The prevailing tone of all these *Epistles*, is that of warning against the seductive practices of the Judaizing Christians, whose doctrine had now begun to be tinged with the Oriental Philosophy.

Philip. ii. 25, xx. 18.

Col. i. 7, ii.

* Some intimations of this might be intended in the words, with which the Gospel opens, "Forasmuch, as many have taken in hand to *write in order*," &c.

* Epaphras's visit must have caused some suspicion, as for some reason he appears certainly to have been detained in confinement with Paul, (*Phil.* ch. v. v. 23.) Unless this expression, as well as that relating to Aristarchus be taken, not literally, but as implying that they were the companions of Paul the prisoner, and by their Society had put themselves in the condition of prisoners

History

It is pleasing to pursue the Apostle, from this his path of public duties, to any of those scenes of private life which bring us more, as it were, into a personal acquaintance with him. Such was the occasion of his *Epistle to Philemon*, in behalf of his slave Onesimus.

§ *St. Paul and Onesimus.*

In the zeal with which the advocates of humanity and the natural Rights of Man, have endeavoured to abolish Slavery from the civilized world, it has been of late not unusual to represent it as inconsistent with Christianity. On the other hand, the absence of all negative precepts respecting it, the frequent allusions and comparisons adopted by our Lord himself from the state of Slavery, to illustrate the condition of God's *servants*, and, lastly, the correspondence between Paul and the Master of Onesimus, without any reproof from the bold and uncompromising Apostle to his convert Philemon, on his assumed right of ownership, even over Onesimus, have been urged as tacit sanctions to the system, whatever abstract objections may lie against it. The subject for its own sake alone would not perhaps have claimed our attention; but it furnishes a remarkable illustration of a general system observed in the propagation of Christianity, for the sake of which it is here noticed. The whole question, then, proceeds on the mistaken notion, that Slavery is a subject to which the precepts of Christianity were applicable. But surely, whatever be the magnitude of the evil, and great it doubtless is, it is a *political* not a *moral* evil; and as such, we may as well expect to find arguments in the New Testament for or against the Christian character of absolute Monarchy or Republicanism, as against Slavery. As in the case of all other institutions, customs, and forms of society *not Religious*, so Christianity took no cognizance of this; Christ's was not a Kingdom of this world, and interfered with nothing in the forms of any society. On the one hand, therefore, it might as well be asserted, that Christianity sanctioned the abominable tyranny of Nero, because Paul made no attempt to seduce from their allegiance his Prætorian Converts. On the other hand, with the same show of reason, it might be contended, that inasmuch as the welfare and happiness of the several States of Europe are most agreeable to the Christian views, the balance of power should be maintained, not as a matter of Political expediency, but as a Christian duty.*

§ *St. Paul at Liberty.*

For the remainder of St. Paul's fourth Apostolical journey, we are indebted chiefly to the hints scattered throughout his later *Epistles*, those, namely, to the *Hebrews*, to *Titus*, and to *Timothy*. From the former

eb. xiii. 23, 24.

it appears, that on his release he continued his Ministry from Rome to other parts of Italy; but as to the precise object, or the result of his labours there, we have no certain account; and it is not desirable to mix the traditionary records which exist, with his authentic history. It is a scruple, indeed, which the Historian who is passing the line which separates the one from the other, the inspired from the uninspired records, cannot be too cautious not to violate. It is well known what errors have from time to time crept into the popular views of Christian believers from an incautious or an artful blending of the two; and the reader and the writer alike should be anxiously watchful in treading the space of meeting, that the character of each fact should be preserved, and divine authority kept for ever distinct from human. It is partly from the one source, partly from the other, that we suppose Spain to have formed the next stage of his Ministry. From his *Epistle to the Romans*, it appears to have been his intention to proceed from them to Spain; and as the early Christian writers* relate, that such a visit was paid, there can be little doubt that Spain was now included within the compass of his mission. Beyond the general fact, however, it is useless to pursue the thread of truth which one might hope to extricate from the legendary fables with which every Church was wont to deck its origin, in the same Spirit wherein Livy describes great States and Cities as referring their foundation uniformly to the Gods. From Spain, again, we still more certainly trace his course homeward through Crete, Jerusalem, and thence to Antioch in Syria.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

Rom. xv. 24

Titus, i. 5. and *Heb.* xiii. 23, 24.

ST. PAUL'S FIFTH APOSTOLICAL JOURNEY.

A. D. 66 TO 67.

As the History of St. Paul draws to a close the authentic materials become more scanty. All that we learn from his own writings is, that from Jerusalem and Antioch he soon resumed his travels, purposing, no doubt, as was his custom, to visit those places in which during the preceding journey he had planted the Faith. His route, too, may from the same sources be recognised through the places we have noted, without much, however, to instruct us in the progress made at each of them. The Colossians and Philippians he might be induced to visit, if merely to express his sense of their kindness during his late imprisonment; and Troas is now remarkable for being the scene which has furnished one of Paley's† beautiful arguments for the authenticity of St. Paul's Epistles, from the most trivial incident recorded in the New Testament.

2 Tim. iv. 13.

From Troas he sailed to Italy. But the state of public feeling had undergone a lamentable change since his last visit there. Perhaps the Jews had been busy in his absence, spreading, as was their custom, calumnies against Christianity and Paul. Perhaps the Gnostic heresy, which by this time had made considerable progress, might have generated or aided the prejudice. From whatever cause, he found the Christians treated, according to the representations of Suetonius‡ and Tacitus,§ as an abominable sect, and deserving the hatred of all mankind. It would seem, nevertheless, that he was for awhile successful in baffling the accusations of his enemies. But "the time of his departure was at hand; he had fought the good fight, and his

Unfavourable opinions maintained against Christianity in Italy.

2 Tim. iv. 17.

Ibid. i. 8.

---

* It not a little confirms this view, that the *immoral* practices arising out of *Political* or *social* evil, are strongly stigmatized by St. Paul. The ἀνδραποδισταῖς, the traffickers in Slaves, are enumerated in a catalogue which embraces the vilest of mankind.—*Tim.* ch. i. v. 10.

* Clem. *Ep.* sec. 5; Chrys. *Orat.* 7 in St. Paul, tom. viii. p. 59; Theod. *in Paul.* p. 25.

† See Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*.

‡ *In Nerone*, c. 16.

§ *Annal.* lib. xv. c. 44.

History.

course was finished." As the Persecution in which he suffered was not confined to him, but for the first time became a public measure, so as to comprehend the whole body of the Christians, it deserves a separate consideration

NERONIAN OR FIRST PERSECUTION.

A. D. 64.

Cause of the Persecution.

During the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius, Christianity passed unmolested, and almost unnoticed by the Roman Government.* At Rome itself no tumult, such as occurred in the Provinces, had attracted the attention of the Government to it. In the Provinces, too, the interference of the Civil Magistrate had been generally exercised to protect the innocent victims of popular prejudice. Whatever may be thought of the Tradition, that Tiberius proposed to the Senate the enrolment of Christ amongst the Deities of the Empire, it is certain that no encouragement was given by the Emperor further to indulge the Jews in their malice, in consequence of Pilate's report of the Crucifixion, and of the subsequent proceedings of his followers. The Procurator ended his days in disgrace and exile; nor is it very improbable, that some rebuke might have been given him for his conduct on that particular occasion, and that owing to this it was that we find the enemies of our crucified Lord quietly submitting to the mortification of seeing their scheme baffled by the bold assertion of His Resurrection, without obtaining from the Roman authority another blow to suppress it. Under Claudius we have seen Paul, even in the character of a criminal, enjoying the favour of Cæsar's household; and Nero himself would hardly have been induced to commence the work of Persecution either from Political motives, or from personal dislike. Alarmed at the odium which he had incurred by the burning of Rome, whether truly or falsely attributed to him, he appears only to have cast his eye round for an object on which he might conveniently divert the popular fury. The Christians had become a cause of jealousy to so many, that they naturally presented themselves to his unprincipled mind as precisely the objects he wanted. On them, therefore, the guilt was charged; and in allusion to the nature of their crime,† they were burned as public spectacles of amusement: in the exhibition of which, the idle ingenuity which was displayed in aiding the scenic effect, seems more unnatural and inhuman than the most brutal acts of malevolence. Nero escaped: the great mass of people cared not on whom they were avenged for their losses and sufferings; and a large party looked on with silent and malicious satisfaction, at the apparent ruin and suppression of a class of men who had become the objects of the deadliest antipathy. Of these secret enemies, a large portion were Jews.

Malicious Spirit of the Jews at this period.

The peculiar character of the Jews of this Age cannot but strike the attentive inquirer into the history of the times, as that of a people ready to seize every occasion of boldly claiming the blood of their enemies. Their character as a nation had begun to assume a tinge of deliberate malice towards their enemies, such as ordinarily only exists in certain individuals who are exceptions to their sect or nation. All this admits of explanation from their singular fate. Dwelling in all the great Cities of the Empire, their malevolent feelings were doubly excited, by the presence of their Political oppressors, and by the triumph of Idolatry. This for a time did not produce any sudden burst of mutiny; which, according to the usual course of things, would have subsided in torpid and slavish insensibility, as each unsuccessful effort rendered them more hopeless, and their oppressors more watchful and more imperious. There was a secret amongst them, which at once fostered their malice and restrained its ebullition; which gave a higher tone to their sense of wrongs, and yet stifled their complaints: it was the daily and hourly hope of a Temporal Messiah, and the certain presage of retribution, in obtaining through him dominion over their rulers, and being made the oppressors instead of the oppressed. Like the assassin who has attended on his master for years, and crouched beneath his blows without a murmur, waiting for the moment of revenge; so waited the Jewish people, inmates of every City, and even favourites of the Court: to all outward appearance content and peaceable Citizens, so much as to be able to separate their cause from that of the persecuted Christians, but nourishing daily the venom which at length burst forth, and was their ruin. To this may be traced their obstinacy beyond human nature in maintaining the last siege of their City, as well as the monstrous scenes which took place in Cyprus, Alexandria, and elsewhere; and which are, perhaps, the bloodiest on the pages of History, not excepting those of the French Revolution.*

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters. Explained

Among the causes which would produce an increasing party spirit opposed to Christians among the Gentiles also, none, perhaps, was more powerful than that sense of interest, which operated with the large class of tradesmen and artisans. As long as the tenets of their Religion were confined to few, its character was as abominable to the pious Gentile as when it spread abroad; but it was then only that it sensibly affected the gains of the silversmith and the sculptor, the seller of victims, or the expounder of Oracles. It was then that it operated on the public feeling in each separate place, as the introduction either of a body of superior artists, or a sale of better manufactures, would operate in any commercial city; and the condition of the Flemish settlements formerly in England and elsewhere, may, perhaps, not unfitly illustrate the way in which the harmless, unoffending Sect of Primitive Christians became the marks of general hatred. With such a feeling, persecution would be raised, not professing the source from which it sprang, but sheltering its selfish origin under various honest pretexts. Demetrius and the craftsmen would act from a sense of interest, but would appeal to a sense of Religion; and hence, Christians

Hatred of the Gentiles against the Christians.

* The Edict of Claudius, no doubt, included Christians as a Sect of Jews, but was not directed against them specifically.

† They were smeared with pitch, and so burnt, in reference to their pretended crime.

* See Note to Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 377, from Dion Cassius, lib. lxviii. p. 1145. "In Cyrene they massacred 220,000 Greeks; in Cyprus, 240,000. In Egypt a very great multitude. Many of these unhappy victims were sawed asunder, according to a precedent which David had given the sanction of his example. The victorious Jews devoured the flesh, licked up the blood, and twisted the entrails like a girdle round their bodies." Their misapplication of Scripture example forcibly reminds the Englishman of some domestic scenes, never, we trust, to be repeated.

History.

would not only be brandled as "Atheists," but all sorts of crimes and foul practices would be attributed to them, in order to furnish motives in which men could sympathize, instead of the interested feelings from which the instigators themselves either altogether or originally acted. No wonder that the Historian should be found speaking of them with a sort of disgust which would be felt for Bacchanalian associations; or that it should be whispered at Rome, that all kinds of abomination were practised in those meetings, which having been secret originally from fear, continued to be secret from custom.

Extent of the First Persecution.

It has been questioned by modern authorities, whether this Ist Persecution extended beyond Rome, as was commonly asserted; and doubtless the strongest Historical testimony in support of this assertion does not appear to be authentic. The famous Spanish or Portuguese inscription, which is given by Gruter in his *Inscription. Roman. Corpus*, (tom. i. p. 238,) has been justly suspected by Scaliger and others. Independently of the objections urged against it by those writers, it may be observed, that no native of Spain and Portugal reports it on his own authority. It professes to commemorate Nero's glory, for freeing the Province from Robbers; and also "for cleansing the Province of those who were infecting the human race with a new superstition." This, if authentic, would decide the question; but the denial of its authenticity leaves the fact not *contradicted*, but only *less certain*. It seems, indeed, highly probable that the Persecution was general. It was long currently believed to be so; and nothing is more likely, with the existence of prejudices such as have been described, and which only lay smothered and dormant in a large portion of every community, than that the erection of an inquisitorial tribunal at Rome would be imitated by the nearer Provinces at least; under the pretence of a general conspiracy, a harbouring of fugitives, or whatever other pleas there might be, such as always suggest themselves on similar occasions.

Apostolic Age. Preaching to the Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters.

The continuance of this Persecution through a space of four years renders it still more probable that it was general; and although the legends which have been handed down in the several Churches of Spain and Italy; especially of Lucca, Pisa, Aquileia, and Rome; concerning the martyrdom of their respective Saints are doubtless fabulous; yet that circumstance scarcely contradicts the general statement. It appears to have been in the last of these four years when the Persecution closed, only because of Nero's death, that the great Apostle of the Gentiles suffered. He is said to have been beheaded. About the same time also, St. Peter is asserted to have been crucified, according to the Prediction of his blessed Master. There is, however, some difficulty in reconciling this statement with the established chronology.

Martyrdom of St. Paul, A. D. 67 and of St. Peter.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXXV.

APOSTOLIC AGE.—MINISTRY OF THE OTHER APOSTLES AND MINISTERS.—EARLY HERESIES.

History.

THUS far we have attempted to follow the Sacred narrative in tracing the course of the Holy Spirit's dispensation through its several successive stages—through the period when the Gospel was preached to the Jews only,—through that during which it was preached to Jews and Devout Gentiles,—through that, again, when an especial commission was in force to declare it to the Idolaters also. In conformity, likewise, with that which appears to have been the design of the Sacred narrative, we have thus far confined our notice to the main line of its progress: only touching on the Ministry of the agents of the blessed Comforter, as they were in succession called on to throw open the way wider and wider; and taking no note of the acts and fortunes of the rest. But we are now approaching near to the period when, by the destruction of Jerusalem, the first blow was given to all distinction between Jew and Gentile, and between the Proselytes of the Gate and the Idolatrous Heathen; that is, when all distinction of Ministry and of Teachers was removed, and the Unity of the Church completed. This event did not, perhaps, fully take place until the final overthrow of the Holy City and Nation in the reign of Hadrianus.* Nevertheless, before we close this stage of the mystery of Godliness, and enter upon that last scene, we may be allowed to pause, and inquire into the labours and the fate of those other holy men from whom we have gradually parted in pursuing with St. Paul the course of Gentile Ministry. Not that much authentic information, beyond what has been given, can be laid before the reader, either respecting him or any other of the Apostles and inspired Ministers of the Gospel. Not only are the notices of them in the *Acts* so scanty as to furnish no materials for a narrative; but the greater part have left behind them no Epistolary or other monuments; which, as in the case of St. Paul, may serve to confirm or to refute, to complete or to illustrate, the imperfect and uncertain accounts given by uninspired writers. St. John, St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude, each have left something; but in each case their writings are insignificant, if considered as a source whence to glean Biographical notices. Eusebius's account is brief, and yet contains nearly all besides that can be relied on. So silently did the Apostles proceed in their mighty task of building up the Church, and so truly did the Kingdom of God come upon men "without observation."

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

St. Peter.

General Epistles. A. D. 64, 65.

St. Peter, as we have seen, was, by a special revelation, no less than St. Paul, called from the common Ministry of all the Apostles to preach the Gospel to the Devout Gentiles also. After the conversion of Cornelius little can be gleaned from the Scriptures respecting his progress and success. The address of his *Epistle* "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," marks so far the direction of his journies. The date also shows that Rome had likewise been the scene of his labours.* Agreeably to the view given of his call and special appointment, there will be no difficulty in determining who were "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, &c.," the special objects of his care. That they could not be Jews, as some have hastily asserted, is clear, from the term "strangers." The specific appellation of "Elect," also, which appears in the opening of the Epistle, tends further to prove, that those addressed were Gentiles, that is, Devout Gentiles—Proselytes of the Gate—St. Peter's especial charge. That term, it is true, most properly belonged to the Jews, they being originally the *chosen* and *elect* people of God; but it was to show the world that such privilege and distinction was now cancelled, that the Apostles more frequently apply it to the Gentiles. In this mode of applying it to the latter, they generally add, by way of explanation, that they were "elect according to the foreknowledge of God," "predestined," &c. which was as much as to say, We address you as the Elect of God—You are the Elect as really as the Jews; and this not from any *change* in God's unchangeable purposes, which the bigoted adversary may suggest to refute your claim, but it was so intended from the beginning of the world. God, of course, must and did foreknow and design what has now come to pass. "Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born of *many* brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he has also justified: and whom he has justified, them he has also glorified." Now the addition of this expression relating to God's foreknowledge, which St. Peter makes

Why addressed to the Elect

* A. D. 136, if Basnage's calculation be correct. Some have asserted, that the Emperor banished the Jews from Judæa altogether; others, with more probability, that he forbade them the new city Ælia, which he built on the ruins of Jerusalem.

* That is, if we suppose, as cannot be reasonably doubted, that Rome is designated by the name of Babylon.

History.

to the term Elect, fixes at once the Gentiles, or some portion of them, to be the persons intended. But the body of the Epistle explains the word Strangers more expressly.*

His History doubtful.

In the performance of his Ministry St. Peter is represented by the early Writers as the most active and influential of the Apostles,† which well agrees with the ardent character left of him in the Gospels. But as to the details of that Ministry, it would be as unprofitable as it is useless, to attempt to separate what is palpably false from what is probable or possible. Much is said concerning his disputes with Simon Magus, his victory over that renowned Magician, and the various occasions in which the Apostle's activity prevented the growth of those wild Theological fancies, which the artful impostor was disseminating, from his native country Samaria even to Rome.‡ Some of this must be authentic, else it would hardly be so unhesitatingly sanctioned by Eusebius. On the other hand, so much ground is there for suspicion in every point, that many have plausibly doubted whether St. Peter ever visited Rome at all. The time of his being there, and the period of his martyrdom, are, of course, by no means easy points to be settled. It would seem on the whole, most probable that he accompanied Paul in his last Apostolical Journey to Rome. For this there would be much reason. The Apostle to the Idolatrous Gentiles had, ever since his open declaration at Jerusalem, become peculiarly odious to all the Judaizing party; so much so, that he could hardly hope for success in his Ministry to them. It would seem but natural prudence in him to have abstained from addressing the Jews, and, perhaps, even the Proselytes of the Gate; lest he should again expose himself to the accusation of seducing them from the Law of Moses altogether, and thus raise some uproar, which, at Rome especially, would have sorely impeded his work. What more likely, than that, under these circumstances, Peter should become his companion; and should undertake the Ministry of the Circumcision, and of those allied to the Jews by partial Proselytism, while Paul confined his labours to the converts from Idolatry? It is indeed not very improbable that this was the Apostle's second visit to Rome. It is asserted by Eusebius, that he followed Simon Magus thither during the reign of Claudius.§ Now, considering how St. Paul was at that time circumstanced with respect to the Jewish part of the Church, the presence of another Apostle at Rome, for their sake especially, would seem to be even then peculiarly requisite. The occasion, then, may be allowed to support not a little the assertion of the Historian. Peter might on this account have come to Rome about the period of Paul's release; and if so, in attributing the foundation of the Church of Rome to St. Peter, the Papists may not be wholly in the wrong. That Church, like almost all the other Primitive Churches, was composed of three distinct classes of Converts; those who had been Jews, those who had been Devout Gentiles, and those who had been Idolaters. The foundation of the Church at Rome among the first might have been the work of Peter, as its establishment among the last evidently was the work of Paul. With this, too, agrees the assertion of an old Ecclesiastical writer,* quoted by Eusebius, that they were joint founders.

Probable time of his visit to Rome.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

Peter's martyrdom took place at Rome during the Neronian Persecution; and is said to have been embittered by the execution of his Wife before his eyes.†

Many works were circulated among the early Christians under St. Peter's name, of which the two *Epistles* preserved in our Canon alone appear to have been genuine.‡ Of these the former was always admitted as Canonical: but the latter appears, from some accidental circumstances, not to have been so early acknowledged by the whole Church. Of his spurious works, his Gospel was the most celebrated.§

St. James the Less.

James the Less, as he has been styled to distinguish him from the son of Zebedee, was a kinsman of our Lord. Notwithstanding this connection, he was of all the Apostles the least odious to the Jews. It was, probably, before his conversion that he acquired the popular title of the *Just*, but he continued to enjoy it even until his death.

Bishop of Jerusalem.

Concerning his Ministry Scripture contains but little. By Ecclesiastical Writers he is said to have been the first Bishop of Jerusalem; and the narrative of the *Acts* alone would lead us to suppose that he had some especial jurisdiction in that Church.‖ While the rest of the Apostles dispersed themselves abroad, none would be so likely to preserve peace at Jerusalem as he whom the unbelievers themselves honoured as James the Just. Eventually his popularity may have occasioned his Martyrdom. Festus, who had succeeded Felix in the Government of Judæa, died very soon after Paul's appeal and departure to Rome. The Jews took the opportunity of satiating their disappointed vengeance on the Christians who remained. The Feast of the Passover came, and numbers, as usual, attended. The occasion seemed a fit one for exposing the whole body of Christians to the fury of the mixed multitude of Jews assembled from all parts. To effect this, it was proposed that James should be prevailed on, either by threats or persuasions, to ascend a conspicuous part of the Temple, and thence publicly to make a disavowal of Christ as the Messiah. Deserted by their Bishop and their most respected Pastor, the Christians seemed thus most likely to be ruined. James consented. On the appointed day he presented himself from the upper part of the Temple to the crowds below, and in that situation was addressed, by the Conspirators, with the fatal question. "Why asketh thou me," he replied, "about Jesus the Son of Man, whose abode is on the right hand of the power on high, and who is coming

His Martyrdom. A. D. 62.

* *E. g.* But ye are a *chosen* generation, a *royal priesthood*, a *holy nation*, a *peculiar people*, that he should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light. Which in time past *were not a people*, but are now *the people of God*; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy. Dearly beloved, as strangers and pilgrims abstain, &c. In this passage, the term "Elect," which is obviously characteristic of the Jewish people considered as the original "Elect," is transferred to these converts, in order to denote that they were now equally so.

† Eusebii *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 14. Τὸν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων προήγαγεν.

‡ See Clementini *Recognitiones*.

§ Eusebii *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 13.

* Caius.

† Eusebii *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 30.

‡ Ibid. lib. iii. c. 3.

§ Ibid. lib. vi. c. 12; see also the extracts from it in Jones's *Script. Canon.*

‖ In St Paul's Epistle to the *Galatians* there is an obvious allusion to it. Speaking of certain who came from the Church at Jerusalem, he describes them as coming from James. *Galat.* ch. ii. v. 12.

History.

himself hereafter in the clouds of Heaven." The infuriated Zealots perceiving that their scheme was likely to end in a contrary impression on the multitude, to that which they had designed, rushed up and cast him headlong. His fall disabled him, and he was immediately assailed with stones. Strength enough was yet left him to imitate his dying Lord, and to pray aloud for the forgiveness of his murderers. A Priest who was looking on, was so struck at hearing him, that he made an attempt to save him; but before he could effect his purpose the Apostle received a blow from a club, which ended his sufferings.

Of all the atrocities which the Jews from time to time committed, or caused to be committed against the Christians, this alone seems to have been regarded by them with remorse and horror. Their Historian, who was certainly no friend to Christianity, remarks, that the siege and destruction of Jerusalem was long afterwards currently spoken of as a visitation of God for this crime more especially.

His *Epistle*. A. D. 61.

One *Epistle* is all which has been preserved of James's Scriptural labours. For no other reason, as far as can be ascertained, than because it had not been so frequently alluded to as the generality of Scripture, by the Writers immediately succeeding the Apostolic Age, it, at one period, laboured under some suspicion. Its authenticity is nevertheless unquestionable. It is addressed to *the Jews in the dispersion*, an expression which, by its obvious contrast to that of Strangers in the dispersion, confirms the interpretation assigned to this latter in the Catholic *Epistle* of St. Peter.

St. James the Brother of John.

A. D. 42.

The Martyrdom of St. James is noticed in the narrative of the *Acts*. It is there simply stated, that Herod put forth his hands to afflict the Church, and slew James the brother of John with the sword. Uninspired History furnishes little in addition to this account. All that Eusebius has thought worthy of retaining is, that his accuser became his convert and fellow-sufferer; in the course of his trial was convinced of his victim's innocence, and the truth of his doctrine; and, by openly expressing that conviction, was included in the sentence of death passed on him.

St. Andrew.

Andrew is said to have selected Scythia for the scene of his labours, but with what success we have no authentic testimony either of ancient History or of modern researches.

St. Thomas.

Parthia is named as the district allotted to Thomas. Tradition has further ascribed to him the foundation of those interesting Churches in the East, known by the name of the "Christians of St. Thomas." Some have, however, disputed the truth of this account, and suppose the Thomas from whom they derive this name to have been a Bishop, who lived some centuries subsequent to the Apostolical era.

*St. Jude, also called Lebbæus, and Thaddæus.**

Among the incidents recorded of St. Thomas is one that he was inspired to send Thaddæus the Apostle to Edessa for the cure and Baptism of Abgarus. The circumstance of his being sent by Thomas alone, seems strong against the identity of the Thaddæus who preached at Edessa, and the Apostle who was also called Jude. This tradition, however, whether true or false, is nearly all (besides his *Epistle*) which we know of his history. The authenticity of the *Epistle* itself, too, was subject for a time to suspicion; which gradually cleared up, as a freer intercourse between the several members of the Christian body caused those Scriptures which had a confined circulation to be better known, and their original history to be more certainly ascertained.*

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Missions.

His *Epistle* A. D. 70.

The Mission to Edessa is connected with an event, the improbability of which has been generally contended for, notwithstanding the grave testimony by which the main incidents, at least, of the story are supported. It is said, that while our Lord was yet alive, the fame of His Miracles spreading beyond Judæa was reported to Abgarus, King of Edessa. This Prince, who was labouring under some grievous malady, sent accordingly to Jesus to desire that He would come and heal him. His letter, and one pretended to be returned by our Lord, excusing His personal attendance, and promising to send one of His Disciples to him, were long preserved in the Archives of Edessa. In fulfilment of this promise, it is added, that after Christ's death Thaddæus went thither, and that his testimony was commonly appealed to for the existence of these records. Some add, that our Saviour sent also His portrait.

Letter of Abgarus.

It is unquestionably somewhat suspicious, that no notice should have been preserved of so remarkable an incident in any of the Gospel narratives. And yet this is hardly a conclusive argument, inasmuch as many things we know were omitted;† and this, however gratifying to our curiosity, cannot be considered as peculiarly important for our instruction in Christian Truth, the great principle, we may presume, which guided the Evangelists in their selections. Some foundation there might be for the story, however fabulous the detail. Eusebius relates it without scruple, omitting what is the most improbable circumstance, the sending of the portrait. What more likely, after all, than that the fame of Jesus, and His healing Miracles, should reach the sick Prince of Edessa, and that he should send, according to the custom of the East, to bid the Prophet come and heal him?‡ Equally probable is it, that the substance of the correspondence should be registered in the Archives of Edessa, and afterwards shown to an Apostle of the same Jesus, although that correspondence may not have passed between them in the form of Epistles, but of Messages. There is nothing certainly in the character of our Lord's reply which

* It seems probable that the two latter names were applied to him during our Lord's life-time, in order to distinguish him from Judas the Traitor.

* For a full and satisfactory account of the authenticity of our Canonical Scriptures, and of none besides, see Jones's *Canon*.

† An event so important as the raising of Lazarus was omitted by the three earliest Evangelists. No doubt a reason may be suggested in the danger to which the living object of the Saviour's friendship and power might have been exposed, by calling attention to him. But other reasons, less obvious, may have occasioned the total suppression of many parts of our Lord's life. Our knowledge of His History, like our knowledge of all Religious subjects, may be not the less sufficient because it is "in part."

‡ See the account of the King of Syria's Embassy to Jerusalem, to procure assistance of Elisha for Naaman the Leper. *2 Kings*, ch. v.

History.

appears derogatory from, or inconsistent with the tone and substance of His discourses.*

At the same time, it would be wholly at variance with the strict rule of His Ministry, to suppose that the correspondence was carried on with a view either of healing or converting one who was a Gentile.†

St. Bartholomew.

That Nathanael, who "came to Jesus by night," and was one of the first Disciples, is the person better known as an Apostle by the name of Bartholomew, may be fairly inferred from the Scripture narrative. Otherwise we can hardly understand why Bartholomew should not be numbered among the Apostles by St. John, nor Nathanael by the other Evangelists; or again, why, in relating the same event, St. John should speak of Philip and Nathanael coming together to Christ, the others of Philip and Bartholomew. It seems strange, too, that Nathanael should not have been a qualified candidate for the Apostleship made vacant by Judas's death, unless he were already an Apostle.

Nathanael then might have been called *Bar*tholomew, or the son of Tholmai, as Peter was *Bar*jona, and Joses, *Bar*nabas. The indiscriminate use of these names, and the gradual adoption of one to the exclusion of the other, is only what certainly occurred in the case of Barnabas.‡

India is said to have been the scene of his labours, and amongst his Converts there a Hebrew copy of St. Matthew's Gospel is reported to have been found, at the close of the IInd century, by Pantænus.§

St. Philip.

Hierapolis was the chief abode of Philip. He is said to have been married, and the father of a large family, one of whom is mentioned as peculiarly devoted to the service of the Church, and the rest as Prophetesses. If we may believe the uninspired record further, he was endued with no small portion of the power from on high, and on one occasion raised the dead. It is usual with us now to regard this, and all uninspired accounts of Miracles, as more than doubtful. Yet certain it is, that the Apostles were all gifted with power to work Miracles; and must have needed them most to awaken the attention, and to convince the minds of those who were the least prepared for conviction from Reason and Scripture. It may be venturous and wrong to maintain the certainty of any one Miracle contained in the traditionary records of Primitive times, but it is clearly more so to maintain a system of decided dissent from all.

St. Simon Zelotes.

The title given to Simon, to distinguish him perhaps from Simon Peter, implies that he belonged originally to a sect of the Pharisees, whose intemperate and fanatical zeal was not the least of the many evils under which the Jews of this Age laboured.‖ Egypt, Cyrene, and the African coast, are said to have heard the Gospel from him. Great Britain too has been included within the compass of his Ministry, and reported to have been the scene of his martyrdom.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

St. Barnabas.

With the account of Barnabas's separation from Paul ends all authentic information concerning him. Cyprus would most probably be the scene of his after Ministry; or, if it extended beyond his native island, Egypt, rather than Gaul or Italy, should be the place assigned to him. All certain traces of him, however, are entirely lost; and it would be unnecessary to make any further mention of him, were it not for the writings whch have been ascribed to him.

His pretended *Epistle*.

Of these, the Catholic *Epistle* generally published with the works of the Apostolic Fathers, is all that still pretends to his name. Few can read it without being so sensible of its unscriptural character, as to seek no further for the external evidence against it. It is therefore by universal consent now pronounced to be a forgery. And yet there is, after all, some difficulty in understanding how it should have obtained so much credit with the early Church, if it were so decidedly spurious as we suppose it to be. It is quoted as Barnabas's by Clemens Alexandrinus; Origen seems to sanction its Spiritual authority; and Eusebius assigns it a place in the Canon. On the other hand, in Jerome's Catalogue it is classed with the Apocryphal books, and his authority is supported by the prevailing voice of antiquity.

Some ground there must be for this difference, or apparent difference of statement. This very *Epistle* might have had for its basis a genuine work of Barnabas, and might be the gradual corruption of impostors, who availed themselves of the acknowledged fact, that a writing contalning such and such general features was the production of this Apostle. Hence, although its true estimate was soon obtained, its character would be for awhile variously represented. What tends to confirm this, is the motley appearance it presents, the marked difference of style and thought between the beginning and the close, and the clumsy interpolations which scarcely affect disguise.

The only reason which can be discovered, for the conjecture of some in the early Church, that he was the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, seems to have been the concealment of the true Author's name for a time, and the natural spirit of surmise to which it gave rise. St. Barnabas was named as likely to have written it, and so also were St. Luke and Clement.

St. Matthias.

Of the Calling or Election of St. Matthias, mention has been already made, beyond which nothing certain is known. Eusebius has preserved a remark on the doctrine which he preached, *viz.* that it was the same in substance with what was afterwards called the doctrine of the Nicolaitans.

A Christian is properly enough unwilling to admit such a charge on this solitary testimony. At the same time, it must not be pronounced impossible that Matthias should become a heretic, any more than that Judas should become a traitor. On a subject of belief, we have seen Peter opposed to Paul; and Paul, again, on a question of Ministerial duty, opposed to Barnabas. The very gifts and endowments of the Spirit were, no doubt,

---

* A translation of the pretended correspondence, together with some other incidents on record, is given by Archbishop Wake, in his *Apostolical Fathers*.

† See Horsley's Sermons on Matthew, ch. vii. v 26.

‡ So also Matthew and Levi were applied indifferently to the Evangelist.

§ Eusebii *Hist.* lib. v. c. 10.

‖ Joseph. *de Bello Jud.* lib. iv.

History.

liable to abuse and perversion; and Apostles as well as all Christians were free agents, and responsible for their use of their extraordinary talents. "Woe unto me, if I preach not the Gospel!"

Perhaps, after all, St. Matthias's words were misinterpreted, as St. Paul's and St. James's have been since.

St. Matthew.

That St. Matthew was the Author of the *Gospel* which bears his name is nearly all recorded of him, beyond the scanty notices of Scripture. It was the first that was written, although it is impossible to fix the precise date.

Whether originally composed in Hebrew, as some have asserted, or in its present Greek, becomes a question not material to us. The Greek, if the translation, so soon superseded the use of the Hebrew, as to be the one commonly read and quoted; and, as such, received the sanction of Inspired authority.

St. Mark.

St. Mark's *Gospel* is said to have been derived from St. Peter's instructions, or at least to have received his revisal and sanction. It was compiled at the request of the Christians at Rome;* who very naturally employed for this work one who had been the follower both of Paul and Peter; if, as has been suggested, the original Church in that city was made up of their respective congregations. It has been remarked accordingly by many, as a striking characteristic of this Gospel, that it studiously avoids all allusions and expressions which would not be equally intelligible to Jew and Gentile, and seems carefully adapted throughout to all the classes of believers.

It was scarcely possible for a portion of Scripture so circumstanced as this must have been, not to have been always recognised as authentic.

Although Mark was not an Apostle, yet the gifts of the Spirit were so widely diffused, that supposing him to have recorded from memory the instructions of an Apostle, the *prohibitory impressions* of the Holy Spirit, (the character of which has been already pointed out, and which there is no ground for appropriating to the Apostolic Order,) would have been sufficient to secure him from error. It is indeed asserted, that his and St. Luke's History were finally revised, at least, the one by St. Peter, the other by St. Paul. But, after all, our belief in its inspired character rests on the judgment of the Primitive Church; which was most competent to decide, whether a *Gospel* written by such an Author, and under such circumstances, was or was not of divine authority.

Circiter A. D. 65. If St. Mark's *Gospel* received the revision of St. Peter, it could not have been written later than A. D. 66 or 67, the period of his imprisonment and martyrdom at Rome.

St. Luke.

His *Gospel*, A. D. 63. St. Luke's *Gospel*, like that of St. Mark could not have been published on his own authority, because neither was he an Apostle. Nevertheless, in his narrative of the *Acts* he was particularly qualified for the office of Historian, because he was an eye-witness, and bore part in most of the scenes which he describes. For the remainder too, and for the Gospel History, there could be no surer guide than St. Paul, with whose preaching he was so long familiar.*

Apostolic Age.

Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

Inspiration of St. Luke.

As was observed of St. Mark's *Gospel*, a portion of Scripture so written has not the less claim to *inspiration*, than the work of an Apostle or Prophet delivering an immediate Revelation from God.† For the true notion of *inspiration*, even in the latter case, is not that the Sacred Penman *was inspired while in the act of writing*, but that he wrote *what he had beforehand received by extraordinary Revelation*. It would be impossible else to account for the variety of style and thought, the occasional introduction of matter foreign to Revelation, and whatever else belongs to such writings in common with all mere human compositions. The contrast between the true Scripture and the pretended records of Revelation, in this respect, has been already noticed. Between Luke's writing what he had heard from Paul, and Paul's writing what he had received from God, the only difference could be, the difference between them as authors; the difference of style, of manner, and of the other accidents as it were of authorship. If in writing, or in preaching, St. Paul's memory had *misled* him, some check from the Holy Spirit would have guided him back to the truth. Now Luke, like all who preached the Gospel, must in his preaching have enjoyed the same preservative aid, and why not in writing also? Had any necessary portion of Christian instruction *escaped* St. Paul's memory, the Holy Spirit then would have called it to his remembrance; for such was our Lord's promise to the Apostles. But if this promise did not extend to others, if Luke's *omissions* were not miraculously supplied, Paul was at hand to supply them. Granting the possible omission too of any necessary point; this would not, like a false statement, be inconsistent with the inspired character of any one Scripture, inasmuch as the Record of the Gospel is not one but many.

Acts of the Apostles, A. D. 64. St. Luke's *Gospel* appears to have always passed for his; and although the *Acts* have not likewise his name attached, yet the internal evidence, and the voice of the early Church certainly declare him to be the Author.

Epistle to the Hebrews at one time ascribed to St. Luke. That the *Epistle to the Hebrews* should have been ascribed to one, whose writings had been the vehicle of so much of St. Paul's instruction, is nothing wonderful. At the time when the Author's name was studiously kept a secret from the public, the tone of Luke's conversation, and his very expressions perhaps in some instances being derived from St. Paul, naturally might have fixed on him the uncertain authorship. And if St. Paul desired concealment, St. Luke would be the less likely to be forward in disclaiming the *Epistle*, lest he should, by so doing, direct surmise towards the right person.

It has been very reasonably conjectured, that his *Gospel* was somewhat prior to that of Mark.

St. John.

St. John concludes the Inspired era. St. John was the last of the Apostles. With him therefore, and with the period through which his life and Miracles extended, we may consider the second great era of Christianity to close—the era when it was

* Euseb. *Hist.* lib. ii. c. 15.

* Hieronymi *Procem. in Matth.*

† *Habuit utique authenticam paraturam.* Tertul *adv. Marc* lib. iv. c. 2.

History.

preached by Inspired Ministers. For although no one can undertake to prove that Miracles were not performed long subsequently, yet the main system of Christianity was conducted thenceforth by ordinary means and ordinary agents. After St. John, there was no one endued with that most distinguishing power of an Apostle, the power of *communicating* the gifts of the Spirit.

A life which was prolonged, no doubt providentially, to the close almost of the Ist century, and which consequently embraces more than sixty years of the most interesting period of our Religion, may be expected to furnish an eventful record. But such is not the case. To the acts of St. John belong the same character as to those of the rest of the Apostles; they are only known by their results. Whether in this veil of oblivion, which has been allowed to conceal their glorious exertions from our view, there be any thing like a design of Providence peroeptible, the pious Christian may be allowed to consider. Perhaps he may find in it a merciful removal of a temptation, to view the work in which they were engaged as the result of Human virtue, more than of Divine power extraordinarily exercised. Contemplating the propagation of Religion at this distance, with the earthly and mortal instruments employed by the Spirit removed from the scene, we are led more directly to trace it to its source, and to see it in the light in which St. Paul warns his own Converts and us to view it, as the work not of himself or of his fellow-labourers, but of God who was working in them.

Probable reason for the obscurity which attaches to the History of the Apostles.

Supported by the effects produced by Church Legends.

It may not a little confirm this estimate of the matter, and teach us to distrust our untried hearts on this score, if we recollect that the want of an authentic account of all the labours and sufferings of the Apostles, and early Ministers of the Gospel, has been supplied by a series of legendary tales, which, even without proof or likelihood to recommend them, have actually produced the evil supposed. If the trust of so large a portion of Christians for so many Ages has been withdrawn from God to His Ministers, from the Lord Jesus to His Saints; and the prop of that trust has been the boasted legends of Miracles wrought, and other divine manifestations; how much greater would have been the hold on Men's minds made by such a superstition, had these legends been superseded by accounts not less marvellous, but more authentic.

The History of St. John, like that of the others, abounds with these legends. At one time, we are told, that he escaped unharmed from a Cauldron of boiling oil; at another, he is described as the hero of a romantic adventure among a band of Robbers, whose chieftain he reclaimed and led away triumphantly. As was before observed, it would indeed be presumptuous to say of all these occurrences, or of any in particular, that they must be false, either because they are marvellous, or because they are not equally attested with the Miracles of the Scriptures. Much of the marvellous must doubtless have occurred in the unsubstantiated Ministry of the Apostles; and the lesson to be learnt from the removal of Inspired testimony to those divine interpositions, is not certainly that of universal and dogmatic disbelief. These events *may be* true. Our duty only, is not to mix them indiscriminately with those which bear the seal of the Spirit affixed; for whatever reason that mark of distinction may have been given. Let the reader of the Lives of the Apostles and their Inspired contemporaries, read such facts as the escape of St. John from the Cauldron, not as in themselves improbable; but to be received or rejected as any other portion of History would be, according to the character of the Historian, and the source of his information. At the same time, whatever degree of probability attaches to them, let him read their record with the full impression, that these the Holy Spirit has passed by without setting His seal thereon. Our divine guide meant not to make the same use of them, as of Scripture Miracles. Whatever the facts were to those, of old time, to us they are no objects of Faith; none of the appointed evidence of our Religion; subjects for curious and learned inquiry, perhaps, but not for holy meditation—they are not in the Bible, and must not be added thereto. St. John's life, divested of these, affords his Biographer but a scanty supply of materials. He has left with the Church two Epistles and a Book of Revelations, relating, as it would seem, to the History of the Church traced through its successive stages. From these and from Ecclesiastical History it appears, that the latter portion, at least, of his Ministry, was employed in Asia Minor, especially in the famous Seven Cities. As both St. Peter's and St. Paul's course embraced this district, it was after their martyrdom, probably, that he undertook the superintendence of these celebrated Churches. With the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dissolution of the Jewish polity, all distinction between the various classes of Christian Converts ceased. There was henceforth no longer any peculiar law, or any peculiar Apostle, for Jew or for Proselyte, or for Idolatrous Convert. St. John would thenceforth as properly attach himself to the flock of St. Paul, as to that of St. Peter. Of his former Ministry there is no trace, beyond the slight notices contained in the early part of the *Acts*. From this time, however, he appears to have been fixed in Asia Minor, and to have made Ephesus especially his place of residence. Over the Seven Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea, Bishops appear to have exercised authority; subject to that extraordinary and peculiar controul, assumed by the Apostles for the better foundation of the Church, but obviously designed to cease with the removal of the Apostolic Order. Hence the charge from the Lord Jesus, through His aged servant to these Bishops, is not as to men under authority, but as to those with whom the Supreme Government and chief responsibility was left,—a charge given when the last temporary prop of the holy edifice was about to be removed, and the building was now considered complete and stable.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

St. John's two *Epistles*, A. D. 69. and *Revelations*, A. D. 95.

The Book of *Revelations*, which contains this charge, was written in the Island of Patmos, whither John had been banished from Asia Minor in the persecution of Domitian. It was during his abode there, probably, that he also wrote his *Epistles*; if indeed the first be not more properly a Treatise or Pastoral Discourse. On Domitian's death he was restored to his residence at Ephesus, and died there at the advanced age of 96. Few historical pictures are more pleasing, than that of the old man in his latter days joining the Christian assemblies, in despite of age and feebleness, and always leaving behind him the same brief and simple precept, "Little children, love one another."

His *Gospel*, A. D. 97.

It was during the latter part of his life, either whilst he was in Patmos, or after his recall from banishment, that he composed his *Gospel*. He had at that time seen and approved the narratives of Matthew, Mark,

History.

and Luke;* and his testimony to these at that advanced period of the Church's growth, is doubtless one cause of thankfulness from all Ages, to Him who permitted him to tarry thus long. His reasons for adding yet another *Gospel* are said to have been, first, to supply the omissions of the former Evangelists on some points of our Lord's History; next, to counteract the Heretical opinions that were now springing up concerning Christ's nature. What those opinions were, and whence their origin, will be considered in the sequel.

As to the *Gospel* itself, it has been universally received by the Church in all Ages, although the stubborn testimony it contains to the Divine character of Jesus, has naturally made it an object of cavil and of misrepresentation to many. Of the authenticity of the *Revelations* and of the *Second* and *Third Epistles*, some doubts were once entertained; which, as in the case of other Scriptures in our Canon labouring under the same imputation, were removed when the communication between the different parts of the Christian world became such as to enable these doubts to be sifted, and duly estimated.

Philip the Deacon, Timothy, Titus, and other coadjutors of the Apostles.

Besides the two Evangelists Mark and Luke, there are others whose names are recorded as having received gifts through the Apostles, or as being otherwise divinely appointed as their fellow labourers. Of these, few can be traced beyond the scenes in which they are briefly introduced in the Sacred writings. Philip the Deacon's history has been much confounded with that of the Apostle of the same name, and contains nothing which merits the labour of unravelling the entangled materials. Timothy and Titus deserve more notice; but only on account of the appointment with which we find them invested by St. Paul, and in which they continued to be recognised by all the early authorities of the Church. Timothy was made by the Apostle Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus, Bishop of Crete.

Philip the Deacon.

Timothy and Titus.

Timothy.

The first were Bishops.

In St. Paul's *Epistles* to them some light is accidentally thrown on two important and interesting questions relating to their office, now the highest in the Church: the first, By what authority were these Bishops (the first of their Order as far as we can learn) created? the second, What was the Form observed?

Both these questions may be resolved by that single verse of the *Epistle to Timothy*, in which Paul exhorts him, "neglect not the gift which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery."†

Divinely appointed.

From these words the appointment may certainly be inferred to have taken place in consequence of some *extraordinary divine* command. It was "by Prophecy;" or, as it is elsewhere expressed, "according to the prophecies which went before on thee." As the Holy Ghost bade the Church of Antioch separate Paul and Barnabas for their Apostolic appointment, so, it is implied, that Timothy was separated by divine command for the Episcopal appointment.

That even in the appointment of Presbyters such an express revelation of the divine choice may have taken place, is not improbable, from St. Paul's remark on the Ephesian Presbyters, that "the Holy Ghost had made them overseers." In the case of the Bishops, at all events, it can scarcely admit of a doubt. The sacred testimony requires no support; but it gives us some additional assurance that we are not mistaking its meaning, when we find the earliest Christian documents of the uninspired Church speaking in the same strain. Clement of Rome, in his *Epistle to the Corinthians*, states it as the custom of the Apostles "to make trial by the Spirit," that is, by the "Power of discerning," in order to determine who were to be Overseers and Deacons in the several Churches they planted. Clement of Alexandria speaks particularly of the Churches in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, the Overseers of which he understood to have been marked out for ordination by the Holy Ghost to St. John.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

At the same time, although the Episcopal ordination rested on authority similar to that on which the Apostles themselves were invested with their office, yet there is ample evidence that this new class of Ministers was distinct from the Apostolical. Throughout the *Epistles to Timothy* and *Titus* all their information and instruction are said to be derived from the Apostles. They had no Revelation.

Their heavenly *Gift* (χάρισμα) was doubtless of the same character and import as that communicated to all believers at Baptism,—communicated in like manner, and for the same purpose. It was to *testify* to the ordained, and the others, that the appointment was divine—that the Bishop was duly ordained—was an official Minister of the Holy Ghost, and that his official acts would therefore be valid and effectual.

By laying on of hands.

The next question relates to the form. The only ceremony recorded is that which was used in many solemn acts, *viz.* the Laying on of Hands. It was the form whereby the Apostles gave the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost; and as this extraordinary Gift was only a sign of some invisible agency or sanction, these forms are still observed, although the sign of confirmation is no longer granted by the Divine Dispenser.

But then, the ceremony of Laying on of Hands is here said to have been performed by the Presbyters, while in the *Second Epistle to Timothy* Paul asserts it to have been performed by himself. From which the conclusion is clear, that although the "Gift" which testified the appointment might have depended on the efficacy of the Apostles joining in the ceremony, yet that the ceremony had a further intent, else why should the whole Presbytery join? It was then the Act of the Church, with whom was vested the ordination of Bishops; in like manner as the Church was before made formally to ordain the two extraordinary Apostles to the Gentiles. By the Church, as was before explained, is meant the representatives of the Church; whether, as in the case of the ordination of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, these were Presbyters alone, or, as in that of Timothy, there was one superior to the Presbyters also. Accordingly, in tracing back the annals of Episcopacy, we find the custom scrupulously observed, and the Bishop and the Presbyters uniting in the Laying on of Hands. Occasional mention is made of the ceremony being performed by the Bishop alone, probably considered as the President of the Presbyterian Body, but never of the Presbytery without their head.*

It is quite clear, then, that the ordination of Ministers rests with the Church as one of its rights, we should rather say, one of its *duties*; for these are not matters of

* Eusebii *Hist.* lib. iii. c. 24.

† 1 *Timothy*, ch. iv v. 14.

* See BISHOP, in the MISCELLANEOUS DIVISION.

History.

endowment, but of obedience. But, then, with whom was the appointment left? The Holy Ghost was here, as it would seem, in all instances the sole guide. For, although Timothy was left with power to ordain, yet he had a special Gift attending his appointment; and what more appropriate than the Gift of discerning Spirits, which in its application would be nearly equivalent to a divine Revelation of the Holy Ghost's choice? This, then, was probably the last kind of extraordinary assistance which was withdrawn from the Church; and, when withdrawn, the mode in which the other aids had been gradually and successively supplied by human means, became an obvious rule in this case also. For Revelation they had a Record; Human Eloquence and Learning continued what Inspired Wisdom and Knowledge and Utterance had commenced; the evidence of signs and wonders was operating in like manner as had the Miracles themselves. Each extraordinary support had served not only as a substitute, but also as temporary shelter and protection for some natural power, which was allowed to grow up under its shade, and to attain proper maturity, before the occasional fence was removed. To the Church the Holy Ghost was wont to specify His appointments; and when that voice was no longer given, the Church felt sure that it was called on to act, just as individuals in office had been who no longer found themselves prompted by the Gift of Wisdom, or Knowledge, or Eloquence. It employed all its natural powers in choosing those on whom it thought the Inspired choice would have fallen. Its *office*, its *duty* remained, although all Miraculous aid was withdrawn; just as the duty of those individuals who filled any office in the Church continued, although no extraordinary help was perpetuated together with the office. The other substitutes of Inspiration had proved effectual, and the exercise of natural judgment could not but be expected to prove so in this case also. When the Preacher or the Interpreter used his natural learning or eloquence, his success assured him that God had sanctioned this new mode of Ministry; and, by analogy, the Church when left to itself knew that its appointments, if made according to the best human judgment, would be sanctioned and approved by Heaven.

Christian Unity.

Schism and Heresy, considered merely as Ecclesiastical crimes, may be illustrated by the analogous case of Political crimes. The Schismatic renounces his allegiance to the Ecclesiastical Government under which he has been living; the Heretic adopts practices and opinions contrary to its Laws. The Schismatic therefore is, as it were, in Rebellion against his Church; the Heretic, a violator of its Laws.

Here, however, the analogy ceases. Christ's Kingdom is not of this world. Accordingly, while the rightful punishment of the Rebel who is found arrayed against his Country and its Government is inflicted by the Society injured; the Schismatic, who is similarly opposed to his Church, is reserved for a sentence hereafter,—a sentence either of acquittal or condemnation, as the motives which gave rise to the rebellious act shall be found sufficient or otherwise.

Nature of this Unity.

Before we proceed, however, to notice the Heresies which even during the Apostolic era commenced in the Church, it may be requisite to make a few preparatory remarks on the subject of Christian Unity. Few points have been less satisfactorily discussed than the exact import of this word, nor do we pretend to remove all the difficulty with which the question is encumbered. The following observations however may, it is hoped, tend to clearer views on the subject.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

I. When Christian Unity is spoken of in the New Testament it generally means the Unity of Dispensation for the various classes of Converts. It is expressive of the great principle, that all were to be "one fold under one Shepherd;" that, contrary to the Jewish prejudice, Christianity was to be one and the same, as to all its benefits and privileges, for Jews, Devout Gentiles, and Idolaters, who embraced it. Hence it is called the Unity of *the Spirit*, in opposition to the character of the Jewish Dispensation, which was partially allotted and shaded off, as it were, from native Jew to the Proselyte of Righteousness, and, in a lower degree still, to the Proselyte of the Gate. Hence, also, it is said to be preserved "in the bond of peace;" because the main ground of irritation and enmity on Religious matters was the jealousy of the Jews respecting the Oneness (ἑνότης) of God's Church. That such is the Unity so often recommended, may be proved especially from Paul's *Epistle to the Ephesians;* in which he enforces it as a duty of Christians, *on the ground* that they partake of "one Faith, one Baptism," &c.; which he could not have done, if difference of general Faith or of forms were the departure from the Unity intended.

Unity of Dispensation.

II. Against this Unity, then, Schism or Heresy is not necessarily an offence. Nothing, indeed, was so likely to prevent Schism as an equality of Dispensation, which should leave all classes of converts in every Age or country without room for jealousy and discontent; but neither Schism nor Heresy is properly an offence against the Church Universal, but against some particular Church, and by its own members. It is true, that he who is an Heretic or Schismatic of one Church, may be an unfit member for many others, or for all others; and so it is with certain grievous offenders against the laws of any one Political Society. But because a murderer is tolerated neither by the French nor by the English, we do not thence infer that the French and English form one Political body.

No Church can be Heretical or Schismatical.

On the same principle, it must be admitted, that no *Church* can be properly called either Heretic or Schismatic. For Churches, being independent establishments, may consult each other; but, having no one common arbitrator, if they cannot agree, the guilt of that Church which is in error is not Schism or Heresy properly, but corrupt Faith,—not an Ecclesiastical offence, but one between God and the corrupt Church. Accordingly, our Reformers characterise the Romish Church as one that has *erred*, but have studiously avoided the misapplication of the terms "Schismatic and Heretic" to it.

The Seceders forming such a Church may be both. Though not so their successors.

Nevertheless, if a Church has been formed by the secession of members from another Church, on disagreement of principles, each seceder is both a Schismatic and a Heretic, because of his former connection; but the crime does not attach to the Church so formed, and accordingly is not entailed on succeeding members who naturally spring up in it. If the Schism was founded in *error*, the guilt of error would always attach to it and its members; but not that of Schism or Heresy. On the same principle, the present King of Great Britain's claim to the allegiance of his subjects, is not affected by the question of William the Con-

History.

queror's right to the Throne formerly; nor would an American traitor stand excused, who should plead in defence of his treason that the disunion was unjustifiable, to which the United States owe their independence.

III. Distinct Churches may form alliances, such as existed between the famous Seven Churches of Asia. But then, a secession from this alliance would of itself be no crime whatever. Thus, supposing the Church of Rome not to have needed any Reform, still the Church of England would have been justified in renouncing its association with it, simply on the ground of expediency.

What is a Church?

IV. But then, what constitutes a Church? Is the boundary line Political or Geographical, or what? It is obvious that a mere agreement of Faith and practice does not render two Bodies of Christians one Church; for the Church of England and the American Episcopalian Church agree, but still are two distinct Churches. Much less can it be supposed to depend on a Political or Geographical boundary; except, indeed, when the Church is united with the State, and then the limits of both are by agreement the same. Even the connection between the Church founded and that from which it has been planted does not amount to this; for when Jerusalem sent forth its Spiritual colonies, they consulted indeed with the Mother Church, and with one another, but each was, from the very first, independent, and a Church in itself.

V. Shall we say, then, that the principle is purely Conventional? Every Body of Men and every individual falls by birth and other circumstances into some one Christian body, just as he does into some one Political or other Social body. The Church of England, for instance, if even it were deprived of the advantages which it enjoys in the protection of the State, would be naturally perpetuated as it now is, and every secession from it would be as truly a Schism, and every profession opposed to its Articles as truly a Heresy.

Cautions necessary before Secession.

This, however, does not imply that no plea can justify the members of any Church from seceding. He who is convinced that his Church is essentially in error is bound to secede. But, like the circumstances which may be supposed to justify the subject of any realm in renouncing his Country and withdrawing his allegiance, the plea should be long, and seriously, and conscientiously weighed. In an act of Schism, indeed, a cautious and painful self-examination is even more awfully important, because the temptation to the act receives no check corresponding to that human punishment which menaces the Political Rebel. The Schismatic makes his appeal to the tribunal of Christ. He has done a deed the cognizance of which the Lord has reserved for Himself. Beyond the fears and hopes of other men, he looks forward to that last scene with the consciousness of a bold transgression. He has violated the Christian Temple, he has touched the Holy Thing, and that day only can reveal, whether, like David, he will stand excused and justified by his need, or, like Nadab and Abihu, he will be visited with a visitation beyond that of other men.

The separation from the Church of Rome not a Schism.

VI. The separation between the Romish and the Protestant Churches has nothing of the character of Schism or Heresy in it. The Romish Church had become the head of an ever-increasing alliance between distinct Churches, and gradually and artfully applied to the whole Body, thus formed, rules and obligations which were only applicable to the members of each separate Body, considered in their relation to that Body. Every secession from the alliance was accordingly branded with some epithet which properly belonged to a member seceding from some one Church, and every resumption of independence was called a violation of Unity. Whereas the Church never was, and never was intended to be, One, in that sense of the word Unity.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

VII. It is not strictly correct, therefore, to characterise the Reformation as a Reform of the Church Universal. The more accurate view of it, perhaps, is this. Certain confederate Churches withdrew from their ancient alliance with each other, and with the Romish Church. This they had a right to do, whether the Faith and practice of any or of all required reform or not. In the next place, these Churches reformed each itself. In each, its purity of Faith is a matter for which each is responsible only to the Head of all, who is Christ the Lord.

The Gnostics.

Second Persecution. A. D. 95.

It is generally admitted, that St. John was banished by the Emperor Domitian, and the sentence makes part of what is called the IInd Persecution of the Christians. Nevertheless, it can hardly be classed among the severe trials of the Church. Flavius Clemens and his wife Domittilla, members of the Imperial family, are recorded amongst the victims; the former as suffering death, the latter, exile. It is however after all doubtful, whether these objects of tyrannical suspicion were charged with their real offences, or whether the imputation of "Atheism" and "Jewish manners" may not have been the cloak for gratifying some dislike, or allaying some dread, which Domitian did not choose to avow. No more were made partners of their Persecution than were probably sufficient to give colour to its justice; and were it not that among these the last Apostle is numbered, all mention of it might be well omitted. Such as it was, it ceased with the death of the Emperor.

At this season, however, the Church began to feel the influence of a more powerful enemy perhaps than the sword of Persecution. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the attempts of the unconverted Jews to direct the Civil Powers of the world against Christians were few and feeble. The converted Jews had less spirit, and less show of reason, to contend for the eternal obligation of the Mosaic Law even on Christians. It was no longer deemed necessary to enforce those restrictions therefore on the Jewish and Proselyted converts, which before that signal event prudence had suggested. From the Jews, and from the disposition to Judaize Christians, the Church was comparatively secure. In proportion, however, as this relief was obtained, a new evil began to spring up. The unconverted Gentiles were henceforth the chief movers of calumny and accusation. It was now palpably the interest of a great Body of them to be so. From the converted Gentile too, more than from the Jew, the Gospel was threatened with corruption. It was not now so much an adulterous union between the Mosaic Law and the Christian, as between Gentile Philosophy and Christian Truth, against which the defender of the Faith had to contend. And here it might be expected, that at least the Judaizing portion of the Church would have been firm resisters of this most unnatural union,—but they were perhaps the weaker party, and were even more readily seduced than their brethren of Gentile origin. The reason was this. With the Jews of Alexandria, and,

Causes of the Gnostic Heresy.

History.

through them, very generally with the Jews of all parts, the experiment which was now to be tried on the Christians had been made, and that with eminent success. Long before the establishment of the Eclectic Sect in Egypt, the principles on which it was formed had influenced the Philosophical speculations at Alexandria; and several tenets of the Greek Wisdom had been admitted into the Oriental schools, and still more of Orientalism into those of the Grecian Philosophy. Plato's system, from its fanciful assemblage of *Ideas*, was the most readily identified or amalgamated with the Eastern Theory of Emanations. But the Peripatetic and Stoic were soon found equally pliant and yielding to the ingenuity of men once practised in the method of harmonising and reconciling. Both, no less than the Academic, agreed indeed in the fundamental point of Theology with the Eastern creed, *viz.* that the Deity was the Soul of the World or the Universe itself. The Epicurean system was the most stubborn, but even this was gradually tortured, until it was made to furnish some evidence to the shifting views of these Theorists. Meanwhile, in this rage for Philosophic liberality, the ancient and august character of the Mosaic Revelation, and the reverence with which it was observed by so large a portion of the inhabitants of Alexandria especially,—the great laboratory in which all these experimentalists were at work,—could not but tempt them to tamper with this institution also. Many of the Jews were persuaded into a notion, that part of the Gentile Theories must have been portions of Patriarchal Revelation, and worthy of being believed and applied to the elucidation of the Mosaic. The infection had spread far and wide through the nation at the period of the Messiah's coming; and many of those Jews who became converts to Christianity, carried with them into the Church the tenets and the spirit of Gnosticism. Even during the Ministry of St. Paul we recognise the early use of the word *Gnosis*, (γνῶσις,) applied as it began to be to an *esoteric* doctrine, a refined and Cabbalistic interpretation of the Gospel—a system which in the Apostle's own words was "falsely called Gnosis or Knowledge."* Before the close of the Ist century, however, the warning voice of Paul required the support of the last survivor of the Apostles. The "foolish questions" and the "endless genealogies," from which the former had endeavoured to divert the attention of the Christian inquirer, were becoming more and more objects of interest. Foolish inquiries or questions into the absolute nature of God, led (as it must ever lead men, to absurdity and impiety) to those wild speculations concerning the successive generations of Æons,—the emanations of the Divine Essence,—and all the Metaphysical subtilties of Orientalism, to which St. John briefly, and in the spirit of one dismissing idle discussion by a few authoritative assertions, adverts in the commencement of his *Gospel*.†

Its authors.

The authors of this progressive Heresy are stated by Historians to have been Simon Magus, Menander, Dositheus, Cerinthus, and others of inferior note.

Whatever mischief, however, these may have caused to the Church, all of them cannot properly be called Heretics. To begin with Simon Magus. The character of this Impostor is decidedly not that of a Heretic, but of an Infidel and Blasphemer.* Supposing him to be the same named in the *Acts*, (which supposition rests on uncontradicted tradition,) he was by birth a Samaritan, who, having travelled to Egypt, came home imbued with the Oriental Philosophy, which he taught to his countrymen, claiming for himself the rank of Æon or superior Emanation from the Deity. When Christ was preached abroad, he found no difficulty in admitting the divine authority of his Mission; and merely contended that he himself was a superior Æon, who with his wife or concubine Helena had become incarnate since the Messiah. With such an object, supported by blasphemy and imposture like this, Simon was rather the first of the false Christs whom our Lord foretold, than a heretical follower. It is well known, that in order to make it seem that his authority was, like that of Jesus, divine, he practised Magic, and performed false Miracles; nor, with this general view of his character and manners, is the story in itself improbable which Historians tell of his death at Rome, by a fall, namely, in attempting to fly from the Capitol. No Miracle would have been more worthy of the Impostor's ambition, than that which should make him seem to the Jews to fulfil the desired sign of the Son of Man descending from the clouds of heaven. Notwithstanding the glaring absurdity of his pretensions, it is no slight proof of the prevailing bias of men's minds towards the Oriental and Gnostic fancies, that he not only was attended during his life by a numerous train of adherents, but that as late as the IIId and even the IVth century there continued to exist a sect who claimed him as their founder, still believed in his doctrine, and paid him the honours and worship due to his assumed nature. The assertion that a Statue was erected to him at Rome has been doubted, and the fact ascribed to the ignorance or credulity of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others. The story is improbable, but the testimony is strong, because derived from so many consenting witnesses.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

Simon Magus.

The next place in the list of Heretics is assigned to Menander. Menander; by some supposed to have been a disciple of Simon. As far as any clear and plausible account of him can be collected from the notices of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Justin Martyr, he has been as improperly ranked among the disciples of that famous Magician, as among the Christian Heretics. Like Simon, he is said to have been by birth a Samaritan, and, like Simon, to have taken advantage of the reigning taste of the times, to make himself appear to his countrymen and the world "some great one," and "the power of God." Thus, he might have introduced himself into notice by admitting the divine nature of Jesus, as Simon did; and even of that Impostor also, reserving for himself the character of an Æon still nearer than either to the fountain of Deity. The doctrine of Emanations was obviously suited to the spirit of Imposture, and was naturally the doctrine of each false Christ in succession. Yet was it not the prevalence of that doctrine alone which caused such numbers to submit to similar delusions one after another. This must be sought for in the universal expectation of a great deliverer, which those who were

---

* *Tim.* ch. iv. v. 1; ch. vi. 20. *Tit.* ch. iii. v. 9. *Colos.* ch. ii. v. 8.

† Such is the assertion of Irenæus, Tertullian, and others. See Tillemont's *Mémoires*, tom. i. p. 936. See also a small work by G. L. Oeder, *de Scopo Evangelii Johannis*, published at Leipsic in 1733.

* So Justin Martyr, as quoted by Eusebius, "καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἀνέλκυσιν τοῦ πυρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν, στρεφόμενον οἱ δαίμονες ἐνεφάνισαν τοῖς, λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι θεούς. Σίμωνα μὲν τινα Σαμαρέα, κ. τ. λ. Justin, *Apol.* I. Euseb. lib. ii. c. 13.

History. dissatisfied with the kind of deliverance offered by Jesus and his followers, continued fondly to look for. Love of novelty might account for the formation of one such sect as these; but the ready obedience of new disciples to the call of every similar pretender, could only have arisen from the fullness of the time. Menander's talent for supporting his imposture was probably not equal to that of Simon; for he is less famous in Ecclesiastical legends, and his sect soon ceased to be noticed by Historians.

Dositheus. Another of these Impostors, whose name has been connected with the History of the early Church, is Dositheus. His life and tenets are still more obscure than those of the preceding, but his main object appears to have been the same. By some he has been made a disciple,* by others, the preceptor of Simon. Neither is likely; as far as we can trace his course, it evinced more enthusiasm than knavery, such as Simon's was, and was quickly terminated. Having failed to obtain credit with the Jews, he proclaimed himself to the Samaritans as the Messiah, and an attempt having been made by the High Priest to apprehend him, he took refuge in a cave, wherein he perished.† Still, the same cause which prolonged the existence of the Magian sect, kept alive for centuries the faith and the hopes of his party,—if, at least, from him was derived the sect of Dositheans, whose existence in Egypt as late as the VIth century is well attested.‡

Cerinthus. Of Heretics, properly so named, Cerinthus was perhaps the first. By some he is said to have flourished in the beginning of the IInd century; but the assertions of the early writers, that the rise of his sect was one cause for the publication of St. John's *Gospel*, together with the internal evidence contained in that *Gospel* to the fact, makes it more than probable, that his proper place in Ecclesiastical record is the close of the Ist century. In the romantic and fabling spirit of the times, some have ventured to represent him as the great antagonist on whom the spiritual prowess of Christ's champion, St. John, was proved; as that of St. Peter had been on Simon Magus.§ This may, perhaps, afford an additional ground for presuming that they were contemporary, however decidedly we reject the stories themselves.

Cerinthus was a Jew, and one of those who had deeply imbibed the tenets of Orientalism. He became a convert to Christianity, with his fancy over-excited, his judgment perplexed, and his very affections, which the Gospel was calculated to arrest and sober, so misguided by his previous habits of Religious meditation, that he looked on his new system of Faith with the same nervous and irritable view, with which the great Arithmetician was said to perceive only number in all the variety of scenes he beheld. The visionary *pleroma*, filled with the divine essence, emanating from its source with gradually decreasing brightness, and passing thus through all Nature until it was traced imperceptibly to Matter, and as such losing its original character of excellence, and assuming that of Evil—all this haunted his mind like an enchantment; and he thought on the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, only to find their respective places in this emblazonry of fancy. In the ingenious attempts to harmonize Judaism and Orientalism, the most revolting part of the process had already settled in his mind. Much of the grosser and more offensive tenets of the Eastern Wisdom had been softened down, to effect an union with the faith of the Mosaic Revelation. The Creator of the world, for instance, was no longer, as formerly, represented as an evil and opposite principle to Good, but only as a subordinate Æon, whose work was imperfect, and now become so corrupt that there was need of a superior Æon to restore it. Such a one he beheld in Christ, the Word incarnate. How far he pursued his system of adapting the various doctrines of Christianity to Philosophy is uncertain; but, doubtless, much of the Valentinian Heresy, which arose immediately after, existed in his theory. Considering the Spiritual and Material Worlds as both derived from the same origin, he supposes two classes of Principles, (δύναμεις,) the one Active, the other Passive, the one consisting of Male Æons, the other of Female. From the source of Deity, by a union with Thought or Silence, were produced successive pairs of these Æons, the first of which was Mind and Truth; lower in the scale, the Word, Man, and the Church; and far lower still, the Creator, whose imperfect Power and Wisdom had produced the necessity of an Incarnation, and of all the Christian Scheme. From all these idle and impious fancies, engendered, as it would seem, in the full sunshine of Truth, we should turn aside with little remembrance, if recorded of an individual alone; but the attention is detained, and Reason is staggered, at the record of numbers joining in a view of Revelation such as this; combining through centuries, like the successful builders of a Spiritual Babel; and so established in their creed, as to branch out into subdivisions and sects, all maintaining the great principles of Gnosticism. It is the feeling of each Age, to be amazed and scandalized at the absurdities or impieties of notions worn out by Time; even while it is itself, perhaps, affording matter for the scorn and reprehension of future generations. Scarce less contempt and censure do we pass on the Gnostics of old, than did those Gnostics on the Idol-worshippers, from whose impurities and vanities they had extricated themselves. On us, and on every Age, the Moral presses strongly and beneficially. Other prejudices, than those of a "vain Philosophy," may betray the Christian of the XIXth Century, and of Ages more enlightened still, into errors equally unworthy of the name he bears, and of the God whom he worships. Collectively as a Church, no less than as individuals, we are to the end of time in a state of trial; and it is well to look back on these monstrous pictures of the past, if the retrospect suggests to us, that the best safeguard which we now possess, the aid of the Holy Spirit, was theirs no less than ours.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

The opening of St. John's Gospel directed against the Cerinthian.

It was against the Heresy of Cerinthus that St. John is said to have asserted in the beginning of his *Gospel*, the Eternity of the Word—that the Word which was made flesh was no emanation, but was originally with God, and was God. To other features of this Heresy, he is supposed occasionally to point in his writings, the whole tone of which, of the *Gospel* especially, indicates a design to inculcate the doctrine of Christ's real Divinity, in opposition to the conclusions which were drawn from these principles of Cerinthus; as, that He was inferior to God the Father, that He was a mere Man while on the cross, and separated from the Æon

* Clementini *Recognitiones*.
† Orig. *adv. Cels.* lib. i. and lib. vi. Epiphan. *Hæres.* 13.
‡ Basnage, *Hist. de Juifs*, liv. xi. c. 13.
§ The Legend of Cerinthus in the Bath, and the like.

History.

who possessed His frame, &c. Even those, accordingly, who do not name Cerinthus and his sect as the occasion of the new *Gospel* by the Apostle in his latter days, point to its Spiritual character, and relate that it was composed with a view to represent Christ more in His Divine nature, and especially in that early part of His History which had been hitherto chiefly occupied with His Earthly birth and parentage.

Reason for the progress of Gnosticism.

If it be asked how it happened, that errors like those above described should have passed current with men accustomed to Scriptural Religion founded on Miraculous evidence; with Jews who had received the Law on the testimony of Moses and his Miracles; with Christians whose belief was grounded on a similar foundation, the reason assigned is the following. The artful founders of Gnosticism, in recommending the Oriental Philosophy to the Jews originally, were sensible of the difficulty: They perceived that it was not enough in this case, as in the attempt to reconcile their system with that of Plato, or Aristotle, or Zeno, to make its several parts harmonize and represent those of the other. There was one ingredient wanting, which neither Orientalism nor any Human system of Religion claimed or rested on—an ingredient peculiar to the Truth, and that was Evidence. In order to supply this want, it was found expedient to challenge as authority the very same source to which the Jews themselves were accustomed to appeal. These secrets of Revelation they pretended had been given from the first of Time, together with what was contained in the Jewish Scripture. Adam they said received it, the Patriarchs received it, and through them it was communicated to certain ancient Sages, the especial confidants and guardians of Holy Wisdom. Whilst Divine Faith was presented to mankind in a homely garb, suited to vulgar apprehensions, this key to its real nature was thus preserved in the keeping of a few. In short, this, according to their representation, was the *Esoteric* doctrine of Religion, as that contained in Scripture had been the *Exoteric*. Recalled for testimony to an early Age, to names of whom a blind reverence made it nearly blasphemy to doubt ought; and probably so bewildered in their view of the question as to confound Scepticism, concerning the fact of these holy men having received the communications pretended, with doubt as to the validity of their evidence, if given to such a fact, what wonder that many should fall into the snare? The experience of every Age justifies the great Historian of Greece, in the conclusion to which he was led, by his attempt to ascertain the grounds on which so much idle Fable had been received as truth by his Countrymen. Men will not take the trouble to search after Truth, if any thing like it is ready provided to their hands; and from this fate Religious Truth itself is not exempted.

Apostolic Age. Ministry of the other Apostles and Ministers.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

AGE OF THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS.

FROM A. D. 100 TO 167.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

WITH the removal of God's Inspired servants from the scene, Ecclesiastical History assumes a widely different character from that which it sustained during their Ministry. As long as their agency is employed, we look on with pious confidence in the wisdom of the measures pursued, and presume not to question the reasonableness of the objects effected. But, from the moment at which a transfer of authority is made to fallible rulers and teachers, these become amenable for the discharge of their trust to Posterity, as well as to God; and it is our duty to question the fidelity with which they have discharged it.

Gradual change from Inspired to Uninspired Church Government.

In no part of the Christian scheme is the Divine Wisdom more apparent than in this transfer. It was begun early, long before the removal of the Apostles; and was so gradually accomplished, that even the decay and death of St. John occasioned no such dismay in the Church, as might have been expected at the extinction of the last star by which its course was to be directed. In the first instance too, this transfer of authority was made to those who, for a season, had exercised it under the instruction of the Apostles, and whom the loss of their Inspired guides left therefore engaged in a routine of duty no longer new or doubtful. The change, immense as it was, came almost imperceptibly both on the Church and on its rulers.

Difficulties attendant on such a change.

No portion of the Christian scheme awakens a more anxious inquiry, than the interesting experiment which was thus made in first intrusting Christianity to Uninspired guardians. For, although this was done under circumstances which approach the nearest to extraordinary Divine assistance, and the abruptness of leaving the Church at once to the ordinary help of the Spirit was thereby prevented; although, unlike succeeding rulers of the various Christian Societies, the first Uninspired authorities had received instruction immediately from the Apostles, had acted for a time under their superintendence, and were, accordingly, trained in the practices and taught the doctrines of their Religion in a way which might seem to have precluded the possibility of misapprehension,—still, they were liable to error; and error so near the source of Divine Truth, seems the more likely to mingle and to flow on with it, and to pollute its remotest streams.

Apostolical Fathers.

Of the Primitive Worthies, on whom this weighty responsibility devolved, the most conspicuous are known by the title of the APOSTOLICAL FATHERS, a term obviously derived from the peculiarity of character and circumstances to which we have been adverting. Others, indeed, may have been equally serviceable by their lives, and equally important to the Age in which they flourished; but these have become eminently so to us by their writings, or, rather, the writings which have been transmitted to us as theirs. Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

In the Catalogue of the Apostolical Fathers we usually find the names of BARNABAS, HERMAS, CLEMENT, IGNATIUS, and POLYCARP. Why the first of these, himself an Apostle of no small note, should be classed among the Fathers, it is difficult to understand. Among the works of the Apostolical Fathers, is an *Epistle* claiming to be the production of Barnabas the Apostle. Now, obviously, the only ground for classing this *Epistle* with these works, and not with the Scriptures, is that Barnabas did not write it, whilst the only reason for calling him an Apostolical Father, is that he did write it. It is, in short, to suppose him at once the author and not the author. Barnabas. His Epistle.

One view alone can be at all compatible with this arrangement; which is, that the *Epistle* was originally his, but became so corrupted as to forfeit its Scriptural character. This is possible, but this is not the view taken by the several disputants who from time to time have either advocated or condemned it *in toto*. And even so, although this solution might make the Catalogue of the writings of these Fathers a convenient place for the degraded Scripture, it would not bring down the author to the level of the Fathers. His history, therefore, can only be placed properly where it has been already noticed, with that of the other Apostles.

HERMAS is another Apostolical Father, whose title is doubtful. If his claim be good, he is the same with him whom St. Paul names at the close of his *Epistle to the Romans;* and he is so described by most of the early authorities. Many learned men of later times, however, offended at the character of his singular work, *The Shepherd*, have anxiously sought for external evidence against this identity; nor have they been unsuccessful. There is strong ground for supposing that *The Shepherd* was a production of the IInd century, and that the Hermas who wrote it was a brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome. Nevertheless, as the point is not quite incontrovertible, and as this extraordinary performance was once so famous as by some to be accounted Scripture,* Hermas may still, perhaps, be allowed to keep his place among the Apostolical Fathers, subject to such a protest as the evidence against his claim may seem to require. Hermas. His Shepherd.

* Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* lib. iv. *et apud* Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 8. Origen, too, considered it divinely inspired.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167. Clement.

CLEMENT is more certainly identified with him whom St. Paul, in his *Epistle to the Philippians*, names as one of "his fellow-labourers;"* and from the great number of writings which were made popular by the authority of his assumed name, he may be considered as the most distinguished among the Apostolical Fathers. He was Bishop of Rome by the appointment of St. Peter, and on the death of Anacletus he appears to have united in his person the dignity which was before divided between St. Paul's successor and St. Peter's. Like most of the Bishops of that dangerous See, he suffered martyrdom. Of his writings only one *Epistle* has come down to us, the authenticity of which can be clearly made out. It is addressed from the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth. His *Second Epistle*, as it is called, if originally his, is confessedly very much changed from its original character. But, in truth, there is good reason to believe that no *Epistle* corresponding to this was ever written by Clement. Irenæus† was not acquainted with more than one, and his quotations prove that one to have been the First. Eusebius‡ mentions the Second, but expressly states, that he could discover no ancient authority for it, and rejects it. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, all bear testimony to one only, the First. Two more have been found of late years, attached to a Syriac version of the New Testament, and are published by Wetstein in his folio edition of the Sacred volume. Allowing the full force of the evidence in favour of the genuineness of these, arising out of their Scriptural language, and the absence of terms and topics which belong to a later period, still, this is counterbalanced by other internal evidence which is no less strong against it; and no trace of them is to be found in ancient writers.§ About the spuriousness of the other pieces to which his name has been attached, there is no controversy.‖

His Epistles.

Ignatius. His Epistles.

The remains of IGNATIUS are less scanty, and yet these are confined to seven *Epistles*, written during a hasty and harassing journey from Antioch to Rome, for the purpose of being put to death at a public exhibition. No ancient writings have been more the subject of fraud and corruption than these.¶ Eusebius mentions seven genuine *Epistles*, which Pearson, in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, has very ably identified with that collection which is now emphatically called *The genuine Epistles*.** There is another collection of Ignatius's *Epistles*, of which the former are the basis, but they are most grossly altered and interpolated. A third set appears with his name, which are altogether a forgery. After all, too, although no one can deny the force of Bishop Pearson's arguments in disproving the authenticity of the longer *Epistles*, and establishing the preferable claims of the shorter, still, it is by no means clear, that the imposture practised on what we call the *Interpolated Epistles* was not an after attempt to carry too far, what had been more sparingly, more skilfully, and more successfully effected in the shorter *Epistles*; and that the genuine *Epistles* themselves have been tampered with. The temptation to such a proceeding was strong, and there are certainly not a few internal marks that it was practised. It would, however, lead us too far out of our way to enter into this particular inquiry. Ignatius was the disciple of St. John, and Bishop of Antioch, and suffered martyrdom under Trajan, A. D. 108.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

A. D. 108.

Polycarp. A. D. 167.

The history of POLYCARP brings us much later into the annals of the Church. He suffered beyond the middle of the IInd century, and, like Ignatius, self-devoted for the purpose of diverting persecution from his brethren in Christ. He was that Bishop or "Angel" of the Church of Smyrna, of whom St. John makes so honourable mention in the Book of *Revelations*; and the narrative of his death, which was drawn up by that Church, is peculiarly valuable. According to Irenæus* he left behind him various writings. All that now remains, however, is an *Epistle to the Philippians*, and even of this the original Greek is imperfect, and the remainder only known through a Latin translation.

Inquiries suggested by the lives of the Apostolical Fathers.

However worthy of pious contemplation a more detailed Biography of these holy men may be, the most important, and the most interesting object after all, which is to be obtained from the study of their lives and writings, is, to ascertain how Christians behaved when first left to themselves; or, to speak more accurately, when for the first time left without any extraordinary Divine instruction and superintendence. However famous in their generation might be the names of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, to us they are most interesting as specimens of that generation; as representing in their lives and writings, the opinions and the manners, the practice and the Faith, which enjoyed the approbation of the Primitive Church. Taking this, then, as the main object of our inquiry, we shall not confine our view to their individual histories, but enlarge it from all sources of collateral information which may tend to make the sketch of Primitive Christianity more complete or more faithful.

The leading questions to which we may expect such an inquiry to furnish replies, are

I. What parts of the Apostolic Ministry were intended for the *mere foundation of Christianity?*

II. What parts were intended for the *preservation* of it?

III. How *were these intentions* fulfilled in the Ministry of the Apostolical Fathers and their contemporaries?

I. *What parts of the Apostolic Ministry were intended for the mere foundation of Christianity?*

Difference between the Divine and Human economy.

In the formation of any Society, nothing is more likely than that the means adopted for its first establishment should be also the means proposed for its continuance and security. Thus, the same institutions by which Lycurgus, or Solon, each established a community of that description which best pleased himself, were by them considered as the most conducive to perpetuate it

* *Philipp.* ch. iv. v. 3, "Clement also, and other my fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life."

† *Adv. Hæreses.* lib. iii. c. 3.

‡ *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 38, Ὅτι μηδὲ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἄνωθεν συγγράμμασιν ἴσμεν.

§ For all the arguments against their authenticity, Lardner's *Dissertation on the Two Epistles* may be consulted.

‖ These are
1. An *Epistle to James*, our Lord's brother.
2. *Recognitions*, in ten books.
3. *Clementina.*
4. *Apostolical Constitutions*, in eight books.
5. *Apostolical Canons.*
Of these, the *Recognitions* is the most ancient and the most valuable: it was written, probably, about the middle of the IId century.

¶ Ignatius's *Epistles* were first published in Latin by Archbishop Usher, and afterwards in Greek by Vossius.

** See Eusebius, lib. iii. c. 36.

* Cited by Eusebius, lib. v. c. 20.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

in its genuine purity. This, indeed, will be mostly the case in all Human Societies, but the reverse occurs in the History of the Church. It was established by Miracles exhibiting an infinite variety of superhuman power; it has been perpetuated without any. Its very rulers and agents (as if to make the contrast more striking) have not remained the same. The terms Apostle, Prophet, Interpreter, &c., denote offices which seem to have been designed only for the formation of the Church; and, accordingly, to have been dropped on its complete establishment. Even some of the customary usages of Christianity partook of this temporary character, and these, if preserved, have been applied by the purest Churches to purposes different from those which they originally served.

Reasons for this difference.

The reason of this peculiarity in the character of the Christian Society, or Church, is not simply that its object is Spiritual, but consists in its particular mode of reference to that object. The Church was founded not that new Truths should be revealed through it, but to preserve a Revelation already made. The distinction is very important, and although so obvious as not to require any proof, deserves to be familiarized to the mind in every possible way. The Church was founded by Miracles, and the Christian is often tempted rather hastily to assert that God might, if it had been requisite, properly and consistently have perpetuated it by Miracles. But that this is not the case, a moment's reflection will lead us to determine. Miracles are the appropriate evidence of one who has himself received a Miraculous communication; but what purpose would Miracles serve for attesting a Revelation *fully given* to a preceding generation? A Christian who in the XIXth century should perform Miracles, would naturally be regarded as giving evidence of his possessing, not merely the Christian Truths as hitherto revealed, but some new Light also. A Miracle and a new Revelation go together; when the one ceases, the other also is withdrawn. For what is the import of a Miracle? A Miracle is a change in the order of the visible and material Universe, and therefore an appropriate indication that some corresponding Spiritual or Moral change has taken place. It is the Sign of God revealing and appointing, and is inconsistent with the permanent course of an appointment once made. God's first great Miracle was the Creation and the establishment of the order of the Universe; and this being done, the system was left to work by a power which was created with it. God's last great scene of Miracles was the Revelation of the Christian Scheme; and this being established, its continuance is, in like manner, left to the ordinary operation of that appointment.

Miracles the signs of a new Revelation.

Unnecessary if a Revelation be complete.

If, on the other hand, Christ and His Apostles had taught Christianity *partially*, had only revealed part of the Religious knowledge which was designed for the world; in this case it is very conceivable, that until such knowledge should be complete, individuals in the Church, from time to time, or a regular succession of persons, should have been Inspired; and the new Light would in each case have required the power of working Miracles. The Pope's Infallibility supposes such a need; and if it be well founded, every successive Pope as long as the Age of Infallibility lasts, must have this power; because Infallibility is the power of Revealing on any given point, and supposes therefore a constant extraordinary intercourse with God, which has never been found separate from the power of working Miracles. The withdrawing of this Divine power would in this, as in all other cases, be the negative sign that the Infallibility had ceased.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

But it may be said, that although the connection between a Miracle and a new Revelation be reasonable in theory, do we really find it in the history of God's dealings? The Mosaic Revelation was established by Miracles, but Miracles did not cease with the death of Moses and Aaron, or even of their immediate successors. To this the reply is very obvious. The Mosaic Revelation contained neither all, nor, perhaps, the most considerable portion of that stock of Divine Truth, for the preservation of which the Israelites were formed into a Church. Miracles were from time to time performed; but by whom, and for what purpose? By the Prophets, who attested thereby the Divine communication of *new Light*, which from time to time was added to the former, and which did not complete the sum of the Old Revelation, until 400 years before the coming of Christ. It was, then, that they were left with the Old Testament complete, to employ it to their benefit, or to abuse its Light, as they chose. Occasionally, too, the performance of Miracles arose out of a peculiarity of the old dispensation, which is scarcely ever sufficiently attended to in the parallels drawn between God's former and present Churches. They were the *temporal* enactments of God, as the extraordinary *temporal* Ruler; and had Christ established a Kingdom of this world, then, and in that case only, might we expect a corresponding interference of Miraculous power.

Why continued after Moses.

To the Patriarchal dispensation, as it is termed, the same remarks are still more applicable. New Revelations were continually wanted, and appropriate Miraculous interpositions occurred. Every Revelation was planted by these extraordinary means; and whenever one of God's servants arose to work fresh Miracles, it was to establish some new Truth.

Of the Patriarchs

Notwithstanding, therefore, the pious hope of many good Christians, that Miracles may perhaps be once more permitted for the speedier Conversion of the Heathen, there is, even in this pious hope, something perhaps inconsistent with the *sufficiency* of the New Testament Revelation. A power of working Miracles would place the Missionary in a new character. If wrought in testimony of his preaching, his language would become equivalent to Holy Scripture. He would no longer be a Minister of the New Testament Record, and even if he preached no new doctrine, he must be supposed to preach, not as from the Bible, but by Revelation,—as one guarded against error, and Inspired with correct views, in the same manner as the Apostles. It should be recollected, too, that Christianity can now be proved, to any mind capable of understanding it, by the various sources of testimony which we ordinarily use. Miracles were employed at first, because no other testimony belonged to it; but, although Gentiles and Jews were directed to search the Old Testament for authority, would it not have been strange to have found the Apostles performing Miracles to attest the Ministry of Moses or Isaiah? Equally so would it be, under any circumstances, for a modern Preacher of the Gospel to be furnished with Miraculous testimony in support of the Apostolical Ministry. The book of Revelation has been closed and sealed. Christ's Kingdom is come. Miraculous interposition *now* would indicate that the Christian scheme hitherto has not conveyed all the Truth requisite for Mankind; and the

Arguments against future revival.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

assumption of a power of Revelation or Infallibility, amounts to the same thing.*

Unwillingness of the Church to surrender this power.

All Miracles, then, may be considered as forming that part of the Apostles' Ministry intended for the establishment and not for the preservation of Christianity; whether these Miracles were Signs and Wonders or Spiritual gifts.' At the same time, as nothing could be so mortifying to the pride of the Church as the loss of this splendid power, many might be expected to repeat the attempt to perform them again and again after this power was withdrawn, with the fond hope that the attempt might be successful. Any occasional appearance of success would be hailed, from time to time, by the superstitious as an omen of returning Miraculous agency, and would afford a ready instrument for fraudulent practices as the Church began to offer temptation to ambition or avarice. No wonder, then, that the notice of Miracles extends through its History; and that, however inconsistent with the character of God's final dispensation, they should become the constant boast of Christians, exactly in proportion as that dispensation has been least understood.

Similar cessation of customs connected with Miracles.

But not only Miracles ceased, because designed solely for the establishment of the Church; but the obligation to perpetuate those customs which were connected with Miraculous agency ceased also together with it. As instances of these, may be noticed the practice of anointing the sick, and that of laying on of hands by the Apostle, subsequent to Baptism.

Unction of the Sick.

The first of these customs, evidently, was established as a form of Miraculous cure, similar to that wrought by the pool of Bethesda. It was, no doubt, the mode in which the Apostles fulfilled the Lord's especial injunction to "heal the sick." When, therefore, the custom ceased to have this efficacy, its failure was equivalent to a formal annulment of it by God. Nevertheless, as nothing could have been more mortifying to the Spiritual pride of a Christian, than the loss of so splendid an appendage to the Church as Miraculous power, (agreeably to the remarks above made,) the designing, the superstitious, and, perhaps, the truly pious themselves, would naturally be slow to admit the evidence that its virtue had ceased. To the dying man, and to his distressed friends, even the faintest possibility of success would be a sufficient motive for the experiment. Thus it would be continued, by some from a hope that its efficacy might be renewed; by others from reverence for a custom, which, although ineffectual, had once been blessed by the Spirit; by others, finally, it would be persisted in from a view created by enthusiasm or fraud, that where no palpable Miracle was wrought, a secret Miraculous influence must be communicated in lieu of the specific benefit attached to it. Hence, in later Ages, its invariable use in a great part of the Christian world as a duty to the dying, and as a means of Grace to the departing Christian. Had the custom, when its Miraculous use ceased, been in its nature at all applicable to edification, the reverence which retained it for such a purpose in preference to the introduction of any new ceremony, would have been even praiseworthy. As it is, its preservation in the Greek and Roman Churches is a curious monument of Human weakness.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

The origin and meaning of Confirmation, as performed by the Apostles, have been elsewhere explained. The Apostles used to lay their hands on those who had been Baptized, in order that they may receive some Spiritual gift,*—that is, some Miraculous sign, that the unseen descent of the Holy Ghost on them at Baptism was real. None but an Apostle could do this, and it was done, sometimes immediately on Baptism, sometimes after a long interval; but all Christians seem to have claimed it as a privilege, whenever they had opportunity of receiving it. The rite was called *Confirmation*, and the gift, the Sign of Confirming.

Imposition of hands after Baptism.

Confirmation.

Reasons for retaining this usage.

Properly, then, Confirmation was a temporary usage, connected with a Miraculous display, and, indeed, appended to the Apostolical office, together with which it ceased. Like the Unction of the sick, however, it was still kept up by those who succeeded the Apostles in the government of the Churches, but apparently from a more rational respect for a rite with which such important results had been so long associated. Between the Apostolical Church and that even which immediately followed it, no difference could have been more remarkable than in the increased proportion of infants Baptized. Hence arose one of the first demands on the Uninspired Church for its discretionary power in matters left indeterminate. Those Christians admitted to a participation of the Sacrament before they could, "by reason of their tender years," be taught the meaning of the rite, seemed to require some further formal and public ceremony,—to enable the Church to discharge its duty of solemnly informing them of this meaning, whenever they should be capable of receiving the information. The Apostolical rite of Confirmation had been already made solemn and sacred in the eyes of Christians, and would on that account be far preferable to any new form which might have been appointed for the new object required. It was more—its former object was, to a certain extent, analogous to that for which it was now adopted. It had once solemnized the visible sign of assurance to the Baptized, that he was a portion of the Christian Temple. Its present object was to awaken the Baptized to an inquiry into the evidence which he then possessed of the same state of Grace. Hence, in the most judicious Ecclesiastical regulations, it is made to take place when the mind is supposed to be just capable of appreciating the evidences of Christianity, and the Christian is capable of beneficially partaking of those rites by which he celebrates and renews his Spiritual union with Christ. It is not a Sacrament, nor would that Church be unapostolical which should reject it; but it is the most venerable institution of the Uninspired Church, and the object of it is so consonant to Christian Principles, that if such a form had never been used by the Apostles, that object would, doubtless, still have been provided for by their successors, and some less august ceremony would have been introduced.

Not a Sacrament.

Another branch of the Christian Institution, which was designed only for the foundation of Christianity, and not for its perpetuation, consists in those Ministe-

* Of course any Miracle, which was the fulfilment of a Prophecy delivered during the Inspired Age, would not be inconsistent with this view, *e. g.* the interference of the Almighty to prevent the building of the Temple at Jerusalem; for which there is certainly sufficient evidence in the case of Julian's attempt, and which would, no doubt, be repeated if ever a similar emergency required it. That Julian did encounter Miraculous opposition, has been placed beyond all reasonable doubt by Warburton. See his *Julian*.

* "I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some Spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established." *Romans*, ch. i. v. 2. The Roman Church, when St. Paul wrote this, had not yet been visited by an Apostle.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

rial Offices, the essential characteristic of which was the display of Miraculous power. If Miracles have been shown to be inconsistent with a perfect and established dispensation, of course we should be startled to find any good evidence for the continuance of such Offices in the Church. But no such authority exists. The writings of the Apostolical Fathers are not only without the mention of the terms Apostles, Interpreters, Prophets, &c., as denoting Offices in the Church, but they speak a language incompatible with the continuance of these Ministerial functions under any name. Indeed, there seems to have been no slight scruple in the Primitive Church on this point. For although the Apostolic Order, for instance, was in some respects succeeded and represented by the race of uninspired Rulers on whom devolved the government of the Church, yet they presumed not to apply to themselves the title of Apostles. It might have led to the error of supposing that the essential and characteristic point, Infallibility, had descended to them. And although, as in the case of Confirmation, they scrupled not to apply to a new rite the name and circumstances of one antiquated, because in that case no mistake was possible; yet in the other case the error would have been at once more likely to occur and more dangerous. The Church would never have borne the claim of a Clement or an Ignatius to be *in all respects* the successors of St. Peter and St. Paul; and whatever ambition may have been dormant in the Infant Society, it was necessary that some generations should pass away, and the office and character of an Apostle of Christ be less distinctly present to men's minds, before the fraud should be even practicable.

Cessation of Inspired Ministerial Offices.

Among the Offices created solely for the foundation of the Church, there was one, indeed, which was not necessarily connected with Miraculous power,—that of Deaconnesses. Concerning the origin and peculiar need of this, enough, perhaps, has been said in the preceding pages. Its continuance was prolonged for some centuries after the Apostolic era; and may, doubtless, be with propriety revived, whenever a similar emergency shall call for it.

Deaconnesses.

II. *What parts of the Apostolical Ministry were designed for the perpetuation of Christianity?*

The want of Miracles and Inspiration, how supplied.

To the Apostolical Age the Divine origin of Christianity was satisfactorily attested by Miracles and Miraculous Gifts; the knowledge and the practice of it, too, must have been well understood and familiarized to the various Societies of Christians which so long enjoyed the instruction and superintendence of the Apostles and their fellow-ministers: but the Apostolical Ministry not being designed for the benefit of that Age only, some provision was to be made for perpetuating the Doctrines and the Practices which had been thus established.

Written Record.

Of these the first which presents itself to notice is a Written Record. For the establishment of Christianity the Apostles were commissioned to preach, and to confirm their preaching by Miracles: for the perpetuation of Christianity they were commissioned, *first*, to register the substance of their preaching; *secondly*, to provide means for making this Register equivalent to the word Divinely preached; and *thirdly*, to provide a channel of Evidence to attest the sacred character of that Register. These two last objects were effected by forming Christians into perpetual Societies. Had the Christian Revelation been left to a Record without a Church, it would ever have been liable to two mischances: first, it would have been the property of the Learned only—a mere branch of Philosophy; secondly, all connected chain of evidence for its Scriptural character must soon have been lost; had it been left unrecorded to the various Christian Societies, it must soon have been corrupted and changed.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

The very form of the New Testament Scriptures indicates their dependence on some further act of Apostolical Ministry, such as was the formation of Christian Societies. For, beyond the primary benefit which the Scriptures derive from the Church, in the provision of an unbroken and perpetual channel for evidence; beyond this, the total absence of systematic instruction from them implies, that the sacred Record was accommodated to the existence of a Church, into whose charge should be intrusted the mode of teaching doctrines, and of conforming to the precepts which that Record preserved.

Among the various writings of which the New Testament is composed, there can be no doubt that the four *Gospels*, the *Revelation* of St. John, and the *Acts of the Apostles*, must have been intended as perpetual Records. In writing or inditing the *Gospels*, the Apostles were performing for Posterity their primary office of Witnesses. We should naturally expect from some of them, that in their character of expounders of the Gospel scheme, of Ministers of the Spirit, they would in like manner have laboured partly for future Ages. And yet *Epistles*, and these too abounding in matters of temporary concern, might leave some room for questioning whether the instruction of future generations was contemplated by the writers. The question is not material; for after all, the Ministry of the Apostles was really the Ministry of the Holy Ghost; and whether that Divine Ruler chose to employ His servants in a sphere of Ministry even greater than its extent appeared to them or not; doubtless, the instruction of Posterity was the main purpose for which those *Epistles* were inspired. And it was so, because such is the main purpose which they have served, and for which no other provision has been made. From the *Gospels* and the *Acts* we might have learnt all the facts of Inspired History; but, like the Apostles at the close of their Lord's Ministry, we should have wanted not merely an Historical Remembrancer "to call all things to our mind," but some further Infallible Expositor "to teach us all these things,"—to teach us the full meaning of all that had been done and registered. The Epistolary form in which this has been accomplished might create a question, as to whether the Apostles themselves understood that they were doing this for Posterity as well as for their immediate charges; but that this was even their *principal* design by the Holy Spirit, is a view scarcely to be controverted. More; the careful manner in which these *Epistles* were preserved, transcribed, and circulated, from the earliest times, is a strong presumption that they were from the very first considered in this light. It was this, perhaps, more than personal respect for the memory of the writers, which caused them to be so carefully kept and transmitted. Nor can the occasional topics with which they are occupied be regarded as certain proof that even the Apostles' views were confined to the instruction of those immediately addressed; for although the *Epistle to the Colossians*, for instance, contains some peculiar allusions to the state of

The Epistolary form of several inspired

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

the Church at Colosse;* yet we know that this was sent with a special charge to transmit it for the perusal of the Laodiceans; and to obtain from them the perusal of one which St. Paul appears to have written to that Church. Why may not St. Paul, and the other writers of the *Epistles* of the New Testament, in like manner, have contemplated the perusal of every *Epistle* which they wrote, by every Church in every generation?

It is to be observed, too, that among these *Epistles* are some which really deserve the name of Treatises, although, having been addressed to particular Churches or bodies of Christians, they may in one sense be called *Epistles*. Such are the *Epistles to the Romans*, and to *the Hebrews*.

The New Testament its own Expositor.

In considering, then, the New Testament Record as one of the measures for perpetuating Christianity, its twofold character should be carefully kept in view. It is a Record of Facts; and so far answers to the primary character of Christ's Apostles, his Witnesses.† It is beyond this a Record of the interpretation of the Christian scheme, which was made up of those facts; and, so far, corresponds to the secondary office of the Apostles,—that of Ministers of the Spirit. It contains not only a Revelation, properly so called, but the infallible Interpretation and unfolding of it. It was purposely so framed as to preclude the need of that which was not to be perpetuated,—an unerring Expositor.

The Church.

Reasons for its formation,

The Sacred Record, then, is most strictly a substitute for all the Apostolical instruction. But the Apostolical instruction was preserved pure and entire in the preaching of the Apostles by the Holy Spirit's extraordinary suggestions and corrections, and it was authenticated by testimonial Miracles. An ordinary and permanent provision was requisite to compensate for all this when withdrawn; and, accordingly, these were among the objects contemplated in the formation of the Church. In furnishing a channel of perpetual evidence, it served the same purpose to the Record, as did the Testimonial Miracles to the Apostles' preaching; in preserving the Record entire and uncorrupt, it would do that which the Holy Spirit's suggestions and corrections had done for the unrecorded Revelation, when only existing in the memories and minds of the Apostles.

nd its distribution in separate ocieties.

The Church, then, was the second great provision made for the perpetuation of Christianity. But its importance was not confined to its character as a safeguard, or as a channel of evidence. The Scriptures were so left as to depend on its operations, for the most efficacious employment and dispensation of the Holy Truths which they contained. With every change of Language, of Climate, of Prejudice, and of all circumstances whatever arising out of Religion, or accidentally interfering with it, the Gospel would require to be taught in a somewhat different form. Truths which for any reason had become subject to controversy or misapprehension, would need a solemn specification in the formula of a Creed or an Article; and the young and the newly initiated would require to receive instruction in that particular form which might put them on their guard against those errors to which they were most exposed. Change of manners, of climate, of government, and especially of the relative situation between the Church and State, would present exigencies which could only be properly met by the enactments of an authorized body. All these are the purposes for which Christians were formed into Societies, and which that portion of the Apostolical Ministry appears to have effected.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Necessity for incorporation with it.

Still, we should form a very inadequate view of the benefits of the social connection between Christians, if we did not extend its sphere of utility even beyond that of facilitating and adjusting the other provisions made by the Holy Spirit for perpetuating Religion. More was intended, and more has been accomplished by it. It is one of the appointed means of Salvation; its character is, in short, Sacramental. Although it is true that the individual welfare or misery of every Christian will, according to the Gospel scheme, be separately determined, and sentence be passed, not on Churches, but on individuals; yet it is no less certain, that the means of obtaining future reward, and of avoiding future punishment, are not appointed to be communicated to men otherwise than as members of a Social Body. Every promise of the Gospel is limited to such as shall thus associate themselves with a Church. It is not by virtue of the act of Faith, or by the confession of it, that we receive our first union with the Holy Spirit; but by the act of Initiation into the Church; it is by Baptism. We are not individually, but collectively called by the Apostle, "the Temple of the Holy Ghost;" and he who expects to share in the benefits of Christ's death and Resurrection, can only do so as a member of His body—a portion of His residence, the Church.

Objects of the Church.

The Church, then, considered as a provision for perpetuating Christianity, has four distinct offices: first, that of preserving the Scriptures; next, (which is closely connected with the former,) that of bearing witness to them; thirdly, that of judiciously dispensing the truths contained in them; and, lastly, it has the Holy office of conveying Grace. Accordingly, some of the several component parts of such a Society, as well as its several institutions and enactments, are designed to fulfil sometimes one, and sometimes another of these offices. In some instances more than one or all are to be recognised. For instance, as the channel for preserving and dispensing Gospel Truth, it has Ministers of different Orders, and it establishes Schools of Religious instruction. Again, in its office of conveying to its members the Grace of which it is the appointed means, it enjoins Rites and Ceremonies, and prescribes the form and manner of public Prayers.

Recognised by the Apostles.

All these objects, then, being contemplated in the formation of the Church, the Church's separate functions were begun and sanctioned by the Apostles before their departure from the scene. To its operation as a Body was left, before their departure, the full exercise of all these separate offices, whereby its character as a permanent provision may be understood and attested. It ordained Ministers; it celebrated Rites; it appointed Schools, and prescribed other modes of Religious instruction. Even as a channel of evidence to the Scriptures, it began to be recognised before the death of St. John, who, on Eusebius's positive testimony, lived to see the first Scriptural deposit made and put in trust for Posterity.

But not only did the Apostles thus fashion the Church, and see its several functions in exercise before

* See particularly ch. iv. v. 8—10; and, again, v. 17.

† Herein more particularly we recognise the fulfilment of the Lord's prophecy respecting the office of the Holy Spirit. "He shall testify (or Witness) of Me; and ye *also* shall bear Witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning." John, ch. xv. v. 26, 27.

Apostolical origin of Church Discipline.

their deaths; provision was also made for its security and continuance. Itself appointed to preserve Religion, it required some special provision for its own preservation:* and there was need that this too should be sanctioned by Divine authority, and illustrated by Apostolical practice. Hence the exercise of Church Discipline, as emanating from the Church, was commenced even during the Ministry of St. Paul. *His Epistle to the Corinthians* proves that Apostolical interference was made, not to supersede, but to enforce the pains and penalties of the Church. The same view may be obtained from the manner in which the Bishops of the Seven Churches of Asia are addressed in the Book of *Revelations*. It was the more necessary that this point also should have been understood before the close of the Holy Ghost's extraordinary superintendence; that men may have the less plea to resort to a code of Discipline foreign to the true character of the Church. On this point we have already dwelt more at large in a preceding portion of our History.

Discretionary authority of the Church.

Before we proceed to a distinct examination of the manner in which the Uninspired Church continued, after the removal of the Apostles, to fulfil in each of its departments its character as a perpetual provision, one point must be settled. In order to judge how far the Primitive Christians have been, or ourselves now are true to our trust, it is necessary to determine how far the *discretionary* authority of the Church goes—what is the Principle by which that authority is shaped and bounded?

In what sense the Church is One.

And first it may be as well to get rid of a source of indistinctness and confusion, which is for ever encumbering discussions on this subject. We are wont to speak of the foundation of the Church, the authority of the Church, the various characteristics of the Church, and the like, as if the Church were, originally at least, One Society in all respects. From the period in which the Gospel was planted beyond the precincts of Judæa, this manifestly ceased to be the case; and as Christian Societies were formed among People more and more unconnected and dissimilar in character and circumstances, the difficulty of considering the Church as One Society increases. Still, from the habitual and unreflecting use of this phrase, "The Church," it is no uncommon case to confound the two notions; and occasionally to speak of the various Societies of Christians as *one;* occasionally as *distinct* Bodies. The mischief which has been grafted on this inadvertency in the use of the term, has already been noticed; and it is no singular instance of the enormous practical results which may be traced to mere ambiguity of expression. The Church is undoubtedly *One*, and so is the human race One; but not as a Society. It was from the first composed of distinct Societies, which were called One because formed on common principles. It is only One Society considered as to its future existence. The circumstance of its having One common head Christ, One Spirit, One Father, are points of unity, which no more make the Church One Society on earth, than the circumstance of all men having the same Creator, and being derived from the same Adam, renders the human race One family. That Scripture often speaks of Christians generally under the term "the Church," is true; but if we wish fully to understand the force of the term so applied, we need only call to mind the frequent analogous use of ordinary Historical language when no such doubt occurs. Take, for example, Thucydides's *History of the Peloponnesian War*. It contains an account of the transactions of two opposed parties, each made up of many distinct communities; on the one side were Democracies, on the other Oligarchies. Yet precisely the same use is made by the Historian of the terms "the Democracy" and "the Oligarchy," as we find Scripture adopting with regard to the term "the Church." No one is misled by these, so as to suppose the Community of Athens One with that of Corcyra, or the Theban with that of the Lacedæmonian. When the Heathen writer speaks of "the Democracy of" or "in" the various democratical States, we naturally understand him to mean distinct Societies *formed on similar principles;* and so, doubtless, ought we to interpret the Sacred writers when they, in like manner, make mention of the Church of or in Antioch, Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, &c.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Reasons for this popular Unity observed in the Jewish dispensation.

But there was also an especial reason why the term Church should have been often used by the Sacred writers as if it applied to One Society. God's dispensation had hitherto been limited to a single Society,—the Jewish People. Until the Gospel was preached, the Church of God was One Society. It therefore sometimes occurs with the force of a transfer from the objects of God's *former* dispensation, to those of his *present* dispensation. In like manner, as Christians are called "the Elect," their bodies "the Temple," and their Mediator "the High Priest;" so their condition, as the objects of God's new dispensation, is designated by the term "the Church of Christ," and "the Church."

The Church in this sense a model for all Christian Societies.

The Church is One, then, not as consisting of One Society, but because the various Societies or Churches were then modelled, and ought still to be so, on the same Principles; and because they enjoy common privileges,—One Lord, One Spirit, One Baptism. Accordingly, the Holy Ghost, through His agents the Apostles, has not left any detailed account of the formation of any Christian Society; but He has very distinctly marked the great principles on which all were to be founded, whatever distinctions may exist amongst them. In short, the foundation of the Church by the Apostles was not analogous to the work of Romulus or Solon; it was not, properly, the foundation of Christian Societies which occupied them, but the establishment of the principles on which Christians in all Ages might form Societies for themselves. What they did form, may be regarded rather as specimens and exemplifications of these principles. Agreeably to this view, in the application of these Principles, some variety occurs in the History even of the earliest Churches. At the same time, the foundation Principles themselves recorded in the Scripture, and acted on by the inspired Revealers of them, formed a conspicuous boundary to this discretionary power; and it is by those, accordingly, that our judgment is to be regulated in the proposed inquiry.

Its principles, in what respect differing from those of Mosaic institution.

What, then, were these Principles? As far as they coincided with those on which the old Church of God, the Jewish, was founded, it was not to be expected that any very express directions should be given. That in God's last Social Establishment, His Revelation was thereby to be preserved and applied, as was the design of the Mosaic Institution, was manifest; and the only question was, how far the method of doing this was

* "There is one end of Civil Government peculiar to a good Constitution, namely, the happiness of its subjects; there is another end essential to a good Government, but common to it with many bad ones—its own preservation." Paley's *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, vol. ii. book vi. ch. vii.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

changed? On this point it might be expected that no room should be left for doubt or misapprehension.

The Christian Church Spiritual.

I. In the first place, then, God's ancient Church was established on Earthly Principles. It was a Temporal government, in which His laws were enforced by Temporal rewards and punishments. It was strictly a Kingdom of this world. Hence arose the first distinct Principle which it was requisite to specify. Our Saviour's death, connected with those expressions of His, which at the time of their being spoken were so hard to be understood, left this as solemnly and as awfully impressed as can well be conceived. A Christian Society was to be purely Spiritual; its objects, its functions, its connections, were all to be strictly separated from those of any worldly Society; it was His whose Kingdom was not of this world. But most pointedly was this marked in the final establishment of Christianity. God became the Ruler of His people permanently, in a way which precluded the possibility of attaching His residence and government *to any place* or sensible circumstance, such as characterise Societies of this world. There was no Temple—no visible High Priest—no local medium of communication, to correspond with the residence of Earthly Rulers, and the circumstances of their supremacy. The time was then come, as Christ foretold to the Samaritan Woman, when neither in Mount Gerizim, nor yet at Jerusalem, were men to worship the Father; but they that worshipped Him, were to do so in Spirit and in Truth.

Universal.

II. In the second place, God's ancient Church was a *partial establishment.* Moses and the Prophets were sent only to one nation, and to them were limited all God's offers, promises, and threats. Here, then, was another material point of difference which it pleased God to draw between the former and the latter dispensation, and another rule to be specified. The *new* Church of God, as opposed to the *old*, was not only to be Spiritual, but Universal; and, accordingly, the command expressly was, "Baptize *all nations.*" Until this new ordinance, part of the Human race only was called God's own People; the rest were viewed in the light of foreigners, and were placed out of the pale of His peculiar government. Hence, among the various images by which this innovation of the Christian scheme is alluded to in our Saviour's language, Satan is represented as deprived of that portion of the world which, in a partial dispensation, was left to him. "The Prince of this World" was now to surrender his claim, and *all* nations were invited by God to become subjects of the Universal Empire which He had established.

Uniform.

III. A third circumstance about the Jewish Church, which was not to be perpetuated under the new dispensation, was, that its privileges were dispensed in different degrees. The native Jew enjoyed precedence, it was presumed, in the sight of the Almighty Ruler; his was the highest class of God's people. The Proselyte of Righteousness claimed the next rank, and was entitled to higher hopes and privileges than the humble Proselyte of the Gate. In God's new dispensation there were to be no corresponding distinctions. There were to be no degrees of Christianity. Now there was to be not only "one Lord," but "one Faith," "one Baptism,"—one participation of every privilege for all nations. Unity or Oneness was to characterise the new Church, not less than Spirituality or Universality. This, although, considered abstractedly, it may seem the least of the innovations in the new form of God's Kingdom, was, as appears from the preceding History, the most difficult to accomplish. It was the most obnoxious to Jewish prejudices, and is, accordingly, more darkly intimated than the others by our Lord Himself;—in Parables, for instance, such as that of the Labourers in the Vineyard, and in other indistinct allusions, which would be certainly understood only when the event to which they pointed had taken place. It is from St. Paul's writings, and from the history of his labours, which were peculiarly devoted to the establishment of this Principle, that it derives its clearest elucidation and sanction.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Limit to discretionary authority arising from these Principles.

The three great Principles, then, on which every Church, or Christian Society, was formed by the Apostles, were Spirituality, Universality, and Unity. Out of these arose one important limit to the discretionary powers of the Uninspired Church, when deprived of extraordinary authority. It is of the last importance that this fact should be borne in mind in every appeal to the practice and authority of the Primitive Church. There is (even among Protestant Divines) a vague method of citing the authority of the early Churches in matters of Discipline and Practice, without any distinct view of the exact weight of that authority. In quoting Doctrinal statements we are generally more accurate in our estimate; but it is undeniable, that the Practices and Discipline of the Primitive Churches, are subject to the same kind of check from Scripture, as are their Opinions and Faith; and are in no instance to be received as if they were matters left altogether to their discretion. The *Principles*, although not the specific Rules, are given in the New Testament: and this is, perhaps, nearly all that is done in the case of the Doctrines themselves. Only the elements, out of which these are to be composed, are furnished by Scripture. So far from being stated in a formal way, some of the abstract terms for these Doctrines are not found in the Scriptures; such a statement and enunciation of them being left to the discretion of the Church. So, too, the Principles of the Church Establishment were given and were put in practice for illustration; and the application of these Principles was all that was left to the discretion of its Uninspired Rulers. In short, every Church, in all Ages, holds Scripture in its hand, as its warrant for its Usages as well as for its Doctrines; and had the immediate successors and companions of the Apostles, from the very first, corrupted the Government and Constitution of the Church, *we* should be enabled to condemn them, from the New Testament, and to this test it is the duty of all Ages to bring them. Their management of those matters which are said to be left indeterminate, has only the authority of an experiment; it is a practical illustration of Scriptural Principles. Whenever they have been successful in this experiment, it would, indeed, generally be unwise and presumptuous in Us to hazard a different mode of attaining the same result; but even here, any deviation is authorized by difference of circumstances, the same Principle which guided them being kept in view by Us. But, in whatever stage of Ecclesiastical History the Principle itself has been forgotten,—it matters not how far back the practice may be traced,—it has no authority as a precedent. The Bible is our only attested Rule, and we must appeal to it with the boldness recommended by the Apostle to his converts; and though an Angel from heaven preach unto us any other Rule than that we have received, let him be accursed.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

The Principles themselves to be the object of all Christian Societies.

This boundary line to the discretionary powers of the Church would be quite clear, supposing the Ecclesiastical Principles to have been left only as above considered, in the form of abstract instruction, whether formally enunciated or certainly deducible from the Scriptures. But far more than this was done. On these very Principles the Apostles actually formed and regulated Societies of Christians; so as to leave them not merely abstractedly propounded, but practically proved. This proceeding, while it lightened the difficulty of the Uninspired Church, (especially of those who first received the guidance of it from the Apostles, and who most needed it,) proportionably contracted the discretionary powers with which they were invested. If only Abstract Principles had been left, Uninspired authorities would have been justified in regarding solely these, and regulating the means of conformity to them by their own unbiassed judgment. But the Apostolical precedents created a new restriction. Rulers of infallible judgment had not only taught the Principle, but the precise method by which that Principle was best preserved had been practised by them, and set forth apparently for the guidance of their less enlightened successors. Was the Church of all Ages bound to follow their track without any deviation? If so, where was any room for discretionary power? If not, on what authority was the deviation to be made, and how far was it authorized? Here the most accurate view of the character and object of the Christian's Sacred Record is necessary, in order to remove all obscurity from the question. That Record, as far as the agency of Human Ministers is its object, is partly Historical, partly Legislative. The two terms are not, perhaps, quite expressive of the distinction intended; but, by Scripture being partly Legislative, is meant, that it is partly concerned in conveying the Rules and Principles of Religion—the Revealed Will, in short, of God. It is also partly Historical, and of the Historical portion no inconsiderable share is solely or principally a practical illustration of these Rules. History and Legislation are indeed both blended, and it is because they are thus connected; but the respective uses of them, as distinct portions of Scripture, are here, as in other questions of a similar nature, very important. When the Historical incidents, the *facts* recorded, are recorded as specimens of the fulfilment of God's Will, their only authority, as precedents and examples, arises from their conformity to the Principle which they illustrate. Now it is conceivable and likely, that a change of circumstances may render a practice inconsistent with such a Principle, which originally was most accordant with it, and *vice versâ*. The Principle is the fixed point, and the course which has first attained it may become as unsuitable to another who pursues it, as the same line of direction would be for two voyagers who should be steering for the same landmark at different seasons, and with different winds. Still, as in this latter case, the first successful attempt would be, to a certain extent, a guide to those which follow, and this exactly in proportion to the skill of the forerunner. The Apostles were known to be infallible guides; and those who immediately succeeded them, and all subsequent Ages, are quite sure that they must have pursued that which was, under the existing circumstances, the most direct line to their object,—that, situated as Christianity was in their hands, all their regulations were the best possible for preserving the Principles of the Church Establishment and government. The Uninspired Church was therefore bound to follow them, until any Apostolical practice should be found inadequate to accomplish its original purpose. Here commences the Discretion and Responsibility; the first obligation being to maintain the Principle according to the best of their judgment, as the prudent steersman alters his track and deviates from the course marked out in his Chart, when wind or tide compel him to the deviation.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Different standards of Apostolical and Uninspired Usage.

And thus we shall be at no loss for the precise difference of authority between the precedents of the Apostolical and of the Primitive Uninspired Church. In matters which admit of appeal to the Usage of the Apostolical Church, we are sure, not only that the measure was wise, but the very wisest; and, accordingly, the only question is, whether its suitableness has been affected by any change of circumstances. On the other hand, in a similar reference to the Uninspired Church of any Age, the measure is first of all pronounced wise or unwise—lawful or unlawful, as it conduces or not to the maintenance of the Revealed Principles of Ecclesiastical Society. And, supposing the measure under consideration be proved to have been so conducive, still it is not at once certain, as in the former case, that it was the wisest and most judicious measure which the existing circumstances required or admitted. It emanated from fallible Wisdom. Accordingly, in canvassing the authority of such a precedent, we are authorized and bound to institute two inquiries;—Was the measure *the most accordant* with Ecclesiastical Principles then? Is it so now? Whereas, in the former appeal to Apostolic Usage, the only question is, whether it is convenient now?

Qualification arising from extreme Antiquity.

There is, however, some qualification to be admitted in this general statement, correct as it is in a general view. The qualifying point is this: In usages for which there is no precise rule or precedent in Scripture, but in which we follow the practice of the ancient Church, there is a difference to be made in the authority of our Guide, as the usage can be clearly and decidedly traced to Uninspired Institution or not. If looking back through the successive generations of Christians we find it without date or recorded source, it may have been of Apostolical origin; and the strength of this claim is in proportion to the distance of the first link in the chain of its history,—in short, to its antiquity, combined with its apparent Wisdom and Apostolical character. Such a custom, indeed, may have so great a preponderance of probability in favour of its Apostolical origin, as to claim from us nearly the same cautious diffidence in departing from it, which should influence us in canvassing a deviation from the Apostolical precedents themselves.

Limits from the Possession of the Scriptures.

Our immediate inquiry, however, and the point to which these remarks have been directed, is not concerning the lawful use of *Uninspired precedents* by us, but the lawful use of *Inspired precedents* by those who first found themselves deprived of the immediate guidance of Inspiration. The Church, it was observed, had several distinct offices to fulfil. It was the trustee of Holy Writ for Mankind; and in this character it was called on, agreeably to the Will of God, to exert itself for the preservation, and also for the dispensing of the Deposit. The Church was also a means of Grace; and out of this arose a new demand on its carefulness to preserve or to provide such forms as should be best adapted for this purpose. From Scripture and from oral instruction it had been taught the great Principles by which the Apostles had been directed, under the

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Holy Scriptures, to attain these ends; and it had, moreover, witnessed and practised under the Apostles the specified measures which God had pointed out for a due conformity to these ordained Principles of His Society. Still, as the Principles were the end, and the Practice which formed the Apostolical precedents the means, and, as such, only precedents so far as they were conducive to that end; the Church was left to the exercise of a discretion, which, whether exercised rightly or abused, could not, or ought not, to mislead a succeeding Age. Every Christian Society, at every period, must, as such, possess the Christian's Sacred Record, and is, by that, enabled to judge how far others, or how far it has hitherto itself employed that discretionary power, so that the Church should retain its great Scriptural marks—Spirituality, Universality, Unity.

This reasoning applied to the Duty of universally circulating the Scriptures.

Thus, considering the Church as fulfilling its office of preserving the Scriptures, and of being the Channel of Evidence to their authenticity, the limit to its discretionary power, in any given instance, is not hard to be discovered; and we shall scarcely be at a loss to decide on the praise or blame which the Apostolical Fathers and their coadjutors deserve on this score from Posterity, or on the authority and use of their example. In order to *preserve* the Scriptures, for instance, it would be obviously their duty to promote their general use among Christians precisely in the form in which they were first deposited as a trust to be preserved. So far would no check be requisite, beyond that implied in the obligation to perpetuate these writings, in order to assure the Church, that however useful for specific purposes it may be, to recast the Scriptural Truths, and to combine and mould them differently in Homilies, Catechisms, Creeds, and Articles—that, still, it would be unlawful to *substitute* these, however perfect, however completely conveying Scriptural Truth, for the Sacred Writings themselves. The New Testament was an Estate in trust, and the trustees had no authority to dispose of the property, however advantageous the transfer might appear. But, although no doubt could arise on this point; although it is evident, that in order to preserve the Scriptures, and so to preserve them, that each generation may become a strong evidence to the next of their perpetually admitted authenticity, a very general use of the original Scripture is indispensable; still, a doubt may arise, as to the obligation of circulating these writings in their original form among all ranks and descriptions of persons; among those, for instance, whose labours or whose History was not likely to descend from one Age to another, and thus to furnish the intended evidence. If such a doubt arose, how would it be determined? Obviously, by observing how far the great foundation Principles of the Church would be violated or preserved, as one side or the other was adopted in the question. Looking back to the Apostolical course, no Historical fact, no precedent would, perhaps, present itself as being precisely a parallel case; but what could not fail to force itself on the attention, would be, an anxiety expressed in the Sacred writings and in the Ministry of the Inspired Teachers, to preserve that distinction between the Christian and the Jewish Church which forbade a *gradation* of privileges amongst its members; which maintained the breaking down of the partition walls which formerly separated God's Church into classes, each claiming a different proportion of communion, instruction, and whatever else be comprehended under the term Divine Dispensation; which taught that there was one Law for all. This reference to the Principle of Unity, then, would be sufficient to guide the Church, for the first time, in its distribution of the Scriptures, and would equally suffice to enable any other Church, of any other Age, to judge whether it had distributed them rightly or otherwise. No plea, not even an Apostolical precedent, (if such a supposition be possible,) would form a ground for withholding, from any portion of the Church, the Scriptures in a language understood by all. This is so, because the Principle of Unity of Dispensation is the fixed mark, by which the Apostolical precedents themselves were directed; and any such supposable deviation, could only have arisen from extraordinary variation in the means of attaining that end.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Again, considering the Church in another capacity, as the Dispenser of Scriptural Truth, we naturally find it shaping its measures by an attention to those circumstances which would render, in each Age and Society, the Scriptures more easily learned, or less liable to be mistaken. These Truths being always the same, there would still be much room for discretionary power, in conveying them to children, or to mature minds; to a cultivated, or to a savage People; to a Philosopher, or to the vulgar. As errors and heresies arose, a further modification would take place in the mode of teaching Truths once perverted; and these would be, according to the exigency, made more prominent, more explicit, and be more definitely and securely worded. Catechisms, Creeds, and Articles, would be the natural result of the Church's efforts to do its duty as Dispenser of Scriptural Truth. As a Body, likewise, it would, with the same intent, appoint Preachers of the Word, and dispose the oral and written eloquence of its Ministers to bear in the same direction. For the right management of all this, the Uninspired Church would often find no parallel or strict precedent in Apostolical History, and would act on its own discretion. But here, again, the discretion would not be quite uncontrolled. It would be bound so to act, as to conform to those very fundamental Principles of the Church to which the Apostles themselves conformed; and, of course, any precedent which was created by this practice, would be first tried by this standard, before it was acknowledged as such. We examine its conformity with those Principles at the time, in order to determine whether the practice was then right; we should further calculate on its conformity under all the difference of circumstances between the then and the present condition of the Church, before we admitted it as a lawful precedent.

To Catechisms, Creeds, Articles, Preaching.

Accordingly, if these Expositions (whether Catechisms, Homilies, or Creeds) claimed any other authority than that of an Exposition of Scripture, and a mode of Dispensing the Word, a due sense of the Spiritual character of the Church would furnish an infallible check. It would be, obviously, incompatible with this view to allow any Doctrine to proceed from Human authority. Supposing the Doctrine to be true, still, this does not alter the view of it; the appointed characteristic of the New Church is, that its government is Spiritual. Unlike the former Church, it issues its Revelations through no succession of Mediators, Lawgivers, Judges, Prophets, or Kings. Its only medium is the *Record of the Spirit*, and the only authority of the Church's Doctrines is Scripture.

These ought to rest solely upon Divine authority.

Nor should we too hastily determine, as many are apt to do, that discredit would attach to the Divine

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

character of our Religion, if it appeared, in any one instance, to have been generally corrupted so near its source. Even if it were found to be so, this would not affect its claim to a Divine origin, much less oblige us to imitate the corruption. In mere Human institutions, it may imply want of wisdom and foresight in the Founder, that his work should soon have degenerated, and its object be defeated; but this reasoning is not applicable to the Divine appointments, at least it does not apply to the condition of the Church more than to any other of these appointments. The same difficulty meets us in the History of the progressive corruption of the Human race; in the backslidings of God's chosen People, the Jews; and it is what we have reason to look for even in the last dispensation itself, from the Prophetic warning of its Inspired founders. It is that which resolves itself into the inexplicable question concerning the existence of Evil. The general corruption of the Christian world, at any past period, ought to be considered rather as a presumption that the Church is assisted by God; and this the more, the earlier such corruption occurred. It is so for this reason. When the old world first began to corrupt Religion, we know that men plunged deeper and deeper into error. When the Jews began to disobey the Law and to practise Idolatry, we see plainly from their History that the like fate would have befallen them. And why did it not? *Because God continually interposed.* What, then, but a corresponding, though insensible, Divine guardianship can account for what has taken place in the Church of Christ—Reformation? That it should have occurred otherwise, is contrary to all that has ever happened, according to the Religious History of Mankind in every Age.

Early corruption of Practice by the Church not inconsistent with God's other dispensations,

an argument for the presence of His constant Guardianship.

II. To the Rulers of the Church, viewed in its Sacramental character, as the Temple of the Holy Ghost, and the medium of Divine Grace, a discretionary power was likewise left, and likewise subject to a limitation which could never be fairly misunderstood. For the attainment of this object, certain Forms and Ceremonies were requisite; in which Christians, as such, join, and through which, as members of a Community, Grace was to be imparted. To Christians, as a Society, the promise of the Spirit was made; and, accordingly, to them, as a Society, it was to be conveyed. The Apostles had begun and established precedents, which, of course, would be naturally adopted by their Uninspired Successors. But still, as these were only the formal means of Grace, and not the blessing itself, it was equally to be expected that the Church should assume a discretionary power, whenever the means established became impracticable or clearly unsuitable, and either substitute others or even altogether abolish such as existed. At the same time, so great a license would leave the Church liable to be disturbed by the caprice of Mankind, and it was accordingly quite necessary that the boundary of its liberty should be strongly marked. The obvious line is this. The appointments made by the Apostles had a twofold object, some were designed to convey extraordinary gifts, some ordinary. Whatever form was instituted by them for conveying extraordinary gifts, was evidently not to be continued by the Uninspired Church; at least not with the original purpose in view. As to the other appointments, it might seem at first that the Apostolical precedents were literally binding on all Ages; but this cannot have been intended, and for this reason, that the greater portion of the Apostolical practices have been transmitted to us, not on Apostolical authority, but on the authority of the Uninspired Church: which has handed them down with an uncertain mixture of its own appointments. How are we to know the enactments of the Inspired Rulers from those of the Uninspired? and, if there be no certain clue, we must either bring down the authority of Apostolical Usage to that of the Uninspired Church, or raise that of the Uninspired Church to that of the Apostolical. Now the latter is, doubtless, what was, to a certain extent, intended by the Apostles themselves, as will appear from a line of distinction by which they have carefully partitioned off such of their appointments as are designed to be perpetual, from such as are left to share the possibility of change with the institutions of Uninspired Wisdom. If, then, we look to the account of the Christian usages contained in Scripture, nothing can be more unquestionable, than that while some are specified, others are passed over in silence. It is not even left so as to make us imagine that those mentioned may be all; but, while some are noted specifically, the establishment of others is implied, without the particular mode of observance being given. Thus, we are equally sure from Scripture, that Christian Ministers were ordained by a certain Form, and that Christians assembled in Prayer; but while the precise process of laying on of hands is mentioned in the former institution, no account is given of the precise method of Church Service, or even of any regular forms of Prayer, beyond the Lord's Prayer. Even the Record of the Ordination Service itself admits of the same distinction. It is quite as certain that some Prayer was used, as that some outward Form accompanied the Prayer; but the form is specified, the Prayer left unrecorded. What, now, is the obvious interpretation of the Holy Dispenser's meaning in this mode of Record? Clearly it is, that the Apostles regulated under His guidance the Forms and Practices of the Church, so as was best calculated to convey Grace to the Church at that time. At the same time, part of its institutions were of a nature, which, although formal, would never require a change; and these therefore were left recorded in the Scriptures to mark the distinction of Character. The others were not, indeed, to be capriciously abandoned, not at all, except when there should be manifest cause for so doing; but as such a case was supposable, these were left to mingle with the Uninspired precedents, the claims of which, as precedents, would be increased by this uncertain admixture, and the authority of the whole rendered so far binding, and so far subject to the discretion of the Church. They might not be altered, unless sufficient grounds should appear; but the settling of this point was left to the discretion of the Church; and this discretion, again, was subject to the check above described, as arising out of the well-defined characteristics of the Church. Among the methods of Divine Grace, the Sacraments, of course, are distinguished as having been the appointment of our blessed Lord Himself. As far, however, as their permanent claim extends, in common with that of other institutions, to be celebrated according, to all the form found in Scripture, the foregoing general remark is sufficient. It will be time enough to enter into a fuller description of this particular branch of inquiry, when we arrive at it in the detail of the Practices of the Primitive Church; for the better estimate of which, this previous view has been taken.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Discretionary power of the Church as to Ceremonies.

How far limited.

HISTORY.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

AGE OF THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS.

FROM A. D. 100 TO 167.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

How far the design of the Church's Inspired Founders was preserved and followed up by the First Uninspired Churches, or their Rulers.

Of the three leading questions, whereby it was proposed to elicit a view of the Primitive Church, two have been briefly, but, perhaps, sufficiently discussed. We have now seen, first, what parts of the Apostles' Ministry were intended for the *foundation* of Christianity, and next, what parts were intended for its *preservation* and *application*. The third inquiry remains, How far was the design of the Church's Inspired Founders preserved and followed up by the first Uninspired Churches or their Rulers?

As this can only be satisfactorily answered by a detail of the proceedings of the Primitive Church, so far, at least, as those proceedings are known to us; little more will be requisite in most instances, than to observe such an arrangement of these Historical facts, as shall connect them with the general view to which they refer. This arrangement will be formed in reference to the view already taken of the character of the Church and its several Offices; so as that each point of Ecclesiastical History necessary for our purpose, may be brought under one of these four heads.

I. How the First Uninspired Church fulfilled its office of preserving and attesting the Sacred Record.

II. How the First Uninspired Church fulfilled its office of dispensing the Truths contained in this Sacred Record.

III. How the First Uninspired Church fulfilled its office of conveying Divine Grace.

IV. How far its Discipline, or method of self-preservation, was conformable to the design of its Inspired Founders.

I. *How the First Uninspired Church fulfilled its office of* PRESERVING *and* ATTESTING *the Sacred Record.*

Preservation of the Sacred Record.

One of the preceding remarks on the uses of the Church was, that it was designed to be to the Sacred Record, what an Inspired Order of Ministers had been to the unrecorded Revelation. Revelation was withdrawn and Scripture left in its room. As Revelation had been secured against misrepresentation or curtailment, by Divine suggestion and correction, and also attested to be Divine by Signs, wonders, and spiritual gifts; so, in the establishment of the Church, we see a corresponding provision made for the preservation of the Scriptures, and also for a perpetual testimony to their authenticity. Among the means whereby this was effected, the principal have been:

1. *The Public Reading of the Scriptures.*

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167. By Public Reading. Its value

It is not to the utility of this practice as a mode of promulgating the Divine Truths of the Gospel, that we are now alluding; but to its effect in preventing the loss or corruption of the Sacred Record itself, in any, or in all Societies of Christians; and also in keeping up a perpetual testimony to its Divine authority, of which evidence the Church was the especial and appointed vehicle. The value of the practice, in this point of view, can only be justly estimated by recollecting, how much more difficult it was to keep up a chain of evidence to the identity of a Record such as this, (in which the smallest doubt was likely to vitiate the claim of the whole,) before Reading was common; and still more, before the Art of Printing was invented. The language of Scripture continually sounding in the ears of Christians of all classes, would leave no interval for the introduction of false Records. The Church would thus keep up a familiarity with its Divine guide, which might be compared to that which Holy Men of old, probably, acquired with any particular mode of Divine communication from the frequency of their Revelations. They learned to know the voice of the Lord God, and could not be imposed on by a lying Spirit. And so, doubtless, it was intended, that the written word of God should be made continually to speak to His Church, in order that His Church never may be subject to delusion from the cunning devices of impostors.

That the Primitive Church contemplated this purpose, in its careful observance of the usage, need not be made a question. It is, indeed, probable that its main object was the instruction thereby afforded. But, granting this to be so, neither in this nor in any other of the Christian practices, was it requisite that the whole or the main design of the Church's Divine Ruler should have been comprehended by His obedient Ministers. The Apostles themselves, perhaps, saw not the full operation and progressive results of their own plans; and we, at this moment, may be cherishing among the rites and ordinances of Christianity some, the full effect of which it may be reserved to future times, to a period beyond this world, to develope. It is impossible to say, how far we are living by Faith and not by Sight.

Early customs attendant upon it.

As far back as we can trace any accounts, incidental or direct, of the Service of the Primitive Church, the Public Reading of the Scriptures is recognised. Even the minute arrangement of particular portions for particular seasons was observed. Chrysostom* calls it

* *Hom.* 47.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

"the usage of the Fathers;" and some slight variations in the mode of following up this usage are known to us. As, for instance, that for the first 400 years, the Romish Church confined itself to the Public Reading of the New Testament, to the exclusion of the Old.* That in doing this, too, something more was felt than a desire for instruction,—some respect and veneration, in short, for the deposit intrusted to their care. An anxious wish to attach to its preservation every solemn circumstance, may be inferred from the custom which long generally prevailed, of rising when the Gospel was read;† and also from the words with which its reading was prefaced, "Thus saith the Lord." It denoted a feeling that Scripture was the appointed substitute for what had in times past taken place; "God speaking in divers manners," and a scrupulous respect for it, as for the new Shechinah.

Translation of the Scriptures.

The object of this custom would obviously have been defeated, had the Scriptures been read in a tongue unknown to the congregation. Without any direct testimony therefore to this point, we should naturally take it for granted, that the word of God was read in a language "understanded of the people." But, it is clearly ascertained, that for the convenience of those Churches wherein the original of the Scriptures was unintelligible, Translations were early made and used;‡ as early, perhaps, as the close of the Ist century; and what is, perhaps, no less conclusive than direct testimony, is the inference to be deduced from the language of the Apostolical Fathers in their *Epistles* to different Churches. In these, the writers are addressing themselves to each Church as a Body, and appealing continually to the words of the *Gospels* and *Epistles*, as to documents with which those addressed are supposed to be familiar. As the greater portion of every Church, however, cannot be imagined, at that time certainly, to have had copies of the Scriptures in their hands, or even to have learned to read, this habitual familiarity with its texts could only have been acquired by the Public Reading of them.§ In support of what is alleged, we may refer, for instance, to Clement's *First Epistle to the Corinthians*,‖ wherein he introduces a quotation from St. Luke's *Gospel*, with "*Remember* the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, 'wo to that man by whom offences come, &c.'" So, too, Polycarp to the *Philippians*,¶ "*Remembering* what the Lord taught us;" which is followed by another exact citation from St. Luke's *Gospel:* but this is, indeed, the tone and spirit which pervades the writings of the Apostolical Fathers.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

2. In this very custom of quoting the words of Scripture in all their writings, we may perceive another mode in which the Church and its Rulers became the vehicle of evidence to the Sacred Record, and the means of preserving it pure. When Clement or Ignatius cite a passage of St. Luke or St. Paul as inspired, the citation serves at once the purpose of preserving to Posterity their testimony to the Inspired character of the writings, and of enabling us to identify those writings with such as have been transmitted to us as Scripture. In no respect is the testimonial office of the Church more apparent than in this. During a period of nearly 1800 years, the Church of one Age has been thus passing on the memorial of its own conviction and satisfaction to another. Like a chain of heralds stationed over a wide extent of country for the purpose of transmitting some great and urgent tidings; one generation has written, what may be called, the telegraph of its own conviction to the next; and thus it has passed on even unto Us. Let no one, therefore, blame the zeal which incites numbers still to tread the same ground with their predecessors; to write on the same topics on which *they* have written, or even without the design of superseding their labours, or the ambition of rivalling them. He who has left to the world a statement of his belief in any Gospel Truth, and the authenticity of the Record which preserves it, if his writings but remain to another generation, will have borne a part in one of the most important offices of that great Society to which he belongs. His writings will have served to swell the voice, that speaks out, according to the appointment of Providence, from one station of Time unto another; and which must continue to be heard till Time shall be no more.

By Citations.

Out of those writings of the Apostolical Fathers which are commonly selected as genuine, the following quotations from, and allusions to, the New Testament Scriptures, may serve to show in what way those writings attest the genuineness of our Canon; and a reference to the context in each instance, will enable us further to judge how far these Fathers applied the Scriptures, according to what we consider to be their true import and intent.

§ *A selection of quotations from, and allusions to, the Scriptures of the New Testament, which are found in the genuine remains of the Apostolical Fathers.**

CLEMENT.

First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Citations by Clement.

Chap. xiii. "Remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, which He spake concerning equity† and long-suffering, saying, Be ye merciful, and ye shall obtain mercy: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: as ye do, so shall it be done unto you; as ye give, so shall it be given unto you: as ye judge, so shall ye be judged: as ye are kind to others, so shall God be kind to you: with what measure ye mete, with the same shall it be mea-

---

* Strabo, *de Reb. Eccl.* c. 12, cited by Stillingfleet, in his *Orig. Britan.* ch. iv.

† *Constitutiones*, lib. xi. c. 57. See also Chrysostom, *Hom.* 1, *in Matth.* Sozomen (lib. vii. c. 19) notices it as a peculiarity of the Alexandrian Church, that the Bishop did not conform to this custom. St. Jerom records a custom in the Eastern Churches, of ushering in the Gospel with lighted candles. Cave, however, doubts the Primitive antiquity of this practice; and there is certainly no reason to suppose that it was universal. See Bingham's *Eccl. Antiq.* book xiv. ch. iii. sec. 2.

‡ See the ancient testimonies named in Bingham's *Eccl. Antiq.* book xiii. ch. iv. Justin Martyr is the earliest, see *Apolog.* xi.

§ It appears from Eusebius, that in the Age of Constantine there was a custom established, of leaving in each Church one or more copies of the Bible for the use of those who could read, and who might wish to refer to it. The Emperor himself is said to have been in the habit of using them, (see Eusebius, *vit. Constant.* lib. iv. c. 17.) There is extant a distich of Paulinus, which was written by him on the walls of the *Secretarium* of the Church of Nola, in allusion to this custom:

Si quem sancta tenet meditandi in Lege voluntas
Hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris.
Paulin. *Ep.* xii. *ad Severum.*

‖ Ch. xliv. ¶ Ch. i.

* These passages are given from Archbishop Wake's version, and wherever it fails to give the full sense of the original, the deviation is noticed at the bottom of the page.

† Ἐπιείκεια, *meekness, forbearance, mercy.* Even ἐπιείκεια was so applied, as in 2 *Corinth.* ch. ix. v. 9, Ἡ ἐπιείκεια αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. In *Matt.* ch. i. v. 19, Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς δίκαιος ὤν, should be rendered, *Joseph, her husband, being* a mild or merciful *man.*

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

sured to you again." Compare Matthew, ch. vii. v. 6, and Luke, ch. vi. v. 36—38.

Chap. xxxvi. "This is the way, beloved, in which we may find our Saviour, even Jesus Christ, the High Priest of all our offerings. By Him would God have us to taste the Knowledge of Immortality, who being the brightness of His glory,* is by so much greater than the Angels, as He has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For so it is written. Who maketh His Angels Spirits, and His Ministers a flame of fire. But to His Son,† thus saith the Lord: Thou art My Son, to-day have I begotten Thee. Ask of me, and I will give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for Thy possession. And, again, He saith unto Him: Sit Thou on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." Compare *Hebrews*, ch. i. v. 3—13.

Chap. xxxvii. "Let us for example take our body; the head without the feet is nothing, neither the feet without the head. And even the smallest members of our body are yet both necessary and useful to the whole body. But all conspire together, and are subject to one common use,‡ namely, the preservation of the whole body." Compare St. Paul's 1st *Epistle to the Corinthians*, ch. xii. v. 12—26.

Chap. xlvi. "Remember the words of our Lord Jesus, how He said, Wo to that Man by whom offences come!§ It were better for him that he had never been born, than that he should have offended one of My elect. It were better for him that a millstone should be tied about his neck, and he should be cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of My little ones." Compare Matthew, ch. xviii. v. 6; Mark, ch. ix. v. 42; Luke, ch. xvii. v. 1, 2.

Chap. xlvii. "Take the *Epistle* of the blessed Paul the Apostle into your hands. What was it that he wrote to you at his first preaching the Gospel among you?‖ Verily, he did by the Spirit admonish you, concerning himself and Cephas, and Apollos, because that even then ye had begun to fall into parties and factions among yourselves." Compare St. Paul's 1st *Epistle to the Corinthians*, especially ch. i. v. 11, 12.

Chap. xlvi. "Why do we rend and tear in pieces the members of Christ; and raise seditions against our own body?—Are we come to such a height of madness, as to forget that we are members one of another." Compare St. Paul's 1st *Epistle to the Corinthians*, ch. xii. v. 27, &c.

Chap. xlix. "Charity covers the¶ multitude of sins: Charity endures all things, is long-suffering in all things. There is nothing base and sordid* in Charity. Charity lifts not itself up above others; admits of no divisions; is not seditious; but does all things in peace and concord. By Charity were all the elect of God made perfect."† Compare St. Paul's 1st *Epistle to the Corinthians*, ch. xiii. v. 7, &c.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

IGNATIUS.

By Ignatius.

Epistle to the Ephesians, ch. xii. "You are the companions of Paul in the Mysteries‡ of the Gospel, the holy, the martyr, the deservedly most happy Paul, who throughout all his *Epistle* makes mention of you in Christ Jesus." Compare St. Paul *to the Ephesians*, especially ch. iii. v. 3—9.

Same *Epistle*, ch. xviii. "The doctrine of the Cross is a scandal§ to unbelievers, but to us is salvation and life eternal. Where is the wise man? Where is the disputer?‖ Where is the boasting of those who are called wise?" Compare 1st *Epistle to the Corinthians*, ch. i. v. 18—31.

Epistle to the Magnesians, ch. x. "Lay aside therefore the old, and sour, and evil leaven, and be ye changed into the new leaven, which is Jesus Christ." Compare St. Paul's 1st *Epistle to the Corinthians*, ch. v. v. 7, 8.

Smyrnæans, ch. i. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who truly was of the race of David according to the flesh, but the Son of God according to the will and power of God." Compare *Epistle to the Romans*, ch. i. v. 3, 4.

Epistle to Polycarp, ch. v. "Exhort my brethren, that they love their wives, even as the Lord the Church." Compare St. Paul's *Epistle to the Ephesians*, ch. v. v. 25.

POLYCARP.

Epistle to the Philippians.

By Polycarp.

Chap. iii. "Paul, who being himself in person with those who then lived,¶ did with all exactness and soundness teach the word of Truth, and being gone from you, wrote an *Epistle*** to you; into which, if you

---

* Ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, "the brightness of his Majesty;" the word μεγαλωσύνης occurring in the same verse, was very naturally substituted by one quoting, as Clement probably did, from memory. See v. 3.

† Ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, "in reference to His Son."

‡ Ὑποταγῇ μιᾷ χρῆσθαι εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι ὅλον, "all practise submission, that they may be preserved as a whole."

§ The latter part of the sentence is not in the original.

‖ Ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Confer *Philipp.* ch. iv. v. 15, Οἴδατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς Φιλιππήσιοι, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν, κ. τ. λ. Ecclesiastical writers use the phrase in the same sense.

¶ The article is wanting, as is the case in the original expression of St. Peter, from whom it was, doubtless, borrowed.

* Οὔθ' βάναυσον ἐν ἀγάπῃ οὔθ' ὑπερήφανον. "Pompous" would have expressed the meaning of βάναυσον more exactly. Aristotle, in his *Ethics*, makes βαναυσία the excess of μεγαλοπρέπεια, see lib. ii. c. 7, and lib. iv. c. 2, Ὁ βάναυσος, τῷ παρὰ τὸ δέον ἀναλίσκειν ὑπερβάλλει, ἐν γὰρ τοῖς μικροῖς οὐκ ἀπαναίσθητον ποιεῖ ἀναλίσκων, καὶ λαμπρύνεται παρὰ μέλος. Οὐκ ἐμφανὴς γαμικῶς ἐσσῶν. Clement, doubtless, intended to express St. Paul's ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ περπερεύεται οὐ φυσιοῦται.

† Ἐτελειώθησαν, "have been made perfect."

‡ Συμμύσαι, persons initiated in the same Mysteries. It is an allusion to the Apostle's language, concerning the call of the Gentiles, which he speaks of as "the mystery which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest." See more especially *Ephes.* ch. iii. v. 3—9.

§ "A stumbling block."

‖ Συζητητὴς, "the profound inquirer."

¶ Ἐν ὑμῖν omitted; "those of you who then lived" would have expressed it.

** Ἐπιστολὰς. Lardner understands him to speak of the *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, as well as that to the *Philippians*, (see *Credibil.* vol. ii. p. 91, 92.) Cotelerius, in his note on the word, cites Eusebius and other authorities, to show that the word is sometimes used in the plural for a single Epistle. This is partly true. The plural of ἐπιστολὴ may be so used as *not to imply* more letters than one, but not, like the Latin *literæ*, to express one letter. The translation therefore is not quite correct. It should be "Paul, &c. wrote to you, and, if you will refer to what he wrote." The circumstance of its being one or more Epistles, is not intended to be expressed.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Age of the Apostolical fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Paul's *Epistle to the Philippians.*

Chap. ii. "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death." Compare *Acts*, ch. ii.

Chap. iii. "Wherefore, girding up the loins of your mind,* serve the Lord with fear." Compare St. Peter's 1st *Epistle*, ch. i. v. 13.

Ibid. "Remembering what the Lord has taught us, saying, 'Judge not, and we shall not be judged: † forgive, and we shall be forgiven. Be ye merciful, and ye shall obtain mercy: † for with the same measure that you mete withal, it shall be measured to you again. And again, 'Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the Kingdom of God.'" Compare Luke, ch. vi. v. 10, 37; Matt. ch. v. v. 3, 10; ch. vii. v. 1.

Chap. iv. "The love of money is the root of all evil. Knowing therefore, that as we brought nothing into the world, so neither may we carry any thing out, &c. Compare St. Paul's 1st *Epistle to Timothy*, ch. vi. v. 7, 10.

Chap. v. "Every such lust ¶ warreth against the Spirit; and neither fornicators, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, shall inherit the Kingdom of God." Compare 1st *Epistle of St. Peter*, ch. ii. v. 2, and 1st *Corinthians*, ch. vi. v. 9, 10.

Chap. vii. "We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and every one render an account of himself." Compare St. Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*, ch. xiv. v. 10, 12.

Ibid. "Whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, he is antichrist." Compare 1st St. John, ch. iv. v. 3.

Chap. viii. "Jesus Christ, who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth; but suffered all for us, that we might live through Him." Compare 1st Peter, ch. iii. v. 22—24.

Chap. x. "Keep yourselves from all evil. For he that in these things cannot govern himself, how shall he be able to prescribe them** to another. If a Man does not keep himself from covetousness, he shall be followed with Idolatry, and be judged as if he were a Genuine? But who of you are ignorant of this? Do we not know that the Saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches? But I have neither perceived nor heard any thing of this kind in you, among whom the blessed Paul laboured, and who are named in the beginning of that *Epistle*, for he glories of you in all the Churches, who then only knew God." Compare St. Paul's 1st *Epistle to the Thessalonians*, ch. ii. v. 19; *Ephesians*, ch. v. v. 5; *Colossians*, ch. iv. v. 1st *Corinthians*, ch. vi. v. 2; *Philippians*, ch. ii.

Chap. xi. "I trust that ye are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures, and that nothing is hid from you; but to me not yet is it granted. Only we are to practise that which is written, 'Be angry and sin not,' and, again, 'Let not the sun go down upon your wrath.'" Compare *Ephesians*, ch. iv. v. 26.

It has been observed by some that although in most of these and the like instances, the citations are sufficiently correct to preclude all doubt of their being taken from the very parts of Scripture to which they are assigned; yet that in a few, the meaning, and not the exact words is given: and again, that quotations are made which it is difficult to accommodate in any part of the Canon. This is noticed, because it is sometimes urged as detracting from the authority of the Fathers, in the present application of their writings. There is in truth however, something highly natural in this inaccurate mode of quotation used by the Apostolical Fathers. They were, it should be remembered, instructed, not from Scripture, not from a Record, but from the oral teaching of the Apostles themselves. The very words in which they first heard many of the Gospel Truths which they afterwards impressed on their congregations must, beyond a doubt, have been in substances different from the expression of the Record. To them, accordingly, these would be most natural, and would often, in the earnestness of their exhortation, be

These citations sometimes differ from the precise words of Scripture.

Reason for the difference.

---

* "Of your mind," not in the original.

† *Ita un veniat*, in order that ye may not be judged.

‡ *Ut dimittat*, in order that ye may obtain mercy.

¶ *Omnis concupiscentia*, "every lust."

** *Hoc*, "this," the rule, namely, which follows, "If a man does not," &c. agreeably to our Lord's language, as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke, "How canst thou *say to thy brother*, Brother, let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye." Luke, ch. vi. v. 42; Matt. ch. vii. v. 4.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

inadvertently adopted in preference to the Scriptural language. This is not only possible, but what, under their circumstances, we should expect to take place: and there is therefore no occasion for attempting to solve the difficulty, either by supposing any portion of the Holy Testament to have perished under the Church's keeping; or by attributing to these writers the habit of occasionally confounding the Uninspired with the Inspired works of that Age.

Preservation of the written Record by the collection of its several parts.

There is yet another point of view, in which the Church may be regarded as a Vehicle for preserving the Record of Revelation, and also for attesting it, *The collecting the several Inspired writings into one body.* It has already been pointed out, that of the two distinct kinds of writing of which the New Testament is composed, each has its proper use, and reference to the other. The narrative, separated from the *Epistles*, would be like the testimonial character of an Apostle disjoined from the Ministry of the Spirit. The History of the facts of the Gospel scheme required an exposition of their import; and this exposition, again, would have been useless without the History. To preserve, therefore, the Record of Revelation pure and perfect, it was necessary, that, although composed of portions, which could only be gradually collected and put together, it should be so combined and so preserved as One. At what time this collection was completed, cannot be certainly ascertained, although there is every reason to think that it was not later than the middle of the IInd century; and, consequently, before the decease of all the Apostolical Fathers. That it was begun, even before the death of St. John, is more certainly inferred; and, probably, from his sanction to the three *Gospels* of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the addition of his own to the number, we may date the commencement of this important work.* That the feeling with which it was undertaken has never ceased to influence all the Church, may, perhaps, be not unfairly presumed from the scruple which still exists, against publishing separately the writings of the New Testament. The *Revelations* of St. John is, perhaps, the only Book that has been commonly edited apart; and the peculiar character of that work may sufficiently account for its being made an exception. With regard to the rest, it would, doubtless, somewhat offend and startle Christians, to see the *Works* of St. Paul, or St. Luke, or St. John, printed and circulated apart from the venerable body of Scriptures, in connection with which it is that each is most valuable.

Probable time of this collection.

Reasons for the imperfection of many MSS.

Nor is this view at all inconsistent with the fact, that so many of the Manuscript copies of the New Testament contain only the *Gospels*, or the *Gospels* and the *Acts*. The collection of the whole Volume must have been gradual, and the New Testament of every Church at one period imperfect,—in the earliest times containing generally no more than the supposed original collection, that of the *Gospels*. Now, although the ancient Catalogues and the assertions of the Fathers prove, that these alone did not constitute the Holy Book of any Church; still, the original imperfect Testaments would be preserved, and the Copiers transcribe them separately from the portions gradually added to each. It may, too, have arisen from some arrangement respecting the reading of the Lessons, with a view to which a divided copy would have been convenient. Such a convenience appears, certainly, to have given rise to those MSS. which are called *Lectioriaries*, from the circumstance of their containing the Scriptures in detached Lessons, as they were appointed to be read in the Public Services.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Disputes concerning the Canon of Scripture. Probability that these did not occur in the Primitive Church.

But if this has been the prevailing tone of feeling in the Church of all Ages, how is it, it may be asked, that the records of the Church should leave any grounds for the disputes, which have existed among later Christians, concerning the extent of the Canon? Granting that the labours of the Learned have been successful in ejecting many spurious writings from their assumed place in the New Testament,* and in establishing others the claims of which were doubtful; still, does not this very circumstance denote greater carelessness in the Primitive Church, than our view supposes?

Contradictory statements certainly do exist: and yet the general tone and manner in which all these statements are delivered, (independently of any explanation from other parts of the same author's writings,) leave a strong impression on the inquirer's mind, that the great Christian body was originally unanimous in its decision. Viewing the collected evidence, or even the separate portions of it, it is impossible not to feel, that the authors are, for the most part, recording, not their individual opinions alone, but the sense and voice of Christians generally. This leads us at once to suspect, that these contradictions are apparent and not real; and requiring only a more complete view of the circumstances attending the formation of the Canon, in order to be explained and reconciled.

Examined.

In the absence of direct Historical information, recourse must be had, not indeed to mere conjecture, but to the most probable opinion which can be founded on the nature of the case.

Whatever test was originally applied, to separate the true from the counterfeit Scriptures, there can be no question as to the object of the investigation, *viz.* Whether a work claiming to be Scripture was, or was not, Inspired. Assuming this, then, as the ultimate aim of all the inquiries which could have taken place, let us consider what would be the natural and necessary steps by which men would advance to their conclusion.

A work is circulated, as the production of St. Paul or St. Barnabas. Obviously, the first question would be, Is he really the author? It is immaterial to our argument at present, by what process of proof the conclusion might be gained,—whether by tradition, the characters of the MSS.,† or any combination of external and internal evidence. According as it was found to be so or not, the work would thus far be pronounced genuine or spurious.

In either case, the inquiry would not rest here. Supposing the true author to have been ascertained, before an infallible authority could be conceded to his work, it would be requisite further to know that he was Inspired to write it. Here, then, would be a new line of inquiry, and a new conclusion to be sought.

On the other hand, the circumstance of the work having been falsely ascribed to St. Paul or St. Barna-

* See the last note.

* See Lardner's *Gospel Credibility*, or, what is more generally accessible, "Jones's *Script. Canon.*"

† The autograph of St. Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians*, for instance, might have been recognised by the peculiarity alluded to in ch. vi. v. 11.

History. From 100. to 167.

bas, would be no conclusive evidence against its Scriptural character. Its author might accidentally, or even designedly, have remained unknown; and still, if satisfactory evidence could be obtained, that the Apostles, or other competent* judges, had pronounced it Inspired, its Scriptural character would stand precisely on the same footing, as if the work had been traced to an author known to be Inspired.† Yet, in one sense, such a writing would be spurious. It would be genuine, considered with reference to the Canon, but spurious considered with reference to its authorship. Thus there would exist two principles of classification, little likely to interfere and create any confusion in the minds of those to whom all the circumstances of the investigation were familiar; but for that very reason, the less carefully distinguished in their statements. The terms "spurious," and "genuine," "acknowledged," and "doubted," would be often applied indiscriminately to both cases, to the uncanonical, and to the misappropriated; and this, without any surmise of the misapprehension and perplexity which might arise in after Ages. To him who wrote it, especially in the case of a casual remark, such a latitude of expression would seem determinate enough, because it would be so at the time in which it was written; however obscure and unsatisfactory it might become in the lapse of a few centuries, or even in a much shorter period.

Pursuing the same course of inquiry, we shall find the probability increasing, that this has sometimes been the case. Let it, then, have been satisfactorily made out, that the work in question was the production of an Inspired author; and, further, let that author have been certainly ascertained; a scruple might still exist as to its purity—its entire freedom, not from corruption merely, but from the liability to be corrupted. Other writings, so situated, might retain a value, diminished only in proportion to the injury they have met with from the hands through which they have been transmitted; but, grant any alteration to have taken place in an Inspired work, since it received the sanction of Inspiration; grant that the point be even uncertain; and all its value as Scripture, as an infallible guide, is destroyed. Ninety-nine parts out of the hundred may be assuredly of Divine origin, but if the spurious particle be so blended with it, as to be inseparable—if it be impossible to point out where the additions have been made, the whole is in point of authority no more than equivalent to a counterfeit throughout. For what security would there be in any given instance, that it was not the fallible judgment of men, and of designing men too, to which the appeal was made? At the same time, such a work would be respected and used by the Church with the necessary cautions; and might thus be handed down to Posterity, described in unguarded phraseology, as genuine and yet spurious, acknowledged and yet doubted,—as "genuine" and "undoubted," because it assuredly was the production of the reputed author; as "spurious" and "doubted," because containing, or likely to contain, an admixture of spurious ingredients. It would, in short, be spoken of in the language which we hear applied to the original of a great Artist; the value of which, as such, has been destroyed, and its very title to originality brought in question, by the touches of some meaner hand.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100 to 167.

It is well known, that the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, the *Second Epistle of St. James*, the *Second of St. Peter*, the *Second and Third of St. John*, that *of Jude*, and the *Revelations*, are not always found in the old Manuscript copies of the New Testament; nor are their names invariably recorded in the Catalogues of the old writers. Various epithets, also, and expressions denoting hesitation or rejection, are occasionally applied to them. Nevertheless, no candid inquirer doubts that they are all Scripture, and that they were from the earliest times so considered. First, because in almost all, if not in every authority, which furnishes the doubtful expression, or makes the suspicious omission, some statement is found incompatible with the notion, that the author had rejected the piece on the score of its being Uninspired. Take, e. g. the most ancient Catalogue of the Scriptures now extant, that of Origen.* In this, no mention is made of the *Epistles of* James and Jude; although in other parts of his writings, their authority is acknowledged. Again, Jerome's† Catalogue contains expressions of doubt, respecting the *Epistle to the Hebrews*; yet there are passages from the same author, which prove indisputably, that he made use of it as Scripture. In these and the like instances, it is impossible not to attribute the apparent inconsistency to some unrecorded circumstances, attending the settlement of the Canon, such as have been here suggested.

Portions of the New Testament missing in some MSS.

Proofs of their genuineness.

Secondly, reasonable and satisfactory as this method of interpretation is, (for it is like a cross examination of an author respecting his evidence,) it is not, and never was, be it remembered, the only clue for distinguishing the true Scripture from the false, whenever the two have been confounded in the same doubtful testimony. By comparing such writings with the great body of the New Testament, of which no doubt of any kind was ever expressed, we may safely pronounce them Inspired or not, according to their agreement or disagreement with these. But it is worthy of notice, that this test is only applicable to a work which has some presumption in its favour derived from other sources. If otherwise applied, it is, in fact, no test, no medium of proof at all. Any orthodox publication of the present day, for instance, must, as orthodox, answer to it; not would it be supposed from that circumstance to derive any title to independent authority. Not that this kind of evidence is the less forcible on that account, in any instance wherein its use is admissible. It, in fact, is one, and perhaps the principal one of a class of Scriptural proofs, which change their very nature, by being combined with others; and may be compared to those substances, which require a chemical union with others of a different class, in order to elicit their most striking properties.

Although it does not enter into our plan to investigate the *proofs* made use of in the first settlement of the Canon; that this kind of evidence must have been one of the chief, by which the judgment of the Church was determined, may be naturally concluded, both from the nature of the subject, and from the notices which

Methods resorted to for the original settlement of the Canon.

* I. e. rendered competent by extraordinary endowments of the Spirit.

† The *Epistle to the Hebrews* might have been so circumstanced for a time; the prejudice of the Jewish Converts generally against the author, being an obvious reason why his name should not be at first attached to it.

* Origen, *Comment. in Matt.*, *apud* Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. 26. Origen, *Exposit. in Joann.* lib. v., *apud* Euseb. ibid.

† Jerome, *Epist. ad Paulin. de stud. Script.*; *Expos. in Symb. Apostol.* sec. 36.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

are left us of such proofs being resorted to, by Eusebius and others.

Even in the days of the Apostles and Inspired teachers, such a rule we know was insisted on by St. Paul; "Though *we*, (writes he to the *Galatians*,*) or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other Gospel unto you, than that you have received, let him be accursed."

The antecedent claims, which would induce them to bring any writing to this test, would be the evidence of particular Churches, in which the writing had been deposited; the autography of the MSS. in some cases furnishing particular signs, such as may be supposed to have been the case with the original copy of St. Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians*,† and the traditional account of its contents, or of any circumstances connected with it. The seal and confirmation of its authenticity, would be its agreement with such Scriptural Doctrine as was contained in those Books which were so widely circulated, and so clearly sanctioned, as to furnish the basis of a standard for Scripture. One work settled, became a measure for others, and Scripture was made the test of Scripture. The Sacred Volume thus formed, becomes the depository of a power not less effectual, than that which the Inspired Church possessed of trying Spirits; and is our unfailing security against the forgeries of distant Ages, and the pretended revelations of later times.

II. *How the First Uninspired Church fulfilled its office of* DISPENSING *the Truths contained in the Sacred Record.*

1. To the Apostles a Revelation had been given, which on their removal was supplied by a Sacred Record. The Apostles had been commissioned and empowered to preserve that Revelation pure and perfect, by the extraordinary suggestions and corrections of the Holy Spirit; and also to attest it by Miracles and Miraculous endowments. The Church, as has been shown, was qualified to fulfil the same purposes with regard to the Sacred Record. But then, the Apostles were not only commissioned and empowered to preserve their Revelation entire and uncorrupted, and to furnish evidence to its Divine character; they had a further duty to perform; that, namely, of *dispensing* the Truths it contained—of "rightly dividing the word of God,"‡ as it is expressed by one of them. For this portion of their Ministry likewise, they received from our Lord Himself an assurance of extraordinary assistance ever at hand,§ which the narrative of that Ministry clearly shows to have been fulfilled. The Sacred Record required, of course, a corresponding dispenser; and the Church was accordingly so shaped and modelled, as to assume that character. In what manner it discharged this portion of its duty, on the first ceasing of Divine interposition, is the point of inquiry at which we have now arrived. The measures adopted will be considered briefly and separately; and first, among these, may be noticed the perpetuation of a Clerical Order, as distinct from the Laity, in each Church.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

1. *Ministers of different Orders.*

In Sacred History, we find the Apostles and others duly appointed, exclusively officiating in a course of Ministerial duties; and, if it be admitted, that these, or many of these Offices, were designed to be perpetual, the perpetual obligation on Christians to have a separate officiating Order to succeed the first, seems to be a necessary inference. The character and pretensions of this Order may, indeed, become changed, so far as to be inconsistent with Christianity itself; but this should only induce us to ascertain clearly, and to keep steadily in view, the true object and intent of the Institution. Beyond this connection, with the formal observances of Religion, however, the Ministers of the Gospel may be viewed in the light of special *Dispensers of the Truths contained in the New Testament.* This is their chief and most important office; and if it be true, that one of the purposes Divinely intended in the formation of the Church was the dispensing of these Truths; the appointment of this Order, as one of the methods, becomes an obligation, independent even of Apostolical precedent or specific rule.* The great caution to be observed in the Church, was, strictly to adhere to this view of its Ministers. There was a continual temptation presented to the Jewish Convert, in the habit of looking at Religion, as it existed in the former Church of God; and equally so to the Gentile Converts, in their long familiarity with the corruptions of the Heathen world. In both, the Minister of Religion had been regarded as the mean of communication between the worshipper and the Being worshipped; between Man who sought Divine instruction, and the Deity from whom it was supposed to proceed. But Christians were left without any such Mediator on earth. Their High Priest was no longer visible; and the Sacred Record was the only mode of sensible communication which had been left; Christ was seen no more, and the Holy Ghost was no longer outwardly manifested. The Christian Ministers, therefore, were designed to be the organ of the Church,† in dispensing these Divine oracles; not themselves the oracles and sources of information.

Christian Ministers considered as Dispensers of the Gospel.

Bishops.

That the Primitive Bishops claimed for themselves no higher character, is very plain from the tenor of their lives, and from the language of their genuine remains. It is evident from the writings of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, that the terms "Priest," (*ἱερεὺς*,)‡ "Vicar

---

* Ch. i. v. 8.

† 2 *Timoth.* ch. ii. v. 15. Ὀρθοτομοῦντα means the fashioning of the Word preached, so as to render it intelligible, acceptable, effectual; as the workman cuts the stone or wood, to suit the particular object about which he is employed.

§ E. g. Luke, ch. xxi. v. 14, 15, "Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer; for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to resist." 2 *Corinthians*, ch. xii. v. 9, "My grace is sufficient for thee; for My strength is made perfect in weakness;" and the like.

* Ignatius's assertion is strictly correct, "Without these there is no *Church*;" that is, the Christian Society could no longer fulfil the object of its institution, whatever other means might be substituted. *Ep. ad Trall.* sec. 3.

† Ignatius calls them in his *Epistle to the Philippians*, "servants of the Church of God," sec. 2.

‡ It may be necessary to state to the mere English reader, that there are two Greek words, of very different import, which we translate indifferently "Priest." Ἱερεὺς is one, and is the term applied to him whose office it was to sacrifice, or otherwise to mediate between the worshipper and the Being worshipped; the other πρεσβύτερος, signifies an Elder; and was applied to those Ministers in the Christian Church, whose age or office entitled them to such distinction. To Christ alone, under the Gospel dispensation, was the term ἱερεὺς applicable, and to Him alone it is applied in the New

Ministry of Christ, From A. D. 100. to A. D. 167.

Meaning of the Terms Bishop and Presbyter.

Presbyters and Deacons

Five inferior Orders.

Deaconnesses.

Apost. & Apostol. Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Supreme authority of the Bishop.

Public Reading of portions of the Scriptures in the Services of the Church, and even of the Prayers, made up in a great measure of Scriptural expressions, may of itself be reckoned among the Ministerial duties of dispensing Gospel Truth. Indeed, in an Age when neither books nor readers were general, this would be even more important than at present; because, whatever more convenient forms were devised for the conveying of those Truths, it was necessary to convince all that to the Bible they were to be traced, and this could only be done by reading or hearing it read. If therefore there be any difference in the proportion which the Lessons have borne to the Prayers in the Primitive Church Services, and in the Services of any modern

Testament; but, from the common custom among the early Christian teachers, of illustrating the respect, &c. due to the Gospel Ministers, from that which had been paid to the Jewish Priests, the term *ἱερεὺς* gradually became transferred to the Gospel Minister. The same occurred with respect to many other Christian institutions. The Lord's table, e. g. acquired the title of "the Altar," the Bread and Wine, that of "the Sacrifice." It is surprising, how much the accidents which befal language affect even the practical views of those who employ it. At this day, we may trace to these very ambiguities a proneness to apply to the several parts of the Christian Institution, reasoning drawn from those parts of the Jewish which do not coincide with them, further than that both bear the same name. The use made of this fallacy by the Church of Rome, in its gradual assumption of those powers and privileges for its Bishop, which can only belong to a Pontiff or High Priest, are now too well known to require further notice. See Esprit. Louis.

* Cited by Amalarius, *de Offic. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 2.

* Ignat. *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 13, *Ἀσπάζομαι τὰς οἴκους τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις, τοῖς οὖσιν ἐπ' ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* See Cotelerius's note on this expression; and also *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 4.

† Ch. viii.

History of Society. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Such was the case. The remains of the Apostolical Fathers do not, indeed, furnish direct testimony to the custom of Reading the Scriptures as part of the Church Service; but the writings of those who immediately succeeded them, are sufficiently clear and ample on this point, and speak of it as a custom originally established, and even then of the Church Service. Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, and St. Basil, may be appealed to as decisive authorities for the early existence of the usage, which, indeed, could not have been neglected without so flagrant a violation of the fundamental principles of the Church's establishment, as to have caused the neglect, and the origin of it to be recorded and handed down to us. The mere silence of History on such a point, would have left us warranted in maintaining the observance of the custom.

Authorities for this custom.

Preaching.

At the same time, the Public Reading of the Scripture Record was not the only nor the principal office with the Ministers of the Church had to perform, as Dispensers of the Truths contained in it. That Record was the test, the source of all that was to be communicated to the world; but it was left to the discretionary power of the Church, to shape the various forms in which it should be presented to Mankind, to the Church collectively, to its Ministers individually. The Gospel Ministers were to expound, to arrange, and to accommodate the Divine Truths to the education, habits, and other circumstances of their hearers. Looking in each instance to the mode, in which instruction would be best understood, and most readily listened to. Hence, the importance of the Preacher's character, not as the eloquent master of the feelings of an audience—but far more, as the judicious dispenser of Gospel Truth; in applying, and teaching others to apply, to particular cases, the general principles and precepts of the New Testament; in arranging systematically the Doctrines, there incidentally taught, or in giving clearness to what might be there obscure, by combining separate passages, and by all other legitimate methods of Uninspired exposition. In such an employment, the danger, the chief danger at least, would arise from too great an accommodation to the previous tastes and habits of thought in those addressed. The converted Gentile Philosopher would best understand the Christian mysteries, when illustrated by allusions to the metaphysical theories with which his mind had been previously familiar; the Jew would be made more ready to listen and to understand, by the continual use of images belonging to the Old dispensation, to explain and recommend the topics of the New. In the great Inspired Preacher to the Gentiles, his successors and imitators would observe, perhaps, the splendid effects produced by his grafting Christian instruction on the manners, and even the prejudices of men; and might, therefore, proceed the more fearlessly in the same track, without quite the same controlling wisdom. What he had gained by colouring his instructions with the memory of the Law, and its venerable adjuncts, when addressing the Jew, or by alluding to the assemblies, pursuits, or the amusements of the Gentile world, when the Gentiles were addressed; emboldened, perhaps, the first Unbaptized Preachers even beyond the bounds of prudence. They ought, we have every reason to believe, to Truth and only Truth; but if we may judge from the remains even of the Apostolical Fathers, it should be ungrateful not to admit an overruling influence in those Truths (in some cases) to receive their form and impression from the previous notions, both of Jew and Gentile. It was the easier method, and easiest to be understood at first. But to this only can we attribute the ready introduction into the Church's language of such terms as "Priest," (Sacrificial) "Mediator," when applied to the Ministers of that Religion which acknowledges no Priest on earth, and only one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus. Hereby as it might have been, it was, perhaps, the first link in that chain of corruption which ended in the creation of a Christian Pontiff. Their accommodation to the Gentile prejudices, or rather to the Philosophy of the Gentiles, was by no means so great, although occasionally discernible, as to have produced no more than the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. It was to the Sacred Record alone, and to its own Preaching, only in a particular form of communicating it, that they directed the attention of their audience, and it deserves to be recorded as a remarkable illustration of this fact, that in the African Church a custom long prevailed among the Preachers of reading only part of any Scripture passage cited in their Sermons, and pausing, for the remainder to be filled up by the congregation. An instance of it may be found in St. Austin's Sermons.[1] That the character of the Primitive *Preaching* was such as is here described, we chiefly infer from the character of the Primitive *Writings*, and these being in the form of Epistles, require some observations distinct from what is applicable to them in common with Preaching.

Custom of the African Church in Preaching.

Danger from the accommodation of Preaching to the particular hearers.

The custom of writing Public Letters is a distinct branch of the office of the Christian Minister, in dispensing the Truths of the Gospel; and one for which no less than Preaching, they had the example of the Apostles. Indeed, when we consider the opportunity afforded by such a mode of address, for the Bishop to give an interest to his instructions, by alluding

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

---

* For the indirect testimony to be derived from these writings, see the remarks on the Public Reading of the Scriptures, considered as one of the means of *preserving* the Sacred Record.

† Ch. viii.

‡ It was, doubtless, in conformity with the custom of the Synagogue, that the Saviour used in the Primitive Church to be usually delivered by the Preacher sitting, whilst the congregation stood. (See Bingham's *Eccl. Antiq.* book xiv. ch. iv. sec. 24.) The Scribes and Pharisees, said our Lord, "sit in Moses' seat;" and his own example might have been considered as a further warrant for adopting the Jewish usage in a matter of indifference. He is described, even in childhood, as "*sitting* and disputing among the Doctors in the Temple;" (St. Luke, ch. xlvi.;) and, again, we read, ch. iv. v. 20, "After He had stood up to read the prophet Esaias, He *sat down* to teach the people." See also ch. v. v. 3, and St. John, ch. viii. v. 2. His avowal, as recorded in St. Matthew's *Gospel*, ch. xxvi. v. 55, is, "I *sat* daily with you teaching in the Temple."

§ Almost all the early Heresies may be traced to the presumptuous attempt to speculate *metaphysically* on the nature of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. St. Paul speaks of these speculations as falsely called Knowledge; and warns Timothy against them, as endangering the faith of the instructor and the instructed. For the results which ensued in no long interval, we need only refer to Irenæus's 1st Book *adv. Hæreses*.

¶ *Serm.* 13, *de Verbo Domini*, "*Finis præcepti est*,"—*Jam vos dante mecum: (a populo acclamatum est) "caritas de corde puro."* See Bingham's *Eccl. Antiq.* book xiv. ch. iv. sec. 26.

‖ That such was the character of their Epistolary instruction, will be manifest from a cursory glance at the Remains of the Apostolical Fathers, which abound with references to Scriptural authority.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

sions to matters of local, and peculiar interest, which could not so properly be introduced in a Sermon or a Charge, it is rather surprising to find so early and so total a disuse of this good old custom. It is probable, that few attempts to exhort or to instruct as a Preacher would be so interesting, as the opening of the successive packets, for instance, which conveyed to the Churches of Asia the farewell injunctions of Ignatius; and Polycarp's serious instructions to the Philippians were, doubtless, remembered better in an Epistle, which disdained not an allusion to conversational matters, than if he had been compelled to address them only with the solemnity of the Christian Preacher.* Clement, whose *First Epistle to the Corinthians* is perhaps, on the whole, the most valuable of the Remains of the Apostolical Fathers, seems not to have been sensible of this advantage, in the method which he nevertheless employed; and his *Epistle* is therefore a Treatise, compared with an Apostolical *Epistle*, cold, dryly systematic, and uninteresting. It is scarcely possible to devise a better method of appreciating St. Paul as a writer, in this particular department, as a writer, namely, of Public Letters to Bodies of Christians; than by comparing with Clement's his own energetic *Epistles* to the same Church, written on nearly the same subject. At the same time, it must be allowed, that Clement was writing in the name of the Church of Rome, and addressing a Church not peculiarly his charge. Now, it is out of this latter circumstance that an *Epistle* derives its most interesting topics.

Advantages of this mode of instruction.

It was thus, then, that the Primitive Church fulfilled its office of dispensing the Truths of the Sacred Record, through the agency of its various Orders of Ministers. They Read Publicly the word of God; they Preached it; and they sent it to the absent by Letters. Of the mode of appointing these Ministers, some account has been given in a preceding part of our work; enough, perhaps, for our purpose. It does not appear, from the remains of the Apostolic Fathers, whether the performance of this rite required a Bishop. Still, as this practice is mentioned by Jerome, Chrysostom, and succeeding writers; and noticed by them, not as an innovation, but as a settled usage: there can be no reasonable doubt of its Primitive adoption.

Revenue.

The Revenue for the support of the Clergy in this season of the Church's poverty, appears to have arisen from the continual contributions of the Laity in each Church; aided in some instances by the accumulation of a fund, the probable origin of which, in the Apostolic days, has been already suggested.

Bishops ordained by the Apostles.

The Catalogue of the Bishops ordained by the Apostles is, according to the best authorities, as follows:

Jerusalem.

I. At Jerusalem: James the Apostle, and Simeon the son of Cleopas.

Authorities. Unanimous testimony, especially that of Jerome, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, the author of *The Apostolical Constitutions*, Hegesippus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Dionysius of Corinth, as quoted by Eusebius.

Antioch.

II. Antioch: Enodius and Ignatius.

Baronius conjectures, that they were contemporary; one for the Gentile, and the other for the Jewish portion of the Church. But, it must be admitted, that this is not a very likely arrangement; when we consider, that one of the great efforts of the Apostolical founders was to amalgamate Jew and Gentile into one Church, and to preserve the *unity* of the Spirit. They are represented as successive Bishops by Eusebius, Theodoret, Athanasius, Origen, and Jerome. At the same time, the expedient might have become necessary for a time at Antioch, as appears to have been the case at Rome.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100 to 167.

III. Smyrna: Polycarp.

Authorities: Jerome, Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius.

Ephesus.

IV. Ephesus: Timothy.

See Ency. Apostolic Age.

Authorities: Eusebius, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Jerome, Hilary the Deacon, the Author of *The Passion of Timothy*, in Photius, and Theodoret, who expresses himself singularly enough, saying, "that he was Bishop, under the title of an Apostle."*

Crete.

V. Crete: Titus.

The same authorities. Eusebius makes both Metropolitans. Hooker adopts this view, in his *Eccles. Polity*.

Athens.

VI. Athens: Dionysius the Areopagite, and Publius Quadratus.

Authorities: Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, a writer of the IInd century, quoted by Eusebius. It was Quadratus who presented an *Apology* to the Emperor Hadrian.

Philippi.

VII. Philippi: Epaphroditus.

Authority: Theodoret.

Rome.

VIII. Rome: Linus, Anacletus, and Clement.

The order of succession in these three, is not very easily determined. Irenæus, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Ruffinus, Jerome, Optatus, Epiphanius, and St. Austin, all contain notices which may help the inquirer. The most probable mode of solving the difficulty is, that in the distracted state of the Church at Rome, the same necessity, which required the care both of St. Paul and St. Peter, namely, the aversion of the Jewish party to the great Gentile Apostle, might have caused a division of that Church into two Societies; over that, composed chiefly of Gentiles, Linus might have been appointed by St. Paul, and succeeded by Anacletus; over that, consisting of Jews chiefly, Clement might have been appointed by St. Peter. As Clement survived Linus and Anacletus, and by that time the spirit of dissension had well nigh ceased; the Church was probably reunited and again became one, as it originally was, when St. Paul first wrote and preached to them; and thus Clement became the first sole Bishop. The assertion of Eusebius, that St. Paul and St. Peter were joint founders, favours this view; which is, however, subject to the objection above noticed, respecting a similar case at Antioch.

Hierapolis.

IX. Hierapolis: Papias.

He was a disciple of St. John, and contemporary with Ignatius and Polycarp. Although, therefore, there is no

* See ch. xi. and xiii. of the *Epistle*.

* See too the quotation above given from St. Ambrose. It is likely enough, indeed, that Timothy was called an Apostle, because sent by St. Paul to preside over the Church at Ephesus; and it was perhaps subsequently, to avoid the confusion between Apostles of Christ and these Apostles of His Apostles, that the latter were called by a synonymous term Angels, or Messengers. Under this title St. John speaks of them in the *Revelations*. This title also must have been liable to objection, because applying so specifically to an unearthly Messenger; and still more, when the succession of Bishops in established Sees began to take place, and a new Bishop was not necessarily *sent* to preside over a new See, and ceased therefore to be considered in the light of a Messenger, Apostle, or Angel. His superintendent character was now the chief, or only one which claimed regard, and hence the natural transition to, and permanent adoption of, the title *Episcopus. Superintendant*.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

direct assertion in ancient authors, of his being ordained by the Apostle, there is every reason to rank him with the others. See Irenæus and Jerome.

§ *Propagation of the Faith by Missionaries.*

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, then, were the regular and appointed agents of every Church, for dispensing the contents of the Sacred Record amongst its members; each according to his Office. It was one great purpose for which the Church was founded, to dispense the Truths so intrusted to it: and the institution of these Orders was one of the principal means employed for accomplishing this object. But this duty of the Church and of its Ministers, would have been very imperfectly, and, (if one may say so,) unconstitutionally performed, if their labours had been limited to their respective Societies, or to Christians only. One of the marks set on the New Church of God, to distinguish it from his former holy People, was its Universality. Directly opposed to the principle on which the Jewish Polity was instituted—a principle, namely, of separation, guarded by a fence-work so intricate and elaborate, that it could never have afforded a free admission to the great mass of Mankind—directly opposed to this, was the precept of the Gospel, "Go forth into *all lands*, and preach the Gospel to *every creature*." What was, perhaps, more effectual too than formal precept, was the genius and character of the Institution. The separation of the Divine worship from any one Temple, or local point of association; the substitution of *Principles*, on which Sacred Societies may be formed to any extent and number, instead of the establishment of any one Society; the removal of all necessary ordinances connected with the customs of any one People, or the peculiarities of any one climate, or country; all qualified the new Dispensation for a Universal one. On those, then, who were intrusted with the New Testament, the promotion of this object by all legitimate means was impressed, as well by the character of that holy Deposit, as by the special precepts it conveyed to them. Even complete success was promised at some indefinite period, to animate the efforts of every Age; which, without the assurance of Prophecy, might still seem, in the ordinary course of Providence, never likely to be fully successful. Before Christ's second coming, we know that His "Gospel must be preached to all the world."*

Universality of the Gospel dispensation.

Hence the necessity of Missions.

It is in the character of propagators of the new Faith, that the Inspired Teachers of the Word are chiefly presented to our view in Holy Writ; as it was, indeed, their chief characteristic. But the duty of sustaining the same character, (as did all Ministerial duties,) devolved on their Uninspired successors. The Ministers of the Primitive Church were not only employed in teaching at home; but were sent abroad to plant the Faith, and to give freely that gift which they had freely received.

Caution respecting the History of Missions.

Concerning the personal labours of these early Missionaries there is much fable, and no means of separating from it whatever may be true. On the whole, it is no doubt better for us, that we should only know their history by its results: lest, in our admiration for the Saints and Martyrs of Christ, we should forget to give the glory to God. In no case is this temptation more strongly felt, than in contemplating the adventurous course of a Missionary. Even although he may perform no "Signs" and "Wonders," he seems to disturb the established course of the world. Ancient prejudices, national habits and institutions, fall before him; the very passions of men seem to be cast out by his word; and his work itself looks, in every Age, the result of Miracle.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Much, too, of what is recorded concerning the planting of the Primitive Churches, has been vitiated through the ambition of every Church, at some period, to refer its origin to an Apostle; or, at least, to one specially appointed for its establishment by an Apostle. Hence, doubtless, many of the worthy successors of God's Inspired servants have been robbed of that grateful tribute, which Posterity would still gladly pay to their zeal and fidelity, in the cause of the Gospel; and a general statement only remains to be given, of what may be considered as the undistinguishable labours of the Inspired and Uninspired in the Primitive Church; undistinguishable, we mean, beyond what clue is afforded by Scripture.

A similar rivalry among the different parts of every Christian country, of Europe especially, to be foremost or among the first who were called and elected, renders it no less difficult to ascertain the precise places wherein the Word was planted; even in countries concerning which the most certain testimony is preserved, that they were visited and partially enlightened.

Their progress.

Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Great Britain, and many other parts of Europe, have each some authority to trace their first conversion to Apostles, or their immediate successors. The labours of St. Paul and and St. Peter at Rome, give much reason for supposing, that throughout Italy Christianity soon found Converts; and, that the settlement of a Church in Spain was contemplated at least by St. Paul, long before his death, his own words bear testimony.* Macedonia and Greece, and the reception which the Gospel had met with there, under St. Paul's Ministry, need not be mentioned. In Asia, too, we trace its progress on Inspired authority from Judea to Syria, and from Syria through Asia Minor. How far the labours of Paul, Barnabas, and their attendants, were followed up by those who, Inspired or Uninspired, strove to tread in their steps, we may judge from the accounts of Irenæus† and Tertullian,‡ both writers of the IInd century, and both asserting that Christ was by that time worshipped throughout the East. Even to India, indeed, His name and worship must have already penetrated, if Eusebius be correct in stating, that Pantenus found there a copy of St. Matthew's *Gospel*, which was reported to have been left by St. Bartholomew.§ If we turn our eye to the condition of Africa in those times, it would be hardly too much to assert, that it

* See *Romans*, ch. xv. v. 24, 28.

† Irenæi *contra Hæres.* lib. i. c. 10.

‡ Tertullian, *adv. Judæos*, c. 7.

§ Eusebii *Hist. Ecc.* lib. v, c. 10; Jerom. *Catalog. Script. Ecc.* c. 36. Mosheim supposes, that Eusebius meant this not of the Indians, but of certain Jews, who were inhabitants of Arabia Felix, (see *Ecc. Hist.* vol. i. p. 149.) This certainly is not implied. Eusebius only states, that the book was written in Hebrew; and it might possibly, therefore, have been a copy, not originally designed for the Indians, but left with them by their Apostolic Missionary, because he had none in their own language. Or, it is very conceivable, that it might have been even an Indian Translation made by Bartholomew for their use, and written by him in *Hebrew characters*, (which they would easily learn,) because more familiar and more readily used by him. The Greek is Ἐξεῖναι γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου κατελιφθεῖσαν γραφήν.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

must even at that period have numbered amongst its believers, whether colonists or natives, more than a million souls. Alexandria in Egypt was ever to imbibe, and to communicate every new system which appeared in the world; and the constant intercourse which it maintained with Jerusalem, and also with Cyprus, the native island of Barnabas, will readily account for the early and strong interest felt there in the new Religion; and could not but produce zealous efforts to propagate its Doctrines throughout Egypt, and the more enlightened parts of Africa. And, perhaps, monuments of their labours might, at this day have remained, under God's blessing, by which, compared with our own, we might have estimated the effect of time and different circumstances on Churches so differently situated; while those who now sit in darkness, might have been themselves the agents of enlightening others, had the Gospel been preached in Apostolic purity. But Christianity suffered a corruption in Egypt, more cruel than did the Israelitish Faith of old. It went forth from Alexandria adulterated with vain Philosophy of every kind; and the worship of the one true God was again converted into a Polytheism, the more dangerous, because no longer gross, sensible, and palpable in its absurdity, but subtile, spiritual, philosophical.†

It would be vain to inquire into the various steps, by which Christianity maintained its struggle with the Powers of this world, and either gained or lost ground in these several Countries; much more to attempt its History in each separate Church or City: but there are some Churches, the fate of which has been so much more closely connected than the rest, with all Christian Societies in all Ages, that any notices which may be gleaned of their Primitive condition, may not be unacceptable. Jerusalem is, of course, one of these.

§ *The Church at Jerusalem.*

St. James.

The History of the Church at Jerusalem, until the death of its first Bishop St. James, is no further known, than from the Scriptural Record. On the martyrdom of that Apostle, Symeon, the son of Cleopas, and, as has been asserted, one of the Seventy Disciples of our Lord, was appointed in his room. The importance of the See may be conjectured, from the anxiety of the whole Christian world about the succession. Apostles, and other eminent men, among their coadjutors, were present at the election, and aiding by their advice. In this, as in several actions of the Christian world at this period, it is impossible not to recognise the operation of the most unqualified Faith in the fulfilment of the Christian Prophecies.‡ The period was at hand, when our Lord's mournful prediction, respecting the fate of Jerusalem and its blinded people, was known to be approaching to its accomplishment.§ In this, the

Symeon.

Effect of the Prophecies relative to the destruction of Jerusalem.

risk and distress, to which even his followers might be exposed, were expressed in no equivocal terms. On the appearance of the fatal ensign of Desolation, their flight was to be instantaneous, whatever sacrifice it might require; the dissolution of the nearest connections which existed between the believer and the friends or kindred who yet held back or traversed, was to be awfully abrupt. Even the pontiff was announced to those who should be with child, or give suck in those days, can aptly be applied to the Jews alone; but accords with the closing assertion, that unless those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; and that they were shortened for the elect's sake.

The solemn suspense, with which the whole Christian world must have looked on, from one Prophetic sign to another, for the consummation of this state of sorrows, must have been more intense than that which is said to seize on the minds of men, when the first shock of an earthquake awakens an anticipation of the second and the third. In the mortal and visible agents which were at work, producing the catastrophe, they saw the slow-appearing Sign of the Son of Man in Heaven. But the Faith that made them tremble, made them proportionably resolute to abide in Jerusalem, and to wait for the signal of their departure. Under the superintendence of the mild and bold Bishop St. James, the most prudent human measures were likely to co-operate with the promised aid of Heaven. But in the midst of his exemplary course, they behold him fall a Martyr to the bigotry of the Jews, and the Church in Jerusalem obliged suddenly to appoint another Bishop. The general interest, therefore, which was taken in Symeon's election, is easily explained; but only on the supposition, that our Lord's Prophecies were as certain of fulfilment to the Christians, as if the events predicted had already taken place.

Between the appointment of Symeon, and the war which ended in the destruction of the Holy City, the affairs of the Church were probably conducted with a prudence which did not disappoint the Christians; for in the interval, we hear of no further attempts against the peace of the believers, nor of any internal dissensions.

It was during the reign of Nero, that the Jews arrived at the last extremity of hope deferred. The Seventy weeks of Daniel had been long fulfilled; and while they obstinately rejected the claims of a Spiritual Messiah, they as obstinately clung to the hope of a temporal deliverer. Up to the time now mentioned, they patiently and sullenly endured all oppression, in the daily expectation, that their Avenger would appear descending from the clouds of Heaven. So violent, however, had their sense of wrongs become, and so rancorous their suppressed hatred to the Romans, that on the first signal of revolt the whole of Judea was in a state of determined Rebellion.

As the accomplishment of our Saviour's prediction drew nearer, the signs of the end of the Jewish Polity had been discerned, and have been recorded even by unbelievers. But the trial of the believer's faith, was to wait for the last sign, which, humanly speaking, was to put it out of his power to escape. Not until the Roman standard, "the abomination of Desolation," was brought to the siege of Jerusalem, and the Holy City was "encompassed by armies," did the Church quit it.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

* By the end of the IInd century the proportion of Christians in Carthage was so great, that Tertullian speaks of them as constituting one tenth of the whole number of inhabitants. *Quid, si ego Carthaginem possessa est? decimanda a te. Ad Scapulam.*

† Consult Cave's *Life of Justin Martyr*, whose remains, as well as those of Origen, abound in Platonism.

‡ A similar instance, is the Collection made for the poor Christians of Jerusalem, as a provision against a predicted famine. See *Acts*, ch. xi. v. 27.

§ Besides the Prophetic signs given, it was expressly declared, "This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be fulfilled." Matt. ch. xxiv. v. 34; Mark, ch. xiii. v. 30; Luke, ch. xxi. v. 32.

* Matt. ch. xxiv. v. 22; Mark, ch. xiii. v. 20.

† Matt. ch. xxiv. v. 15; Mark, ch. xiii. v. 14; Luke, ch. xxi. v. 20.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Before the formidable character of this Rebellion was known, Cestius Gallus, the Governor of Syria, marched with the united forces of this Province against the Capital, not doubting that the revolt would thus be at once suppressed; and being forced to raise the siege, and retire, a respite was given, whereby the Christians were providentially and signally left an opportunity for escape. Their city of refuge was Pella, which, being occupied by Gentiles, escaped the fury of the conquerors; and here, during all the horrors of the war, and the subsequent miseries which resulted from it, they remained in perfect security. Not an hair of their heads perished, and that they were shortened for the elect's sake, was literally fulfilled.

The Christians withdraw from the City.

In the third year of the war, (A. D. 70,) Vespasian, who had been appointed by Nero to conduct it, left his station for Egypt, in order to secure support in his attempt to wrest the Imperial dignity from Vitellius. He had already advanced into Galilee, burnt Gadara, and razed Jotapata, (where Josephus, the Historian, was taken prisoner,) and was preparing to march against Jerusalem, when the prospect of obtaining the Empire induced him to leave to his son Titus the completion of his plans. Under his command, the Roman army invested the Holy City, and after a siege of five months, marked by scenes of horror which would be incredible did we not connect them with the peculiar temper of the Jewish nation, Jerusalem was taken, sacked, and levelled with the earth. Only enough was left standing to form quarters for a garrison, or to be a monument of the greatness of the city subdued. Its Temple, which was then left without one stone upon another, has never yet been rebuilt. Julian tried to restore it, and failed. Will the Jews, with any future Antichrist, be ever bold enough to renew the experiment?

Its capture by Titus.

As soon as the terrors of war were past, the Christian Church of Jerusalem returned to the desolate City; and took up its abode amidst its ruins. Here it existed until the final and utter destruction by Hadrian, who in the early part of his reign had rebuilt it, and called it *Ælia*.

The Christians return.

Long before this latter event, the good Symeon had suffered martyrdom, having been permitted to preside over this first Christian Church, in its most trying season, for more than forty years; "till God, probably lengthening out his life," to use the words of a pious and learned man, "that as a skilful and faithful Pilot, he might steer and conduct the affairs of the Church in those dismal and stormy days." Eusebius states, that he was put to death on information laid against him, that he was of the family of David. This, in turn, strongly marks the impression made on the minds of the Romans, that the Jews were so convinced of the truth of the Messiah's time being come, as to make it unsafe, to leave even the mild and aged Symeon amongst them, lest they should take him by force, and make him a King.

Martyrdom of Symeon.

§ *The Church at Rome.*

Causes of the assumed Supremacy of this Church.

It requires some effort of imagination, to represent to ourselves, truly and fully, the feeling with which the Imperial City was regarded throughout the world, in the first Ages of Christianity. It was not only the greatest, the leading City of the Universe; for in this point of view the influence of every association which clustered round it might find a counterpart in the awe and admiration excited by Turin for the Capital of the Spanish, the French, or the British Empires. But its character was distinct and supreme. It stood alone, the one abode of authority and rule, to which all other places had contracted a relation of dependence and subjection. That any Society established there should, from the ordinary results of association, acquire a more august and dignified character than similar Societies elsewhere established, seems almost unavoidable. As it gradually numbered amongst its members more and more of those who formed prominent features in this great object of worldly veneration, the principle of association now would of course operate more strongly still. But when the Emperor himself not only became enrolled among its members, but promoted the success of these Societies, by the actual protection and patronage of the Imperial Government, any distinction of respect, unanimously conceded to that Society, through which, in the first instance, all these privileges and favours flowed, and with which little immediately they seemed to be connected, any distinction of respect paid to this Society, is conceivable, which may be looked upon with the principles on which all these kindred bodies were formed; and a tendency, a very strong tendency, might be presumed to exist in all, even to go beyond this limit. This temptation would be twofold in the several Societies, to honour and give precedence to that one which had allied itself to a source of prosperity, of which all partook, in the Society elevated, to be puffed up by every successive token of respect, and to aim at a still higher elevation; and, as the origin and history of its original equality became less familiar, and less clearly to be ascertained, to claim, as legalised rights, those titles and that precedence which accident and custom had created. Such was the condition of the Church at Rome, in its progress from that Primitive Age, when it dwelt in equality and unity with its brethren, to the period at which it began to search, in Scripture and in legend, for the title-deeds to that Supremacy, which courtesy and custom had unthinkingly established. On the transfer of the seat of Empire from Rome to Constantinople, it was first awakened to the uncertain tenure of those rights, which it had so long enjoyed, not indeed without question, but with security. It had set an example of temporal ambition, which could not but prove attractive to those who ministered to that ambition; and the Church of Constantinople, accordingly, claimed for itself a share of that rank, which, if rightly paid to its sister at Rome, while Rome was the Imperial City, clearly now was due to that Church which occupied the corresponding station. Constantinople, as her Church represented, was "the New Rome," the young heir of Italian Rome's greatness, and, as such, she desired a participation at least of her rank and influence. Hence the diligence which even from the first the Church of Rome has displayed, in casting a shade over the origin of its greatness, and endeavouring to account for it on Scriptural authority, however palpably insufficient. This has been, ever since, its method of defence; and its purpose is partly answered, whenever the attention is thus decoyed from the real quarter, in which all its worldly grandeur was nestled and hatched.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

It is with pleasure, therefore, that we look back on a period, when even at Rome the Church of Christ was

† Cave, in his *Life of St. Symeon.*

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

only Spiritual, her highest character, that of trustee of the Record of Revelation, and the first ambition of her Bishops, to be dispensers of revealed Truth, Ministers of the Word, or Martyrs for its sake.

Barrenness of her early records.

It is not the least striking evidence of the correctness of this view of the Church of Rome, that peculiar as its situation was, in the seat of Empire, its authentic records are as barren as those of the more remote and obscure Churches. Even the exact order of succession among the three first Bishops, has furnished matter for elaborate controversy; a fact, which would of itself be subversive of the claim to any peculiar rights, founded on a regular succession of Bishops from St. Peter. Such a lineal descent would surely have had a record, as accurately preserved by the care of Providence, for the satisfaction of the Christian Church, as was the lineage of David, for that of God's former People. In the early Bishops, as successors of St. Peter too, we should expect a record of authority exercised, to illustrate the right vested in them.

Probability of the existence of two separate Churches at Rome.

The probability that St. Peter and St. Paul were joint founders of this important Church, the former taking the Apostleship to the Jews, the latter, that to the Gentile portion, has been already noticed. It has been further conjectured by some, that this division continued long after the decease of the two Apostles; and that thus we are to account for the otherwise contradictory statements, on the one hand, that Clement was the third in the list of Bishops, on the other, that he was ordained by St. Peter, to take charge of the Church, when his own martyrdom was at hand. This is, indeed, to suppose the existence of two Churches originally at Rome; the one governed by Linus, whom St. Paul appointed, and by his successor Anacletus, or Cletus; the other by Clement, who survived and united both under one Bishop. Undoubtedly, the ground for having two Churches would be one which only extreme necessity would have admitted, as the object in the establishment of any Church was union of Jew and Gentile in the common bond of Christianity. But, as it is little less than certain, that during the Ministry of the two Apostles, such unity was not effected, the two parties may possibly have thus continued distinct, until an opportunity was afforded for their union. This appears to have occurred during Clement's Bishopric; and it not a little coincides with this view, that the only genuine work of his which remains, is wholly occupied with the subject of unity and Christian Love, as the highest characteristic of a Church. If this view, which is sanctioned by the learned Cave, and is, perhaps, the only one that reconciles the statements of History, be admitted, the list of early Bishops will stand thus:*

For the Gentile portion: Linus and Cletus, or Anacletus.

For the Jewish portion: Clement.

For the whole reunited: Clement.

Epistle of Clement.

The *Epistle* to which we allude, must have been written after this union took place; for, although it is called an *Epistle* of Clement, yet it is really an *Epistle* from the Church at Rome to the Church of Corinth; and the strict intimacy which subsisted between these two Churches, and which amply accounts for such an *Epistle* having been written, was probably through the Gentiles, rather than through the Jewish converts For it is to remembered, that their link of union was St. Paul, who at Corinth first met with Aquila and Priscilla. To his residence at Corinth, they doubtless traced the first interest which he took in their conversion; and it is more than probable, that that interest would be shared by the Corinthians themselves, and be the foundation of a lasting intimacy. That such an intimacy did subsist between these two Churches, may be proved from an *Epistle*, written by Dionysius Bishop of Corinth to the Church of Rome, towards the end of the IInd century; part of which is preserved by Eusebius; (lib. iv. c. 23;) and may further account for what is there noticed, that the above-mentioned *Epistle* of Clement used to be read at Corinth as a portion of the Church service. This *Epistle*, then, is an interesting monument of the peculiar connection between the two Churches. It is not the decree of a superior to an inferior body of Christians, but the affectionate remonstrance of friends and fellow Christians on the renewal of those schisms at Corinth, which had before called for the interference of St. Paul. The Church of Rome reminds them (c. 47) of their common Apostle's authority and advice, as still preserved in those *Epistles*; and, as if careful not to offend by appearing to assume any authority by this act of friendly interference, accompanies all its advice with expressions like these; "Beloved, in this *Epistle* we are not only suggesting advice to you, but refreshing our own minds with our duty, for our station is the same, and the same our course of duty." "Beloved, the custom we adopt of reproving one another is excellent, and beyond measure useful; for it unites us to the will of God;" and it concludes with nothing stronger than an anxious wish that the messengers may bring back an account of that harmony which they so desired and prayed for. Is it likely that the Church of Rome or its Bishop, would have neglected to mingle salutary threats of punishment and hints of a superintending authority with its exhortations, as St. Paul did in his *Epistles*, if either Church or Bishop had then possessed Apostolical controul or superintendence over other Churches?

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Disproves the claim to admission of any Supremacy.

Indeed, if such an authority had been vested in the Church of Rome, it is impossible that no more should be left on record of its intercourse with the other Primitive Churches, in a season which, above all others, seemed to require the active superintendence of a head, if any there were. Subsequently to the writing of this *Epistle*, all, perhaps, that deserves notice concerning the state of affairs at Rome, is the *Epistle* which Ignatius addressed to them, in his journey thither as a condemned martyr. This *Epistle* no less than the former, although in a different way, confirms the Protestant's assertion, that all Churches are independent of Rome and the Romish Bishop. Ignatius writes to them in the same independent tone which appears in his *Epistles* to other Churches; and, in one place particularly, speaks of the joint founders of that Church, in a way which is certainly inconsistent with the view of their successors being invested with a similar character. He had been desiring their prayers for him in his approaching trial; and he adds, "I do not *command* you as if I were Peter or Paul; they were Apostles." Would he, who

Ignatius Epist. ad Rom.

* More than one instance will be found, subsequently recorded in Ecclesiastical History, of Schisms being ended by the temporary appointment of two Bishops. See in Theodoret (lib. v. c. 3) the proposal of Miletus, Bishop of Antioch to Paulinus, to settle the opposition between them in this manner. The same offer was made by the Catholic Bishops of Africa to the Donatists, in the conference between them at Carthage; and from the way in which it was proposed, it would seem to have been, at that time, no unusual expedient. See *Collat. Carthag.* 1, *Dec.* c. 16. "Nec *novum aliquid* fiet, &c."

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

of all writers, ancient or modern, most insists on the authority of the Christian Ministry, in all its gradations, have neglected here to remind the Romans of the character of their Bishop, if it were different from his own? Could he have failed to allude to the infallible authority that still abode with them, if there were any since that of Peter and Paul?

Object of that *Epistle*.

The author of this *Epistle* soon after suffered martyrdom in the Coliseum at Rome; and the chief object of his sending the *Epistle* before him, appears to have been to prevent any rash attempt on the part of the Christians there to rescue him. Any turbulent or disobedient spirit, which might have been thus displayed in the Capital of the Empire, would of course have been tenfold more dangerous to the furtherance of the Gospel, in awakening the suspicions of the Gentile Government, than any thing which might take place elsewhere. The *Epistle* was admirably adapted to accomplish this; and the warm expressions which it contains, concerning the joys of martyrdom, will not seem unnatural and extravagant, if regarded with this view. A cold appeal to the prudence of his brethren at Rome would, with the strong excitement of feeling which his case produced amongst them, have been scarcely listened to. To desert the holy man from prudential motives, might have seemed to them mean and dastardly. It was requisite to represent the fate that threatened him, as not only good and glorious, but absolutely pleasurable. This is the spirit of all Ignatius's *Epistles*, but most of all, of that in which it was most needed.

His remonstrance was, perhaps, not misplaced; for the fact, that his remains were gathered up, as if from a melancholy effort to find some safe way of testifying their regard, seems to indicate, that unless precaution had been used, some imprudent attempt to rescue him might have been made.

§ *The Church at Alexandria.*

To these notices of the Primitive Churches of Jerusalem and Rome, it would be desirable to add some account of the Church of Alexandria; as its influence on the character of the Christian world was certainly not less than that of either of the preceding. But it would be impossible to introduce such a History of it, as would be at once useful and compatible with our limits. At the same time, it may not be improper to remind the inquirer, of the several allusions which have been already made to the corrupt tendency of this Church from the earliest times; and to state briefly, that out "of the false knowledge" cultivated here, proceeded directly, or indirectly, nearly all the heresies of the first Ages. To this day, indeed, remains may be traced in the Christian world, of the false and fatal notions which took their rise in Alexandria; and Christians and Divines have not yet ceased to find Christianity in Plato, and to regard his metaphysical speculations on the nature of the Deity, as glimpses of Revelation; or at least, as anticipations of Divine truths, which they know not how to attribute to mere Human ingenuity. And it must be confessed, that in some of the metaphysical views, which, from time to time, have been taken of the Doctrine of the Trinity, the coincidence between those views and Plato's system, is too minutely exact to have been accidental. In this case, the conclusion would be unavoidable, that either Plato's knowledge was derived from Inspiration, or that Christianity was derived from Plato. But we have not so learned Christ.

Its corruption.

§ *Schools, Catechists, and Catechisms.*

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

We are contemplating the Primitive Church in the performance of its office of dispensing the Revelation recorded and intrusted to its keeping; and we have seen it, with this object in view, interweaving the Holy Scriptures into the stated Service of God; maintaining a separate Order of men for officiating, and for interpreting, as well as for reading this Record; and also employing them in offering the Truths it contains to strangers and the Heathen, as well as to the brethren.

But the Church's trusteeship was, to a certain extent, discretionary. Its first duty was thus to afford to all access to the Word of God, as God gave it; their next, to resort to every method of communicating that Word, which should render it in each case most intelligible or acceptable. The unconverted would require to be addressed in a different form from the Christian already instructed; and, among both converted and unconverted, there would exist an endless variety of intellectual habits and capacities, which would require the Truths of the Gospel to be shaped accordingly.

The great body of those, then, to whom Gospel Truths were addressed, are commonly divided into two classes; the Catechumens, or those who were preparing by an appointed course of instruction (κατήχησις) for Baptism; and the *Fideles*, (πιστοί,) or complete Christians (τέλειοι.)

Mode of instructing the confirmed Christians.

With respect to the latter, the Gospel Truths were dispensed, not only as they were found in Scripture, but systematically arranged in Sermons, in Creeds, and in other formulas of Religious instruction. For the purpose of conveying Scriptural Truth by these channels, either more compendiously, or more in accordance with the previous knowledge or general pursuits of those addressed, technical terms were introduced; which, although not occurring in Scripture, might represent certain doctrines contained there. The word *Trinity* may serve to illustrate what is here meant.

The Catechists.

With respect to the instruction of the Catechumens, it does not appear that any distinct Order of Ministers officiated as Catechists; but that it was only a particular employment which might devolve on any Minister; and which we find, at different times, attached to all the Orders of the Ministry, from the Bishop to the lowest Deacon. It was to avoid scandal and suspicion, no doubt, that the female Catechumens were generally taught by that ancient Order, the Deaconnesses, or widows; of which mention has been formerly made, and of whose original appointment this was probably the main reason.*

The Deaconnesses.

The first instruction probably Historical.

It was their office to prepare the candidates for Baptism, by a course of instruction suited to each; but in what their Catechism generally consisted, we know no further than that the sum of it was Repentance and Faith. In what it would naturally consist, as contrasted with the after instruction of the mature Christian, is a question on which it is not difficult to decide. The original and primary character of the Gospel scheme is Historical; and the first office of its original Preachers, accordingly, that of Witnesses to Facts. A Historical account of the events of the Sacred Record would, therefore, seem almost certainly to be the appropriate

* See Bingham's *Ecc. Antiq.* book ii. ch. xxii. sec. 9. Agreeably to this view, the African Churches, in the decree of the Council of Carthage, specify among the qualifications of a Deaconness, *Ut possit apte et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres*, &c.

History. From 100 to 167.

instruction of the Catechumen, if we had no clue to guide us beyond the character of the subject to be handled. But this presumption is greatly increased, by comparing it with what actually did take place during the Apostolic Ministry, in the few instances on record of what approaches nearest to Catechetical instruction—the Preaching of the Apostles and others to an unconverted audience. In St. Paul's address to the Jews at Jerusalem, and to the Gentiles at Athens, his teaching is strictly of this character; and that this did not arise from any peculiar habit of composition, is evident from his *Epistles*, in which quite a different method is pursued.

Advantages of such a method.

The point has been thought thus much worthy of notice, because it is not unreasonable to believe, that if the custom of so teaching Christianity to the young and the unlearned were more common, the abstract Truths would be more easily and naturally understood afterwards. Whereas, to begin with these, gives the whole an abstruse and unattractive air to most; and creates a difficulty in that study, which was intended for the humblest capacities.

Children.

Separate establishments existed for the Children of Christians and for the adult Catechumens, as might naturally be expected; and the early use of Sponsors marks the anxious care of the Church, that provision should be made for preventing in all a mere conformity to custom.

Schools.

With regard to the places in which the Catechumens received their education and training, although these seem to have been in some instances separate and appropriate, yet in others, the Church, or some part of it, was appointed for this purpose.*

It is scarcely possible to pursue, even in imagination, the stages which connect all these simple seminaries of elementary Religion with those splendid and elaborate Institutions, in which Religion and useful Learning are now united; and which are among the most powerful instruments employed, by our own Church especially, for dispensing the Faith which she has in keeping.

III. *How the First Uninspired Church fulfilled its office of* CONVEYING *Divine Grace.*

Of the sacred character of the Christian Society, considered as the Temple of the Holy Ghost, and the appointed medium of its operations, it is scarcely possible to speak in language too strong. No peculiarity of the New Testament is more striking, than the continual and anxious endeavour of the Sacred writers to awaken and cherish a sense of it. As portions of this Holy building, as members of this Society beloved of God, the Christians received from their Lord his one new commandment, "to love one another." All the zeal of the great Apostle of the Gentiles to teach and preach and enlarge this Society, was at the same time directed towards obtaining from every Church an acknowledgment and testimony of this, in the specific pledge of alms for the needy brethren of Judea. St. John's favourite theme is this holy love; and if more of the Inspired Preachers had left their teaching on record, this, doubtless, would have been a characteristic prominent in all their writings.

Sacramental duties of the Church Ministers.

It was a high and holy office which the Church had to execute in preserving inviolate the Recorded Revelation; it was a duty no less honourable and anxious, which it was appointed to discharge in dispensing this intrusted blessing, so that mankind should receive the greatest possible benefit from it. But higher and holier, perhaps, was this its Priestly office—its Sacramental character—its duty of perpetually communicating to new countries and successive generations, the gift which it immediately received from Christ, and of which it was the appointed medium for ever. The acts which constituted these means were, of course, to be the essential badges of the Society; and without them that Society might have preserved the Bible, and distributed its contents, but could not have been a Christian Church. What these means are, all know. They are all those outward observances in which Christians meet to celebrate their whole spiritual communion with Christ and with each other; but especially those which are distinguished by specific Divine institution—the Sacrament of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Age of the Apostolic Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Why Baptism and the Lord's Supper are specifically Sacraments.

Not that to them alone belongs a Sacramental character; for it is evident, that if only these observances were perpetuated, the Grace of God, which is promised to Prayer, for instance, would want the external sign, and would not therefore be enjoyed. Baptism and the Eucharist are specifically Sacraments, because the *precise forms in each is to a certain extent* prescribed, and therefore the communication of Grace is attached to one unalterable ceremonial. But if, according to our Saviour's promise, "Where one or two are gathered together, there He is in the midst," all the religious meetings of Christians are means of Grace, the Church itself, in the celebration of its union as the Temple of the Holy Ghost, is Sacramental. No specific form beyond the necessary parts of Baptism and the Lord's Supper claim this character, but then, there is a Grace generally necessary to Salvation appointed to be conveyed through Prayer and other observances, although the exact description of these observances be left to the discretion of the Church.

What is now to be considered, therefore, is the mode in which the Primitive Church celebrated these Rites and Ceremonies.

§ *Christian Rites.*

Their distribution.

The Rites and Observances of the Church may be classed under a twofold division; the one part of which would contain those through which Divine Grace is conveyed to individuals as such, or as filling individual offices. Of which kind are the ceremonies of Ordination, Confirmation, &c. The other portion, under which the Sacraments would fall, comprises those which relate to Christians in their common Christian character. Besides the Sacraments are the Public Prayers, the Marriage and Funeral Ceremonies, and the like. Both classes have been stated to be modes of intercourse with Him who has promised to be in the midst of us, whenever two or three are assembled together as His people. So far the Ceremonies of the Church are all of the same character, and, as means of promised Grace, are so far Sacramental. But, in a further view, an important distinction occurs. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are fixed institutions, and Grace is attached to the observance of these specific means; in the others, the means are of the Church's appointment, and the Grace bestowed, although requiring some means, is yet not specifically attached to any. But another difference obtains, which, although not quite so obvious, is scarcely

All but the two Sacraments may vary in form

* Bingham, book iii. ch. x. sec. 4.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

less important and characteristic. One common object is sought in all these acts of Christian celebration—communion with Christ, participation of His Spirit. But we are not styled in Scripture *individually*, but *collectively*, the Temple of the Holy Ghost, the abode of the Spirit; and as members of that well compacted Body we receive it. Now it has been already more than once pointed out, that Christians are not one Society, but many Societies founded on the same principles. Each of these Societies celebrates within itself the Rites and Ceremonies which are the tie to unite it with Christ, and to preserve His Spirit among all its members. Each Church, accordingly, may lawfully observe distinct forms of Prayer, and distinct modes of appointment. It may do so, at least, to a very great extent. And as each Christian Society thus holds communion with God in its own way, so does each member partake of that communion, as a member of his particular Society or Church. With respect to the Sacraments, however, the case is not exactly so. Our act of communion here is performed, not as members of any one particular Church, but as members of the great Christian Body—as belonging to the Elect, the Sanctified, the Redeemed. The duties imposed on us by our Religious condition in this respect may admit of illustration from the necessities imposed on us by our natural condition. It is necessary to the well-being, and to the very existence, of each separate People or association of men, that they should use some language; although the variety of languages may be infinite, which will effect the end desired. This is analogous to the means of Grace, not specifically, but generally required, and cultivated by each Church in its own way. Again, it is necessary to the existence of every individual of the Human Race, that at certain intervals, he should recruit his body by sleep. Here is a necessity, to which he conforms, not after the fashion of any one Nation, not as attached to any one Society, but in obedience to an invariable and universal law. To this answers the Christian's duty of celebrating the Sacraments. They are specifically appointed as means of Grace and therefore are means of Grace for all; all other Ceremonies are means of Grace for the members of the particular Society which adopts them.

Why the Sacraments must be uniformly the same.

Of course these remarks, as far as they relate to the Sacraments, apply only to such portion of those Rites as is recorded to be of our Lord's appointment. In Baptism, it is the use of Water, and of the prescribed Form of words, which denotes the transfer to the Baptized of all privileges claimed by the People of God, whether as Father, as Son, or as Holy Ghost. In the Lord's Supper, it is the symbolical use of the Bread and Wine, which Christ ordained for our instruction, and the accompaniment of the words with which He taught us to accompany it. Beyond the adherence to these points, then, our inquiry into the practice of the Primitive Church need not be prolonged. And first with respect to Baptism.

Limitation of this rule.

§ *Baptism.*

Water always used.

Of the continual and invariable use of Water in Baptism by the immediate successors of the Apostles, it may be proof enough to state, that the remains of the latter end of the IInd and IIIrd centuries are so unequivocal and full on the exclusive employment of the Symbol, that no doubt can be entertained of the custom never having ceased. There is a passage in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, however, which, to those especially who rank him among the Apostolical Fathers, may be cited as contemporary evidence. In his *Similitudes* (ix. 16) he expressly speaks of the "Water of Baptism," and in his *Visions* he alludes to it under the image of the Church floating in a mystic Water.* Whether immersion only was the mode of using this Sacramental Symbol, is a question which need not detain the inquirer, since he will probably, in conformity with certain Principles already established, perceive at once, that to such a departure from Apostolic custom as may be supposed to exist in sprinkling, rather than in immersing the candidate, the discretionary authority of any Church clearly extends.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Not so with respect to the Form of words, so solemnly prescribed by Christ Himself; in strict accordance with which are all the earliest notices of the Baptismal Service. Its literal adoption by the first Uninspired Church is inferred on grounds similar to those on which we assert the invariable use of the Symbol of Water. It is mentioned by Tertullian and a succession of writers who lived within too short a distance of this period to make its intermission at all probable;† and an authority which, perhaps, is still earlier, that of the author of Clement's *Recognitions*, undoubtedly alludes to it, when he speaks of persons "Baptized in the name of the Threefold Mystery;"‡ and, again, of the ceremony being performed "by invoking the name of the blessed Trinity."§ In the *Apostolical Canons* an express prohibition against departure from it is found; which serves to mark the early attempts of Heretics and innovators to corrupt and change the words prescribed. Menander is, perhaps, the earliest who is directly charged with this attempt, which has been also urged against the Montanists, Sabellians, and other heretical Sects.

And the Invocation of the Trinity.

Let it be clearly understood, that the object of this and of similar inquiries into the practice of the Primitive Church, is not to support the correctness of our Church, or of *any* Church, the practices of which coincide with these; the object is strictly Historical, the mere statement of facts, without always inquiring what specific use those facts may serve. It is enough that they are Truths, and Truths seldom remain long unemployed and unprofitable. As to the practices themselves, we should be equally bound to observe them, whether the Primitive Church observed them or not, if they are enjoined by Scripture; equally authorized to retain them on our own Church's authority, if not inconsistent with Scripture Principles. The Primitive Church, in our present view of it, is submitted to a trial on Scriptural evidence, such as one generation of fallible beings is ever subject to from another, and such as every Christian generation is required to institute on its predecessors; according to the command, "prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

The object of these inquiries is Historical.

It is gratifying, doubtless, to contemplate the genuine spirit of Christianity preserved in these early times; and it even adds a natural confidence to decisions founded on independent authority, to find those also the decisions of that generation which was nearest our Inspired guides. Still, our inquiry may be free and fearless.

* *Vis.* 3. c. 13.

† Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, c. 13; Cyprian, *Ep.* 13; August. *de Baptismo*, l. vi. c. 25; *et alibi.*

‡ *Recognit.* lib. vi. c. 9.

§ Lib. iii. c. 67.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

We have satisfactory evidence now, that in the mode of administering the Sacrament of Baptism, the first Uninspired Churches fulfilled their trust. Did they equally so in dispensing this necessary medium of God's Grace to those for whom it was designed, and by the hands of such as were intended to officiate? We are quite sure from the Scripture, of an authority and duty in the Church, to limit Baptism to no age; did the Primitive Societies of Christians act on this principle? Of this there can be no doubt in any candid mind. It is true that Infant Baptism is not mentioned expressly by any earlier writer than Irenæus;* for, although the authority of Clement and Hermas are alleged by some learned men, (besides that the testimony of the latter may be disputed on other grounds,) in either, it only amounts to the avowal of opinions, which would seem to be inconsistent with the Doctrine of the Anabaptists, and not to an express declaration. But Irenæus wrote too early† to leave it a question, whether during the period between him and the Apostolic Age, any different regulation existed in this respect. Certainly no allusion is made by him to the novelty of the practice which he records. The Primitive Church, like ourselves, was bound to communicate the Holy trust, and its first Symbol, to every age and sex within reach; and this it doubtless did. Did it also offer it, as we feel ourselves bound to do, to all degrees of persons, to all ranks and nations? No circumstance, except that of individual preparation, appears to have formed a bar to the admission of candidates into any of the Primitive Christian Societies; and, as far as his preparation depended on acquired knowledge, every facility for making it was afforded, in the establishment of Schools for adults, and in the employment of Catechists. There was, doubtless, a Moral preparation beyond this, which was insisted on; and for want of this, many were forbidden the Christian privilege. Whole classes of persons were thus excluded, on the ground that their lives and occupations were inconsistent with this preparation; and with such pictures as the Heathen Historians and Satirists give of the Imperial City, we can hardly refuse to justify these interdictions, when we find the list proscribed to consist of Players, Gladiators, &c.‡ At the same time, there is no certain evidence that even this rule was commenced so early as the period on which we now are treating.§

Baptism administered to persons of all ages.

And all persons,

Who were fittingly prepared.

The remarks already made on the institution of a Ministerial Order, and the evidence that the Primitive Church well understood its design, and maintained its separate character, render it unnecessary to enter specifically into the question of the persons charged with the performance of the Baptismal rite. It was confined, doubtless, as it has been in after times, among all sober Christians, to the ordained Ministry, (under the authority of the Bishop,*) although cases may have occurred in which it was permitted, by the same authority, that it should be performed by a Layman. But though David eat of the shew-bread, yet the rule which forbade its use by any but the Priests was not thereby abolished; and, such necessary deviations from the fixed course, can never rationally be mistaken for the course itself.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167. By Ministers regularly ordained.

§ *The Lord's Supper.*

The essential part of the Eucharist is the Symbolical use of Bread and Wine, according to the Recorded Institution. A corruption in the celebration of this Sacrament might take place in two ways; either by omitting any of that essential part, or by appending to it circumstances inconsistent with its true character. Of both species of corruption we are bound to acquit the Primitive Uninspired Church. Allusions to the consecrated Bread, and to the Holy Communion generally, are found in the writings of Ignatius;† and the form which the *Apostolical Constitutions* describe, was, doubtless, that which had been long observed in consecrating and administering the Bread and Wine.‡ The Primitive Christians were guiltless, too, of the conversion of this peculiar mean of Grace into a rite common to the Jewish and the Pagan Religions. Towards this it was that the current of prejudice ran strongest. In this most solemn act of the new Religion there must have been a perpetual craving, both in Jewish and Gentile convert, to recognise a substitute for the Altar and the repeated Sacrifice. It was a diseased appetite for a forbidden object,

Bread and Wine always used.

---

* Lib. ii. c. 39.

† Irenæus was born about A. D. 97, and wrote his Book against Heresies about A. D. 176, not long before his death. See Cave, *Hist. Liter.*, and Dodwell, *Dissertat. in Irenæum.*

‡ See Tacitus, and Juvenal, *passim.*

§ The list of the Interdicted may be found in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, (lib. viii. c. 32,) which, although confessedly written at a period very much later than that on which we are now engaged, may be considered as conveying an account of *established* customs; which, in the absence of contrary evidence, have some claim to be assigned to the earliest Age. The notes in Cotelerius's edition of the Apostolical Fathers deserve to be consulted.

As the authority of the *Apostolical Constitutions* will depend much on the date which we assign to their composition, it may be proper to add, that the earliest author who mentions the work is Eusebius in his *History*, lib. iii. c. 25, (unless, indeed, we suppose the *Apostolical Canons* to have been written before;) but, as Eusebius mentions them among spurious works in circulation, the fact seems to imply that they must have been long in existence. For, had they been a forgery of Eusebius's day, the author of them would probably have been known to him, and therefore have been exposed. Their continued interpolation, even to a subsequent period, is possible and likely.

* Ignat. *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 8.

† *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 7, 8; *Ep. ad Ephes.* c. 5, 20.

‡ Lib. viii. c. 12. The addition of *Water* to the Sacramental Elements, of which occasional mention is made, might have been in conformity with the general custom of drinking Wine diluted. Still, it seems strange, that the setting on the Table, separately both Water and Wine should be so specifically noticed. Witness Justin Martyr, (*Apol.* II) προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος; and, again, ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ. Accordingly, the expressions made use of in Irenæus, to denote that the Bread and Wine were prepared for distribution, are *quando* mixtus *calix et fractus panis*, (lib. v. c. 4.) Possibly, the custom may have been thus scrupulously observed by many, from a desire to express more exactly the precious Blood-shedding which took place on the Cross, and which was not, it may be observed, an effusion of Blood alone, but of Water and Blood. That this circumstance should have been so dwelt on, will hardly be wondered at, when we consider the solemn manner in which St. John delivers his testimony to the fact: "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came thereout Blood and Water. And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe," (John, ch. xix. v. 34, 35.) To the same circumstance perhaps his words in his first *Epistle* may refer: "This is he that came by Water and Blood, even Jesus Christ; not by Water alone, but by Water and Blood," (ch. v. v. 6.) St. John is the only Evangelist who has recorded the flowing of Water and Blood from our Lord's side; and it is somewhat remarkable, that he is also the only one who has recorded "the beginning of Miracles,"—the conversion of Water into Wine at Cana. Had the Miracle any meaning connected with the fact which he so pointedly attests, and, if so, what was that meaning?

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

which Idolatrous habits had created in the one, and real Piety perhaps in the other, and which could only be corrected gradually. Looking back upon the scene, with our experience of the actual corruptions which thence arose, we may be disposed to censure even the concessions, (trifling as they were) which these Primitive Rulers and Preachers made; we may be disposed to wish, that they had never ventured to call the Lord's Table an Altar, or the Bread and Wine a Sacrifice. But that they did it innocently, no one can doubt, who merely reads the few remains of those writers who have employed this language, and finds so little fondness, so plain an aversion, to dwell on any circumstance of pomp connected with the Christian Ceremonies. They could hardly be expected to foresee the extent of mischief, which afterwards connected itself with these innocent, inadvertent attempts to be all things to all men. The original use of those terms was certainly not as appropriate names, but as figurative expressions, to illustrate their subject.

Figurative language respecting it

Administered to all Christians.

The Principles of the Church's establishment, as recorded in Scripture, and the practical application of those Principles, as displayed in the Ministry of their Inspired predecessors, were all too recent and fresh on their minds, for any question to arise concerning the *persons* who were entitled to this great Christian privilege—the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. They had been fully instructed in the prime article of difference between the Old and the New Dispensations of God, *viz.* that the former admitted of different classes among those whom it embraced, and of different degrees of privilege and communion, for Jew, for the Proselyte of Righteousness, and for the Devout Gentile: but that in the latter, the partition wall had been thrown down, the veil had been rent. Against this act of uniformity, then, which had been so carefully preserved by the Apostles, in their Preaching and their practice, they were not likely to offend. To have reserved any participation of the Eucharist for the Ministers alone, or for any one specified class of Believers, would have been too manifest a violation of this great Principle; whatever temptation might present itself in the prejudice of Jew and Gentile for an officiating Minister, who should remind them of a Priest.* All were not only admitted equally, but all were invited, to partake of this act of Communion; and, indeed, it was long thought to be inconsistent with a Christian's profession to be otherwise than a regular Communicant.†

By ordained Ministers.

The administration of this Sacrament, as well as that of Baptism, was limited to the ordained Ministry, who officiated by authority derived from their Bishop.‡ Whether any difference of administration, such as now obtains, between the Priests' and Deacons' Office, had its origin so early, there are no means of ascertaining. Justin Martyr§ speaks of the distribution of the Bread and Wine as belonging to the Deacons' Office; and in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, the direction given is, that the Bread be delivered by the Bishop, and the Wine by the Deacon.‖

Communion of the Sick.

Whether the custom of sending a portion of the consecrated Elements to the absent and sick, or that which is still preserved in our own Church, of performing the service in the chambers of the sick, was so early established, is uncertain. With respect to this latter custom, that it is of great antiquity at least, is undoubted; nor can any objection be urged against its lawfulness. Still, it deserves to be considered, whether erroneous notions and superstitious feelings have not been very generally fostered through the custom. The Sacrament celebrated in private, and amongst a few attendants on a sick bed, ceases to be looked on in its true light, as an act of the Christian congregation, celebrating its union as such with Christ, and within itself. Its celebration under circumstances which thus obscure its most prominent characteristics, may cause weak minds to attach almost unconsciously the notion of a charm to the ceremony. It may, accordingly, be desired and demanded, as if it possessed a talismanic influence on the dying, and was indispensable to the safe exit of the Christian. It is not so much on habitual Communicants that this feeling can operate mischievously; it is on those who either never communicating, or not being in habitual communication, reserve this one act of conformity for the season of sickness or of death. To persons under such circumstances, a visiting Minister's exhortation to receive the Sacrament is surely misplaced. It might be better, perhaps, even to dissuade such an one from his purpose, if he desired it. It is scarcely a time for the stricken sinner in this manner to attempt reparation of his former neglect. For that neglect, he should be instructed to pray to God for forgiveness, among the sins which he shall then specifically confess to Him; and to resolve, that if it shall please God to restore him to the assemblies of his Saints on earth, there, where alone it is appropriate, to begin and to continue the special course of Christian Communion.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

§ *Agapæ, or Love Feasts.*

Among the acts of Communion which Christians celebrated as members, not of particular Christian Societies, but of the whole Christian body, the *Agapæ*, or Feasts of Love, require some mention. Agreeing so far in their character with the Lord's Supper, they seem to have had some further connection with the celebration of this Sacrament; and, accordingly, to have been held either immediately before, or immediately after the Communion Service. As this Primitive custom is less familiar to us now than those which have been perpetuated to our own Age, some detailed consideration of it may not be unacceptable.

Celebrated after the Lord's Supper, and supplied from the oblations,

It was an ancient custom, then, in the Church, for Christians to add to the celebration of the Lord's Supper a frugal meal, of which all the Communicants partook. This Love Feast, as it was named, was furnished out of oblations, which it was usual then, as now, for the congregation to make; part being set aside for the Clergy fund, the remainder employed in providing this common table.

In the House of Prayer.

That this remarkable custom was not merely an act of charity to the poor, in providing them with an occasional meal at the expense of their more affluent brethren, nor yet a display of ordinary social feeling, may be inferred from the circumstance, that it was celebrated in the House of Prayer, and in connection with the most solemn portion of Divine Service. For

---

* Ἰερεύς.

† The *Apostolical Canons* direct that absentees from Communion shall be amenable for their neglect. So, too, the Council of Antioch. The Decree of Anacletus to the same effect is spurious.

‡ Ignat. *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 8. § *Apol.* 11.

‖ *Constitut. Ap.* lib. viii. c. 13.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

meetings, the object of which was the relief of hunger, or social relaxation, some other time and place would more properly have been chosen. "What! have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" (writes St. Paul to the Corinthians,) "or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not?" "If any man hunger, let him eat at home.' The union, indeed, of Charity and social feeling with its Religious object, (whatever that object was,) may be admitted, and would be by no means inconsistent; but it would rather remind us of that similar union of Miracle and Mercy, which was conspicuous throughout the Saviour's dealings with mankind.

Antiquity of this custom.

The early Fathers speak of it as an Apostolical rite;* and the same may be inferred from some allusions in St. Paul's *Epistles*, † and still more certainly from a passage in the *Epistle* of Jude. ‡ It is enough, however, to know that the Rite was generally observed by the immediate successors of the Apostles, and on the alleged authority of Apostolical precedent.

Remarkable connection of these Feasts with certain Scriptural Phraseology.

The most remarkable circumstance about this decayed institution is, its apparent connection with an important object of Faith. It will readily occur to all, that the terms in which the Holy Ghost and its operations are described in Scripture, are all figurative. It is called "Light," and "Life," and "the Spirit," "the Holy Spirit." So, too, the change effected by it in the Christian's condition is called "Regeneration," or "a new birth." He is termed "a new man after God created in righteousness," "a new creature," and the like. The reason of this is obvious. The ideas to be conveyed were altogether new, and new or borrowed terms were, therefore, required to express them.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

At the same time, the ideas so conveyed are intelligible enough for our purpose. We are taught by all these various expressions, (and the *variety* of expression seems designed to prevent a *literal* interpretation of any one,) that the effect of the Holy Ghost's descent has been, not merely increased assistance from God, but, as it were, a constitutional change in Man; the addition of some abiding Principle which belonged not to his original nature,—as far as it is connected with the fruits of Righteousness, having a common object with Conscience, but more certain and effectual; even "God working within us to will and to do of His good pleasure." It is called "Life," then, because of the analogy between the imparting of this new element of goodness, and the original creation of Adam, with which it is sometimes contrasted. So St. Paul, "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit." "In Adam all die, in Christ shall all be made alive." It is called Light, too, because of its use in guiding us from error into "the way of life;" or, perhaps, in allusion to that Holy Light in which God's people of old were wont to recognise the symbol of the Divine Presence. And hence it is written, that "God is Light," and, that "if the light that be in us be darkness, how great will be that darkness." Hence, too, the precept, "Let your *Light* so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven." It is also called *Spirit*, because it is God unseen, unfelt, incomprehensible; or rather, because it is God worshipped no longer in connection with any visible symbol, or Holy dwelling-place, neither at Jerusalem, (as the Lord told the Samaritan woman,) nor yet on Mount Gerizim, but in "*Spirit* and in Truth." "As the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the *Spirit*."

Christian Love explained.

Among the terms adopted to express this new relation between God and Man, is ἀγάπη; which in our Bible translation is rendered sometimes Love, and sometimes Charity, apparently without any rule for the difference of translation. It is called Love; yet it is not strictly speaking, Love. The word wanted, was one to express the benevolent relation of God to Man, and the corresponding feeling of Man to God, in this His last mode of manifestation; as residing no longer in a Temple or Holy City, but in that figurative Temple, of which we are the constituent parts, which has been "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone. In whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth into a Holy Temple in the Lord. In whom we also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."* Some word was wanted, in short, to express that particular kind of devotional feeling towards God, as filling this his final dwelling place with his Glory; which the

---

* See Bingham's *Ecc. Antiq.* book xv. ch. vi. Ignatius mentions the rite, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* sec. 8; and in Tertullian there is a full account of it. *Apol.* c. 39.

† In the passage particularly referred to, (1 *Cor.* ch. xi. v. 17,) in which he is upbraiding the Corinthians with the profanation of the Sacrament, by mingling with it indecent revelling, his words certainly seem to imply the existence of some meal, connected indeed with the celebration of the Eucharist, but more of a meal than is perhaps consistent with any supposable mode of distributing and partaking of the consecrated Elements.

There is another passage in the same *Epistle* which probably points to it, (ch. v. v. 11.)

In directing the Corinthians to pass sentence of Excommunication on an incestuous member, he enumerates several crimes besides, for which the offender ought to be punished by the Church with complete Excommunication, total exclusion from all, even the slightest act of Communion as Christians; "with such an one," he writes to bid them "not even to eat." This is, very probably, an allusion to the *Agapæ*; because Excommunication or Exclusion from any Society, as a rightful act of the Society, can only extend to Exclusion from those privileges and exercises which the members share *as members of that Society*, and no further. And, besides, the social intercourse of the table would hardly be characterised as the least of all *ordinary* intercourse; although it may very well be considered as the slightest act of Christian Communion.

Another passage may be quoted from St. Paul's writings, as apparently containing an allusion to the existence of this Rite in the very earliest stage of the Christian establishment. It is his account of St. Peter's behaviour at Antioch, during the attempt of the Judaizing faction there, to enforce on the Gentile converts the observance of the Mosaic Law. (*Epistle to the Galatians*, ch. ii.) "Before" (says he) "that certain came from James, he did *eat with the Gentiles*; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision." It is certainly possible that St. Paul may be here speaking only of the ordinary intercourse of hospitality; but, as this act is specified, as the main token by which St. Peter was supposed to have sanctioned the notion, that an Uncircumcised Christian was no *real* Christian; it is more reasonable to interpret it of some religious intercourse.

‡ Ch. v. v. 12.

* Hence we find this in the IInd century among the elementary Truths professed by the Catechumens at their Baptism. Tertull. *de Bapt.* c. 3, *Cum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignorentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiæ mentio; quoniam, ubi tres, id est, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quæ suum corpus est.* And, accordingly, it is among the Articles of the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost,—the Holy Catholic Church,—the Communion of Saints;" of which clauses "the Communion of Saints" was not added until the IVth century; probably, when the preceding expression ceased to be generally understood, and the truth conveyed by it required a new mode of enunciation. See APOSTLES' CREED.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Israelite felt, when he trod the Courts of the house of God, or at the hour of prayer looked on it from afar, or turned his face to the quarter of the Heavens in which it stood. That associated Love, with which the old worshipper of God was wont to exclaim, "Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy house, and the place where Thine honour dwelleth." "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning;"—that associated Love, was to be transferred to a Society made the new "habitation of God through the Spirit;" and this was expressed by the term ἀγάπη.

Connection between the Love of God and of Man.

In this secondary application of the word, then, it may be interpreted to mean, either the relation of God to Man, as dwelling in him by the Holy Spirit; or, the corresponding feeling of Man to God in that relation. And, as this Spirit of Love, which He hath given, (1 Tim. ch. i. v. 14.) becomes ours, only as members of a Society, the Christian's endeavour to preserve and cherish this Holy union, is necessarily connected with his social behaviour as a Christian, and is, in short, the main principle of it. Hence the continual blending in the Scripture precepts, of the command to love God and our brethren, as if it were one and the same thing; *e. g.* "He that loveth God, loveth his brother also." "He who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen." "We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren." "Every one that loveth is born of God." "He who seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his compassion towards him, how dwelleth the Love of God in him?" In some of them the connection is suggested by the peculiar mode of expression; as in the last, in which the Love of God is spoken of, according to the phrase so often applied to the Holy Spirit, as "dwelling in us." The same may be observed of that which describes the being born of God as the effect of loving; the Scripture language elsewhere being, that we are "so born of Water and of the Spirit."

Use of the term Love by our Saviour,

It was from our blessed Lord's Discourses that this, as many other terms of the Inspired Writers, appears to have acquired its secondary meaning. Among many passages may be noticed especially that in which He tells His Disciples, "As the Father hath loved Me, so I have loved you;"* and, again, His prayer to the Father for Christians in all Ages, "That they may all be one," prayed He, "as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me. Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am; that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast given Me; for Thou lovedst *Me* before the foundation of the world. O righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee; but I have known Thee, and these have known that Thou hast sent Me. And I have declared unto them Thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them."† This passage is given at length, because the particular use of the term is only apparent from the context; as, for instance, in the last verse, "That the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them," is a form of expression cast in the same mould with one of the preceding sentences, "the glory that Thou gavest me I have given them," by which, no doubt, the gift of the Holy Spirit was intended, agreeably to the Sacred language, in which the term glory is made to signify any manifestation of the Divine Nature.

The Apostles, accordingly, continually employ the word in a way which can scarcely be explained but by such a reference as this. We read of the "Love of the Spirit," of "Love in the Spirit," of "Faith working by Love," of "the Love of God being *shed abroad* in our hearts," (another coincidence with the ordinary language which describes the gift of the Spirit,) of "the edifying in Love;" and the Apostolical blessing is, that "the God of Love may be with us."

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167. And by the Apostles.

Of St. Paul's writings, the 12th and 13th Chapters of the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* may be selected as furnishing the most striking instance of the use of the word by him. The topic, as he tells us, is Spiritual Gifts; and in discussing this, he contrasts the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit with ἀγάπη, or Charity; meaning by this latter, as it is plain, the ordinary influence of the Spirit; and showing, that it was this and not the former, out of which arose the moral qualifications of a Christian—that the gifts of Miracles, of Prophecies, and of Tongues, were useful for the planting of Christianity, but this for the salvation of the possessor. Hence, too, he speaks of it as "never failing," as "abiding;" whereas the extraordinary operations were to cease or fail. This was the permanent gift, the efficacy of which was to go further than its accompaniments Faith and Hope; "greater than Faith, and greater than Hope, because it is even from this principle that the Christian "believeth all things, hopeth all things." "And now *abideth* these three" (*abideth* as opposed to the extraordinary Graces of the early Church, of which he had been speaking) "Faith, Hope, and Charity, but the greatest of these is Charity."*

By St. Paul.

In no part of the New Testament, however, is the peculiar use of this word so striking as in St. John's writings. That "God is Love," and that "if we Love one another God dwelleth in us," is the thought that entwines itself into all he writes, whether narrative or precept. To "the beloved" is his habitual form of address. When he describes what St. Paul would call "neglecting the gift within thee," his language is, "Thou hast left thy first Love;" faith in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is called by him, "believing the Love that God hath in us," and the like. And accordingly it is said of him, that when incapable of preaching and teaching any longer, his only exhortation used to be, "little children Love one another."

By St. John.

* John, ch. xv. v. 9. † Ibid ch. xvii. v. 21.

* Compare 1 *Corinthians*, ch. xiii. with *Galatians*, ch. v. v. 19, and the correspondence between what is called in the one the result, of ἀγάπη, and in the other the fruits of the Spirit, will be apparent. The following scheme will serve to show the main coincidences.

Characteristics of ἀγάπη, from 1 *Corinthians*, ch. xiii.	Fruits of the Spirit, from *Galatians*, ch. v.
I. Μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται.	I. Μακροθυμία, χρηστότης.
II. Ζηλοῖ οὐ ζηλοῖ.	II. Ζηλοῦντες.
III. Πάντα ὑπομένει.	III. Ὑπομονή.
IV. Οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.	IV. Χαρά.
V. Οὐ παροξύνεται.	V. Πραΰτης.
VI. Οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν.	VI. Ἐγκράτεια. κ. τ. λ.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

But no passage in his writings is more remarkable than the 4th Chapter of his first *Epistle*. "No man," writes he, "hath seen God at any time. If we Love one another, God dwelleth in us, and His Love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit. And we have known," adds he, "and believed the Love that God hath *in us*;* God is Love; and he that dwelleth in Love dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our Love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment; because as *He* is, *so are we in this world*." 1 *Epistle*, iv.

Now if we compare the first sentences of this paragraph with a corresponding verse in his Gospel, what has been asserted of his meaning will, perhaps, be more evident. In the Gospel, when he is giving an account of the manifestation of God in Christ, his language is, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." In the Epistle, when he is dwelling on the manifestation of God by the Spirit, he writes, "No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another God dwelleth *in us*, and His Love is perfected *in us*;"† following it up by the several expressions already quoted, all conveying the same truth, that this manifestation is made by God's Spirit *in us* as a Society; and it is this union, and the feelings arising out of it, which is the Love of which he writes—that Love which God has *in us*; God being Love. Compared with a passage in his Gospel.

It can hardly be questioned, that by this use of the term in the language of the Apostles, must be interpreted its meaning as applied to that ancient Christian rite, which celebrated the union of Christians as members of Christ—as the common abode of the Holy Ghost. They were called *Agapæ*, and were always appended to the administration of the Sacrament; to intimate, no doubt, the close connection, which, according to Scripture, exists between the Saviour's death, and that blessing for which it was expedient He should go away.‡ As by the Sacrament they were reminded more especially of His dying for our sins; so in this kindred ceremony, they commemorated His return and eternal abode with them by His Spirit. It continued to be observed until the middle of the IVth century; when, owing to some abuses in the celebration of it, it was abolished by a decree of the Council of Laodicea. The Agapæ founded on this language. Abolished in the IVth century.

As no account of its institution is registered in Scripture, it may be considered as one of those points of Apostolical practice, the observance of which, in after times, was, by virtue of this omission, left by the Holy Spirit to the discretion of the Church. Nor can it be doubted, that if its continuance was once found generally incompatible with the decorum of the Church, its revival would be still more objectionable. We have, indeed, ourselves witnessed the experiment, and, to say no more, the fruitlessness of it. Objections to a revival.

§ *Public Prayers.*

The regular observance of Public Prayer has been already noticed under another head, when its character, as one of the means of dispensing the contents of Scripture, was the point in view. But, although this was one purpose which the Public Liturgies have served in all Ages of the Church, yet is it not their chief or most obvious one. We assemble in common Prayer, as a mode of obtaining that Divine Grace, which is promised to us as Members of a Community; that we may worship, not only towards, but in the Temple of the Holy Ghost; which Temple is, not the Corinthian Church alone, but every Church in every Age. Ignatius's exhortation to the Church of Ephesus proves that the glorious impression of this great truth, made by the Inspired Teachers on the Christian world, was still fresh and strong. "Make a point," writes he, "of frequently assembling to offer thanksgiving and glory to God; for as oft as you gather together, the powers of Satan are quelled, and his destruction fails, when this your act of Faith is as the act of one mind."* Grace one object of Public Prayer. Apostolic Practice From A. D. 100. to 167.

As to the particular Prayers adopted by the earliest Churches, it is well known that the greater part of the Liturgy of the Church of England has been framed on the basis of those which seemed to be at once the most ancient and the most accordant with Scripture. Yet, if we except the Lord's Prayer, no obligation is imposed on any Church to adopt or to retain forms which are inconvenient; and it was doubtless from a view of this principle, that no Public Prayers are left among the materials of Sacred Record,—that each Church, in every Age, may be at liberty to form a Liturgy for itself. The obligation is to have *some*, but not any one instituted form. Accordingly, the custom of Bishops assuming the liberty of composing each his own Liturgy, may be traced so far back, as to lead us to a fair presumption that it existed at the period on which we are now employed.† No precise forms enjoined in Scripture.

The Lord's Prayer is mentioned as an exception; not that even this seems to have been intended by our Lord as the peculiar design of His giving us that Prayer. Its capability of being adopted by all Ages and Churches would, however, leave no plea for ever discontinuing its use; and the framing of it by our Lord Himself, would of course make its omission, under such circumstances, imply a want of due reverence towards Him. It was unquestionably used by the early Churches in their Public Liturgies, and its use was considered by many as an indispensable duty.‡

§ *Certain Rites which fall into a distinct Class.*

All Religious ceremonies have one sole legitimate object; they are the outward signs and formal acts of Communion with God, and with a view to that Communion they are all instituted and celebrated. It is true, that the original character of a Religious rite may in the course of time be lost, and some different object may be proposed and effected by it. Worldly policy, or any views of present convenience, may so far interfere with the use of it, as to give it a political or otherwise worldly character; but it loses its Spirituality in proportion. Not that the two objects are incompatible; but that such is the risk incurred by allowing them to be associated. The ceremony of Marriage is a Religious act; but the same rite is in most Christian nations made likewise to serve as the form of the Civil contract; and Civil privileges and penalties are made to depend on it. And out of this union, no evil, no serious evil perhaps, Occasional Religious rites. Marriage.

* Ἐν ἡμῖν. Our translation is, "to us."
† Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect.
‡ The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified. "If I go not away the Comforter will not come."

* *Ep. ad Ephes.* c. 13.
† See Bingham's *Ecc. Antiq.* book ii. ch. vi. sec. 2.
‡ See particularly Tertullian, *de Orationc*, c. 9, and *Ap. Constit.* lib. vii. c. 44.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

has arisen, to detract from the advantages of the arrangement. Oaths, again, are Religious acts; and the more formal and solemn the Oath, the more properly is it to be styled a Religious ceremony. The convenience of a pledge, which might pass in Courts of Justice for a sort of coined and stamped Truth, and subject him who presented it insincere and adulterated to a penalty, analogous to that attached to forgery,—the convenience of this has been always recognised by the Magistrate; and even in Heathen countries, a Religious ceremony has been adopted as the most appropriate form. In the same manner as Men have fixed on gold and silver for money by universal consent, because of some intrinsic attraction in those metals, which attraction afterwards has become a secondary consideration; so it has fared with Oaths. They were admired for their Holy solemnity, and the hold which they possessed on Men's consciences, and, therefore, were chosen for the Political purposes which they have been made to serve. Here, it must be confessed, the experiment has been of a more doubtful result, than in the preceding instance. The great demand for them as a Political convenience, has proportionably diminished their Religious character, and profaned in some measure that which was Holy, and used by the Holy.

Oaths.

Whilst some Religious Institutions are thus adopted into Civil Societies, on the other hand, a custom of mere Human origin may be lawfully converted into an act of Communion with God, and incorporated by the Church into the great Body of those common rites, to which generally a promise of Grace is annexed. To which class belong the Burial Service, the Religious part of the Ceremony of Crowning Kings, and the like. Hence, in different Ages and Countries, the number of Sacred rites will be made to differ, or, remaining the same, to change their character. How far their multiplication may be allowed, and to what extent Human Institutions may borrow Spiritual influence, must, of course, be determined by the Principles given by Christ and the Holy Spirit, for the formation and regulation of every Church. Only, in the inquiry concerning such rites, it must be borne in mind, that their character is always twofold; and that they are accidentally made the means of Grace.

Burial Service

Such being the character of these rites, it is unnecessary that we should pursue any further inquiry respecting them; and we may proceed at once to notice what properly follow the Sacraments, the Love Feasts, and the Public Prayers,—those ceremonies, namely, which are the Church's appointed means of Grace for individuals, or for creating particular Offices.

§ *Ordination, Confirmation, &c.*

Ordination.

Of these, the Ordination of Ministers is the most prominent. In the narrative of the *Acts* we find no specific direction given for the celebration of such a form; and yet the use of some form is left binding, because it is recorded. Again, although no complete ceremony is recorded, because, doubtless, it was not intended that the Church, in all Ages, should be tied down, under all circumstances, even to the Apostolical form; still, besides the general appointment of Prayers, the Laying on of Hands was enjoined. This part of the ceremony, then, must have been recorded, because intended to be perpetual; and, accordingly, in looking back on the view we have left us of the first Uninspired Church, we should not expect even to find all Churches necessarily agreeing in their forms of Ordination Prayers, but we should expect all to use the Imposition of Hands. If we perceive that any neglected to do so, we should have possession of a fact which would enable us to say, that their proceedings were irregular. But there is no evidence of such a deviation from Apostolical practice and Scriptural views; and we are therefore bound to suppose, that Ordination was still continued by Imposition of Hands and by Prayers.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Confirmation is another of this class of rites which deserves a short notice. It evidently arose out of the formal act of giving to the new Christian the confirming sign of the real descent of the Holy Ghost on him. After these miraculous manifestations were withdrawn from the Church, this venerable rite was employed as a useful addition to those outward means of Grace, through which the Church was appointed to communicate and cherish the ordinary gifts of the Spirit. Although always now blended with forms of common Prayer, yet in itself it is an act relating to an individual, and as such has been considered here. Like Ordination, its essential ingredient is the Laying on of Hands, which, accordingly, has been the invariable part of the ceremony from the earliest times. It was long practised in the Church in strict conformity with the Apostolic usage, immediately after Baptism, whether of infants or adults; and it was, probably, only when the return of sensible manifestations had generally ceased to be expected, that its more rational use was established.

Confirmation.

IV. *What measures the First Uninspired Church pursued for self-preservation.*

Besides those measures, the object of which is to preserve or to dispense the Recorded Revelation, the Church is obliged to provide some especially for its own preservation. Stationed as guard over this Divine treasure, it is required to use all diligence, not only to fulfil its office, but to keep itself strong and healthy, and well equipped for so trying a service. What course the Primitive Uninspired Christians pursued with this view, is the point of inquiry at which we are arrived.

And in order to estimate the wisdom of their plans and precautions, it will be necessary to connect them with a view of the dangers to which the Church was exposed, and which these provisions may be supposed designed to meet and counteract. These were various and unconnected: some internal, and arising from its own members; some external, and arising from strangers and enemies. In providing against both these, the Church enjoyed the same sort of assistance which guided it in all its other proceedings,—the recorded Principles on which the Church was formed, illustrated by the application of those Principles in the Ministry of the Apostles. The Uninspired Church was assailed by perils precisely similar to those which it had witnessed successfully opposed, by means still in its power. Within itself it was liable to Heresies and Schisms, and so had it ever been. From without, it saw danger in the wisdom of the unbelieving portion of Mankind, as well as in their power; but the effect of both had been proved. Let us see, therefore, how far it profited by the examples which had gone before.

Dangers of the Primitive Church.

The first measures of self-preservation adopted by any Society would naturally be addressed to its own Members; and these, in the Christian Society, would have in view one of two things; either the profession of Orthodox Faith, or conformity to instituted practices.

Erroneous Doctrines.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Whenever, then, in the first place, any Doctrines of Scripture were likely to be misrepresented, or any unscriptural Doctrine likely to be introduced, it would be the Church's care to enforce the true Doctrine, and to guard against the false, by some specific appointment: and if any such abuse had actually occurred, its vigilance would be proportionably increased by the warning. It would not necessarily happen that the Doctrines thus made prominent, and particularly guarded, because most exposed, would be in themselves the most important; but any so circumstanced would still have a claim during the season of peril to this accidental preference; as the parent watches more tenderly over the weak child, although intending thereby no mark of preference or distinction to it above its brothers and sisters. The principal method devised by the Church from the earliest times for thus securing its members against the particular errors of belief, which foresight or experience had taught to be the most dangerous, has been to draw up Formulas of Faith, Creeds, Canons, Articles, and the like. The Creed, taught to the Catechumens before Baptism, put them on their guard on those points, whereon they were most likely to be assailed. Read constantly in the Public Assemblies, it reminded the whole Church, that the Doctrines specified were among those, belief in which was implied by their becoming Members of that Community. Hence the early and original term for Creed was *σύμβολον*, or "Watch word;" which, whether borrowed, as some of the Fathers assert, from military language, or from the signs of recognition among the Heathen in their Mysteries, denotes a test and a Shibboleth, whereby each Church may known its own, and is circulated throughout its Members, as a warning against the snares of enemies or false brethren.

Guarded against by Creeds, &c.

The Apostles' Creed.

That the Church is authorized to set forth Christian Doctrines, moulded into systems or into any convenient form, has been already shown; and it has been also asserted, that in the present instance they were probably further sanctioned by Apostolic example. Whether any portion of what is called *The Apostles' Creed*, was actually so framed and used by the Apostles, or not, allusions to the use of similar forms may be, perhaps, discovered in several parts of the New Testament. Even so early as the Baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch by Philip, we know that the profession of one Article of Faith, specifically, was required; and this, just the one which at that season was most likely to be made prominent: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;"* nor is it unreasonable to interpret St. Paul's directions to Timothy, in reference to the use of such specific Articles, when he bids him "keep that which is committed to thy trust;† avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of Science, falsely so called; which some professing have erred from the Faith:" and again, "Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in Faith and Love, which is in Christ Jesus. *That good thing which was committed unto thee* ‡ keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us."

The Articles which would originally compose this formula, would, of course, be few; and this would in some measure render it unnecessary that they should be placed on record. But a more powerful reason suggests itself, why, supposing the Inspired Church to have made use of such a form, it should not be registered by it. It was systematic Divinity, and framed into that systematic form to serve a special purpose, and would therefore have been an anomaly in the Sacred Record. To have recorded it with the Apostolic sanction, would have given it the character and authority of Scripture; whereas it was only an illustration of that use which was to be made of Scripture in all Ages.§

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

How far probably framed by the Apostles.

It is, indeed, extremely probable, that a portion of the Apostles' Creed was formed and sanctioned by the Apostles, and preserved for a time in the Church solely by tradition on this very account.† The current tradition, that its origin was Apostolical, is certainly entitled to some credit; although we may reject with certainty the story of each Apostle contributing his quota, and thereby occasioning it to be called a *Symbolum*. Indeed, the internal evidence of a certain portion of it corroborates this view so strongly, that it may be worth while to pause and examine the several clauses, with a view to determine which may, and which may not, be of so early a date.

The Ist Article.

Bearing in mind, then, the object which such a Formula of Faith must have, let us take the Ist Article, *I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.* "He that cometh unto God," writes St. Paul, "must believe that He is;" and the same cause which rendered it necessary for the Apostle to make prominent this Article of belief, no doubt might have occasioned it to be first in an Apostolic Formula. The whole clause considered together forcibly reminds us, too, of the opening of the Book of *Genesis*, where this supreme and distinct Being is set forth, in opposition to the false notions of the world, as the Creator of Heaven and Earth; of those very things which had furnished the chief objects of Idolatry.‡ Perhaps, then, the importance of specifying this great Truth may have arisen from the temptations which old prejudice would foster in Heathen Converts, once more to corrupt Religion as did their forefathers. The most ancient Creeds, too, confirm this view, by distinctly marking the Unity of God, and thus more strongly cautioning the Christian against Polytheism. In the two of Irenæus, and three of Origen, it is "one God;" and in three of Tertullian, "one or the only God."§

The Unity of God.

Probably framed against the Gnostics especially.

But a further ground presents itself, for the employment of this Article, in the very specific form in which it is now worded, even during the Apostolic Age. In a former portion of this History, we had occasion to remark, that not only St. John, the latest of the Sacred Writers, but that St. Paul too, alludes to the

* *Acts*, ch. viii. v. 37. The same profession was made by Peter to our Lord, in the name of all the Apostles, "We believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." St. John, ch. vi. v. 69.

† 1 *Tim.* ch. vi. v. 20, Τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον.

‡ 2 *Tim.* ch. i. v. 13, 14, Τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην.

* Οὐχ, ὡς τυχὸν ἀνθρώπου, συνετίθη τὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ' ἐν πάσαις γραφῆς τὰ καιριώτατα συλλιχθέντα μιᾶν ἀναπλησοῖ τὴν τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν. S. Cyril, *Catech.* cited by Bishop Pearson in his *Exp. of the Creed*, art. I. notes.

† Jerome alludes to the fact, (*Adversus Err. Johan. Hieros. Ep.* 61, c. 9,) *In symbolo fidei et spei nostræ, quod ab Apostolis traditum, non scribitur in chartâ et atramento, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus.* Other allusions of the same kind may easily, perhaps, be met with in the earlier writings of the Church. Petrus Chrysologus (an author of the Vth century) frequently makes use of language such as this: *Hoc vitæ symbolum mens teneat, ne Divinitatis pretiosum munus depreciet charta vilis, ne mysterium lucis atrum tenebret atramentum.* (*In Symb. Ap. Serm.*)

‡ See HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY, vol. x. p. 580.

§ *Unum et unicum.*

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

existence of those wild fancies, with which the Gnostic theory was beginning to corrupt the Church. Some brief outline was also given of the general features of this source of extravagant errors. One of the most attractive principles seems to have been that, which solved the knotty question of the Origin of evil. Among the thirty *Æons*, who occupied the original *Pleroma*, or sphere of pure Deity, *Sophia* (Wisdom) was fabled to have produced, through intense desire to comprehend the greatness of the προπάτωρ, or first father, a monstrous birth, *Achamoth*.* This marvellous offspring was cast out of the heavenly space, and became the author of Matter, and the Mother of him whom they described as the Creator of the world, and whose imperfect and corrupt work it had been the province of certain *Æons* to correct. Their scheme of Reformation was easily made a counterpart to the History of Man's Redemption; and, indeed, the foundation story itself, seems to have been framed with a similar design against the Scriptural account of the Fall of Man, and the bringing in of Sin and Death into the world. Harmlessly absurd as all this may seem to us, yet we know that St. Paul and St. John feared lest it might deceive the very Elect, and that many Christians were bewildered in their Faith by it. Weighing, then, with this view, the exact expression of the first Article of the Apostles' Creed, in what period of the Church would it be more naturally framed than the first? Contrary to these "endless genealogies" and "false oppositions,"† it asserts that God is one and indivisible. In opposition to the notion, that the first father of the *Æons* took no part in the government of the world, but left it to lower emanations, He is called παντοκράτωρ, "all mighty," or "all governing;" and the impious fancy of a separate and Evil Creator, is condemned by the assertion, that it is He who is Maker of Heaven and Earth.‡

And if so, of Apostolical origin

The IId Article.

Art. II. *And in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into Hell, the third day He rose again from the dead, He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.*

Belief in Christ.

That an Article specifying belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, was likely to have been framed by the Apostles themselves, may be asserted from the confession of the Eunuch to Philip, before alluded to. Perhaps, indeed, the whole of the first clause of this second Article may have stood originally as we now have it; for "that Jesus was the Christ,"* was, we know, the very terms of that Faith for which the Jews threatened their believing brethren with vengeance, and all points of confession are united in that which Martha made to Jesus,† "Yea, Lord, I believe that Thou art the Christ the Son of God." To which may be added St. Peter's celebrated avowal, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God."‡

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

No article of the Christian Religion could, indeed, have more required an early specification, and peculiar enforcement. The prejudice which it opposed, was the very bed of tares, which sprang around the tender plant of Christianity,—it was the Jewish prejudice; and that, therefore, against which the earliest Converts, who were Jews, and living among Jews, would require to be most studiously guarded. The particular clauses which follow, might have been gradually added, as occasion demanded; but this must have been as old as Christianity itself. It is worthy of notice, too, that a change appears in the form of expressing belief in Jesus Christ, not only in the Nicene Creed, but in some of the other oldest Creeds; (as, for instance, in one of Irenæus,) which corresponds with what we should expect at a later period of the Apostolic history. It is, "in one Lord Jesus Christ;" the addition of the term "one," being obviously rendered afterwards necessary, by the fancies of Cerinthus, and the like, that Christ was, first, the Son of the Demiurgus, and that, secondly, on Him one of the thirty *Æons* descended at his Baptism, in the shape of a Dove.§

Directed against the very earliest Errors.

To the rise of the Gnostic Heresy we may, indeed, attribute the three subsequent clauses, without being able to determine, whether all did or did not belong to the Creed of the Apostles' days. They would, certainly, not be inappropriate to the latter portion of that period, That Christ, the Son of God, was conceived by the Holy Ghost; that is, in the words of St. Luke, was "called the Son of God," because the Holy Ghost came over the Virgin Mary, and "the Power of the Highest overshadowed her,"‖ was obviously levelled against this Heresy just noticed; so, too, that He "was born of the Virgin Mary," that is, was really Man as well as God, and not the Son of the fabled *Demiurgus*; that He "suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried," all specify those several particulars, which were inconsistent with the union of a superior *Æon* with Christ during His Ministry, and his separation from Him on the Cross, the favourite speculation of the Docetæ.

Son of God.

Born of the Virgin.

His death.

It not a little confirms this view, that we find the earliest Fathers opposing, principally, these very errors, and in similar language. The Creed asserts, that Jesus Christ was "born of the Virgin Mary;" Ignatius, that "He was of Mary truly born,"¶ "truly of the race of David, according to the flesh," "truly born of a Virgin:"** and Origen,†† "that He was born in

Correspondence with the early Fathers.

Origen.

---

* Irenæi, lib. ii. c. 10, *Deum impiè contemnunt non credentes, quoniam ex his quæ non erant, quemadmodum voluit, ea quæ facta sunt, ut essent omnia fecit sua voluntate, quod enim dicunt ex lachrymis Achamoth humectam prodiisse substantiam*, &c. Achamoth is a Hebrew word, signifying the same as Wisdom.

Irenæus elsewhere laments the success of the Valentinians, &c. in seducing τὰς μὴ ἰδρυμένας τὴν πίστιν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, διαφυλάσσοντας: and recommends the use of the Creed as a safeguard against these seductions, (see lib. i. c. 1.) For a full account of these Heresies his work may be consulted.

† Ἀντίθετος, meaning, doubtless, the pairing off of the Æons, who were described as coupled, or *set off* in pairs. With reference to the same notion we may interpret an expression in Origen, (*Dialog.* 2,) when, speaking of the Supreme Being, he adds, ὃς πάντων πρεσβύτερός ἐστι καὶ ἀντίτυπος οὐδείς.

‡ Some of the early Heretics asserted, that the Creation was the work of Angels; but, probably, under every variety of expression they meant the same thing substantially, emissions or emanations from the source of all-pervading Deity. See Irenæus, lib. ii. c. 9. Epiphanius, Menander, Theodoret, and Basilides, are also referred to on this point by King, *on the Apostles' Creed*, (p. 85.)

* John, ch. ix. v. 22. † Ch. ii. v. 27.

‡ Matthew, ch. xvi. v. 16.

§ Irenæi, lib. i. c. 25, and, again, lib. iii. c. 18, where he argues against the notion thus, *Si alter quidem passus est, alter autem impassibilis mansit; et alter quidem natus est, alter vero, in eum qui natus est, descendit, et rursus reliquit eum, non unus sed duo monstrantur.*

‖ St. Luke, ch. i. v. 35. ¶ *Ep. ad Trall.* sec. 9.

** *Ad Smyrn.* sec. 1. †† *In proœm.* lib. περὶ ἀρχῶν.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

reality, and not in appearance only." Again, the Creed asserts, that "He suffered under Pontius Pilate;" Ignatius, that "He was really persecuted under Pontius Pilate."* In Ignatius we read, that "He really suffered, not as some unbelievers assert, that He suffered only in appearance:† and in Origen, "He suffered in truth," "and not by a phantom." In the Creed we read, that "He was crucified, dead, and buried," as so many separate Scriptural assertions inconsistent with the theory of the Docetæ.

Ignatius.

Theodoret.

The same view is enlarged on by other early writers." "The mere fact of His burial," writes Theodoret, "is sufficient to confute what they, (the Docetæ,) seek to establish; for it was neither His Soul, nor His Divine nature, which was deposited in the grave, but His body, for graves are prepared for bodies."‡

Crucified under Pontius Pilate.

The specification of the time, by the expression under Pontius Pilate, was, doubtless, to destroy the claims of any false pretenders of any other period; such as those alluded to in the speech of Gamaliel, recorded in the *Acts*.§

Descent into Hell.

The descent into Hell was certainly not one of the original Articles of the Creed; and when used, was first employed only as an equivalent expression for the term "buried," which was omitted.‖ It was afterwards, however, adopted to denote something distinct from it, as both appear in the later Creeds; or, what is more probable, the ejected term "buried" was now replaced; and this nevertheless retained, because it contained the expression of a Doctrine frequently set forth in the early Fathers, in opposition to the Gnostic Heresies. These, according to Irenaus,¶ denied the Salvation of the body, and maintained, that "the Souls ascended into the Heavens, unto their determined place, from whence they shall no more return unto their bodies." So that it might have reference to the real power of death over Christ, as over all men, against this notion of the reunion of a particle of the Divine essence with its parent source.**

Why added.

Resurrection.

The rising from the dead, is a point so often specified and made prominent in the Preaching and Teach of the Apostles, that we should certainly expect to find it in a Creed of their composing. Whatever occasioned them so to distinguish the Doctrine in their discourses and writings, would be equally good reason for appointing it a place in their formulas of Faith. Although witnesses of all Christ's course of Ministry, yet we know, that they are in Scripture emphatically called witnesses of the Resurrection; and the sum of their Preaching is described by St. Luke, as "Jesus and the Resurrection." We plainly gather from Scripture, too, that there was good reason for a particular enforcement of this great Doctrine, because it was of all others the one most opposed to the preconceived notions of Mankind. The Immortality of the Soul, as taught by some of the Philosophers among the Gentiles, was even inconsistent with a Resurrection of the whole Man; and of the Jews themselves, perhaps even the Pharisees, had not quite comprehended the Immortality of Man to extend to a Bodily Resurrection. At all events, that strong bias in the Gentile world, to reject the Doctrine as absurd, which caused St. Paul to be mocked at Athens, sufficiently accounts for the introduction of this clause into the earliest Creed. But, besides this need for such an Article, it will be remembered, that the Scriptures themselves allude to an error, which was making progress among Christians; a notion, "that the Resurrection was past already."* These Heretics understood the Doctrine, it would seem, in a figurative sense, merely as denoting "a new birth unto righteousness," and might have given rise to the clause, or furnished an additional reason for its insertion.

Age of the Apostolic Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

The occasion of the words which follow and assert the Ascension into Heaven, was certainly the Heresy of some Marcionites, disciples of Apelles; who introduced a variety in Marcion's view, and maintained, that Christ's body, while on earth, was not a phantom, but that after He came down from Heaven, He dissolved this earthly body, and created for Himself a heavenly one, with which He ascended.† Hence, Irenæus, in repeating this Article in one of his Creeds, expresses it by "the reception into the Heavens of Jesus Christ, in the flesh."‡ The addition of the words, "sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty," might have been made in order to express more fully the meaning of the Ascension,—that He who was born of the Virgin Mary, &c.—God manifest in the flesh,—ascended in the same body, and has required and assumed none other. This clause does not appear earlier than the writings of Tertullian; who mentions, what might lead us to suppose, that it denoted the exertion of His mediatorial power at the right hand of God, namely, the existence of certain Heretics, who supposed Christ's state of glory to be one of inactivity.§ It was with a view to maintain the personal identity of Christ, as we are taught to expect Him at His second coming, and not only while ascending and ascended, that the further assertion was made, that He, the same, "shall come to judge the quick and the dead." The particular phrase of *quick and dead*, too, as the objects of His Judicial appearance, can be only understood as an extension of the orthodox view, and implying, that Christ, although once dead, buried, and ascended into Heaven, shall come again in like manner, and with the same body; and, that not only the "quick," those who are alive at His coming, shall in their bodies stand before His tribunal,

Ascension.

Sitting at the right hand of God.

Judgment.

---

* *Ad Trall.* sec. 9. † *Ejusd.* sec. 10.

‡ Theodoret, quoted by King, p. 179. So, too, Petrus Chryologus, (*in Symb. Serm.* 60,) *Sepultum dicit, ut veram carnem Christi, mortemque non perfunctoriam probet confessio sepulturæ.*

§ Ch. v. v. 36, 37.

‖ In the Creed of the Church of Aquileia; see Bishop Pearson, *on the Creed*, art. v.

¶ Lib. v. c. 26.

** The interpretation put on the phrase by the framers of our Articles in the reign of Edward VI. was, "that the body of Christ lay in the Grave until His Resurrection; but His Spirit, which He gave up, was with the Spirits which were detained in prison or in Hell, and preached to them, as the place in St. Peter testifieth." The passage in St. Peter alluded to is ch. iii. v. 19 of his first *Epistle*. On the final revision of the Articles in Queen Elizabeth's reign, this explanatory cause was omitted, in consequence, probably, of exceptions which had been taken against it.

* 2 *Tim.* ch. ii. v. 18.

† Tertullian, *de præscript. adv. Hæres.*; Epiphan. *adver. Hæres. in Hæres. Apell.* St. Austin alludes to the same view in his *De fide et Symbol.*, *Solet autem quosdam offendere—quod credamus assumptum terrenum corpus in cœlum: nascitur quomodo dicimus id, seminatur corpus Animale, surget corpus Spirituale.*

‡ Irenæi, lib. i. c. 11, Τὴν ἐνσάρκον αὐτοῦ ἔνδοξον ἀνάδειξιν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τοῦ Ἠγαπημένου.

§ *De carne Christi, Affirmant carnem in cœlis vacuam esse, ut vaginam, exemplo Christo, cedere.*

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

but "the dead" of all Ages, awaking to a bodily Resurrection.

I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints; the Forgiveness of Sins; the Resurrection of the Body; and the Life everlasting.

The IIId Article.

Two of the clauses contained in this portion of the Creed did not, as far as we can judge from the remains of the Fathers, enter into any of the Primitive or Apostolical Creeds. These are, "the Holy Catholic Church," and "the Communion of Saints." The belief in the

The Holy Ghost

Holy Ghost formed, no doubt, one of the earliest, as one would expect, without any reference to Historical testimony. In no particular was the early Christian's Faith so severely tried, as in embracing the Doctrine of his intimate connection with, and influence by, that Holy Person, who, like the wind, from which He received His name, was viewless and impalpable, and only known by His effects. Hence, the necessity of accompanying the ceremony of Baptism, when this insensible endowment takes place, with some sensible manifestation, to assure the Sanctified of its reality. With the same view, the Catechumen would require to be familiarized with a Truth, which of all others demanded the greatest effort of his Faith; and the most experienced Christian, too, would need some perpetual remembrancer, to prevent oblivion or doubt of the golden rule of Christianity, "we walk by Faith, and not by Sight."

Holy Catholic Church.

When the clause concerning the Church was first made use of, the point of Faith expressed, was simply belief in "the Holy Church;" and it was added, perhaps, by way of enlargement upon the Doctrine to which it is now appended,—the belief in the Holy Ghost. It is as a Church that we are the Temple of the Holy Ghost; as a Society that we perform those acts which are the appointed means of Grace; and that Society, is therefore emphatically termed "the Holy."* The introduction of the term "Catholic" into the sentence, may be easily accounted for, by considering the ambiguity of the term Church. It conveyed a caution, that the Church using such a Creed should not confine its belief in the Divine residence, to its own particular Society; but extend it to that large Body, of which Christ is the Head, and all Churches are members in

Communion of Saints.

particular. The Communion of Saints was a still later interpolation; and its introduction implies, that the preceding clause had become obscure, inasmuch as it is manifestly an explanation of it. The Communion of Saints or Christians is that which constitutes the essentials of a Church; and consists in those acts which are the means of Grace, the outward forms, through which the Holy Ghost vouchsafes His operations.

Tertullian's view of the last clauses.

Tertullian is the earliest who makes mention of an Article on the Church, and this is the view under which he represents it,* "After the declaration of Faith has been made, and the pledge of salvation received in the name of the Trinity, there follows," he observes, "necessarily, a mention of the Church; forasmuch, as where the Three are, that is, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, there is the Church; which is Their body." St. Austin has the same remark, "The right arrangement of the Articles of Confession required, that to the Trinity should be annexed the Church, as the House to its tenant, to a God His Temple, the State to its founder."*

* *De Baptismo.*

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

The clause on the Forgiveness of Sins has by some been applied to errors which arose in the IInd century, those of the Montanists and Novatians.† But there can be no doubt, that it was made an Article of belief among the earliest Christians.‡ Without searching far into the probable need for such an Article, it may be sufficient to observe, that Remission of Sins formed one of the most prominent points of the Good Tidings which the Gospel Preachers announced; and one of the scruples receded of the Jews was expressed by, "Who is he that forgiveth sins also."§ It was, in truth, no accidental bias originating in the heated imagination of a Theorist, which caused the Doctrine to be unacceptable, and likely to be got rid of. The converted Pharisee, who trusted in his Righteousness, and the Gentile Convert, with his habitual view of unlimited Human merit, capable of raising him to Heaven, would naturally require some provision against the continual revival of feelings subversive of the true Christian Spirit,—so contrary to the humiliating Truth, that all, even the best, require "the forgiveness of Sins."

Forgiveness of Sins.

Resurrection of the Body. Life everlasting.

The same may be observed of "the Resurrection of the body," or "the flesh," which, although useful as a fence against the Gnostic follies already alluded to, must, we may conjecture, have been needed from the ancient prejudice of the Antichristian world, and is noticed by the earliest writers. The concluding words on "the Life everlasting," seem properly to belong to the foregoing, and to form with it one assertion; the foundation of which may be seen in our Saviour's declaration, that "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation."‖

Origin of separate Creeds for different Churches

If this view of the Apostles' Creed be correct, it is nothing improbable, that with the exception of the few Clauses specified in our Review of it, Creeds in substance the same were used during the Apostolic Age. At all events, little doubt can be entertained, that such was the case in the Age immediately succeeding. We say *Creeds*, because the Ancient Creeds corresponded to what in Modern Churches are called the Articles of Religion; or, more properly speaking, our Articles combine what were formerly distinct Creeds and Canons, Rules of Faith and Rules of Conformity. This, being so, however intimate the Union may be among orthodox Churches, the particular circumstances of each may require a different formula of Belief, as well as of Conformity; even as two confederate Monarchies, or Democracies, would not require precisely the same Statutes and forms of Administration. And so, although the Apostles' Creed be the substance of the earliest Creeds, and the precise language to a certain extent, yet there may have been many Creeds from the first; shaped by each Church with reference to its

* *Enchir. ad Laurt.*

† This is the view of the learned and ingenious author of *The Critical History of the Apostles' Creed*, whose views generally have been adopted in the preceding remarks.

‡ It appears from Cyprian, that it was in the Creed which the Novatians themselves used, Cyp. *Ep.* 69, al. 70, *ad Magnum*. See Bingham's *Eccl. Antiq.* book x. ch. iv sec. 5.

§ Luke, ch. vii. v. 49.

‖ John, ch. v. v. 28, 29.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167

peculiar dangers of Faith from without, or the prejudices of its own members within. Thus, as far back as we can trace the History of the early Creeds, that of Jerusalem was always distinct from that of Cæsaræa or Antioch, and all these, again, from those of Alexandria or of Rome; and this, during the period of harmony between these Churches.

First encroachment on the independence of separate Churches.

The gradual infringement on the independent character of each separate Church, until it was extinguished by the Papal usurpation, is a subject well worthy of more detailed discussion, than is compatible with the limits of our present plan. Among the Primitive Churches, each formed its own Creed, its own Liturgy, and regulated its own Ceremonies and Discipline. The first encroachment took its rise from an apparent convenience. When the Ruling Powers of the world were generally Christians, each Kingdom was made to have the same Liturgy, &c. for all its Churches. To give an instance, when Spain and Gallia Narbonensis became one distinct Kingdom, it was decreed by a General Council, that there should be exact uniformity through all the Churches of these Provinces.* The same principle, which thus produced an exact conformity among all the Churches of the same nation, became the ground of enforcing it, at length, on all the Churches of the Empire. The first change was in the boundary line of a Church, which was made Political instead of Ecclesiastical. Men's minds being familiarized to this, and Churches being considered as National Bodies, it was no very revolting step which was taken by the Romish Church, when it made itself the Metropolitan of National Churches; and gradually claimed that conformity to its Decrees, and that obedience to its Laws, which the Metropolitan Church of every Nation had acquired a right to expect from all Churches within the Political pale of its jurisdiction. It was this miscalled Christian Unity which the Reformation violated; and it is against such an Universal Catholic Church, that all Protestants are accused of being guilty of Heresy and Schism.

The Church of Rome assumes the title of Metropolitan of National Churches.

Apostolical Canons.

Constitutions of Clement.

The custom of forming a code of Rules for Ceremonial conformity, was of later date than Creeds. The oldest are the *Apostolical Canons*, and the *Constitutions* of Clement, as they are called, although written confessedly long after the death of that Bishop. The date of both these must be assigned, even on the view most favourable to their antiquity, to a period much later than that which is affected by our present inquiry; nevertheless, some use has been made of them, as records of an order of things, which if *then* recorded must have been established in part, some time before any such Code of Rules respecting it could have been framed.

Advantages derived from frequent promulgation of Church Articles.

The Creeds were not only taught to the Catechumens, but were publicly read in the Churches; a custom which has become now almost impracticable. The Articles of the Church of England, comprising both Articles of Faith and Rules of Conformity, present too bulky a *Symbolum* to be published, as is desirable in every Christian congregation, at every meeting; and the few observances of the old rule, enjoined by our Ecclesiastical Statutes, are certainly insufficient for the original purpose. It is to be wished, however, that the members of the Church could be reminded more frequently and habitually of its peculiar Articles. The subject is well worthy of the consideration of those in authority. A few Articles at a time might be read without too much prolonging the Service, although the reading of the whole at once be unadvisable. The main object of such a Form is, that it be used "as a sign upon the hand, and as frontlets between the eyes," that the Lord's Law may "be in our heart;" and it should not be kept merely for reference and appeal. This is the purpose of Scripture, not of the Articles. One substitute, doubtless, has been provided, in commanding the three Creeds to be read publicly; and, accordingly, in order to give these the sanction and authority of our Church, they are inserted in our Articles, although the Doctrines contained in them are elsewhere expressed in the Articles themselves. Still, this only partially effects the purpose which would be gained by continual promulgation of the Articles.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Moral Discipline of the Primitive Church.

To return to the Primitive Church. It was not only careful to preserve itself, by thus providing against errors of Faith, but also by taking cognizance of all immorality or indecorum, which would have endangered the well-being of the Community,—endangered it, either by defeating the practical results of the Faith on Christians, or by exposing the Church to the scorn and reprehension of those without, whom it was a sacred duty to conciliate by every honest endeavour. In this spirit, Ignatius writes to the Trallians,* "Do not let a few unthinking ones among you give occasion to the Gentiles for blaspheming the Word and the Dispensation of it." For precedents in the application of St. Paul's Rule, of being "all things to all men," the Apostolic Church, and especially that portion of it which was immediately superintended by the great Gentile Apostle, was ample even to detail. The partial Record which is left us, abounds in instances; and these must have been but a small portion of the many similar cases, which the first Inspired Rulers were acquainted with from their own experience. The unobtrusive and cautious demeanour of the Church, in every place, may be pointed out as the visible means whereby Providence sheltered it from the ready spirit of persecution in Jew and Gentile; and the testimony of Pliny, when that spirit was awakened, fully proves how little the Church had incurred it by any imprudence or indiscreet regulations.†

Immorality an Ecclesiastical as well as a Civil crime.

But, it was not merely the decorous and appropriate demeanour of Christians, which required the guardian care of their constituted guides; their morals, even more than their manners, came under the cognizance of Ecclesiastical Government; and the exercise of Ecclesiastical control here was peculiarly difficult and delicate. It was so on this account. Moral offences are, for different reasons, proper objects of punishment to the Christian Community considered as a Church,

* "When Churches became subject to one Political head, and National Churches arose from that distinction; then it was thought convenient by all the Bishops of such a Nation, to unite more closely in rituals and circumstantials of Divine worship, as well as Faith and substantials." Bingham's *Eccl. Antiq.* book xvi. ch. i. sec. 13.

* Ch. viii. In another *Epistle* of the same Father, (*ad Ephes.* ch. x.) there is a similar passage, and rather an eloquent one, which may, indeed, be applied to the prudence and expediency of good Morals, as well as of discreet behaviour. "Give them the chance of believing through you. Suppose yourselves employed by God; your lives, the form of language in which He addresses them. Be mild when they are angry, humble when they are haughty; to their blasphemy oppose prayer unceasing, to their inconsistency, a steadfast adherence to your Faith," &c.

† *Ep. ad Traj.*

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

and to the same Community considered as a State. With us, accordingly, who have lodged all power in the State, the former view is lost, and punishment is only directed against Immorality as a Civil crime. But, at the period which we are now considering, each Christian Society, bearing all the weight of responsibility on its own shoulders, and not receiving any support from the several Civil authorities, felt itself bound to take cognizance of Immorality, which, accordingly, became an Ecclesiastical offence. In many instances the same act would be both a Civil and also an Ecclesiastical crime; and this circumstance has had greater influence on the character of the Church's authority than Christians are commonly sensible of. It created a natural disposition in the Church, from its first patronage by the first Christian Emperor, to withdraw its exercise of authority in those matters which came under the cognizance both of Church and State; and it has gradually occasioned all Moral Ecclesiastical discipline, as such, to be superseded. Theft, for instance, is a crime against the Community considered as a Civil Body, and also against the same Community considered as a Church. Now when Church and State have become not only composed of the same members, but subject to the same executive control, it seems absurd, for the same offenders to be brought twice to the same tribunal, to be punished separately for the same act,—although that act be really a twofold offence. With the early Christians, however, this was quite necessary; and Theft, Frauds of every kind, Assaults, and all Immorality, in short, which was subject to Civil penalties, were brought under the cognizance of the Church, and tried without reference to the further punishment which might await the offender from the Magistrate. It would be rather beyond our present purpose, to enter into the question of the comparative advantages and disadvantages of Church Discipline as it now stands, and as it must then have operated. One feature of difference, however, cannot fail to force itself on our observation. Whilst acts of Immorality are generally Civil as well as Ecclesiastical offences; so that the offender against the Church seldom escapes punishment, (although it may not be the appropriate punishment,) and others are thereby deterred; still, the same act may be an offence of much greater magnitude in one point of view than in another. The fraudulent dealer, for instance, who commits the least act which the Law of the land can reach, and the Forger, who is amenable to capital punishment, would not be separated so widely in Ecclesiastical views; although the distinction be clearly just in the former case. But, more, some acts of Immorality, some of the most serious, do not fall under the cognizance of the Civil Magistrate at all; for instance, Adultery, Fornication, Filial neglect, and the like. When, therefore, the Church ceases to distinguish Ecclesiastical from Civil offences in Moral conduct, some of no unimportant character escape all penalty and censure; and the Ecclesiastical Statutes become obsolete. Hence the Church is forced to depend on the influence of Public Feeling, to substitute that punishment, for which, in the other case, it depends on the Civil powers. At the period on which we are treating, all this was impossible; the Church had no resources from without, and thus, although its power was more circumscribed, its jurisdiction was more comprehensive.

Power of Exclusion.

It had, as has been formerly pointed out, one inherent right,—that of Exclusion in all its shades and gradations; which, skilfully managed, became no inefficient system of punishment. Were it likely to have been otherwise, indeed, Christ's Kingdom would not have been limited to the use of it; nor would the Apostles, in illustrating by their example the Principles of our Spiritual Government, have been so cautious not to venture beyond it. By means of this punishment the Primitive Church enforced obedience to its forms of Faith, its measures of prudent decorum, and its requisites of Moral conduct, as far as Moral conduct was necessary to constitute an appropriate evidence of sincerity.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

How wielded by the Primitive Churches.

Of the character of this punishment, as it appears in the Apostolical Church, some remarks in a former portion of our work may be referred to. As far as we can trace, the First Uninspired Churches were guided strictly by these models. The offender, whether Heretic, Nonconformist, or Evil-liver, was first cautioned, then excluded from certain acts of Communion, generally beginning with the Eucharist. If these successive interdictions failed to bring the offender to a sense of his crime, and to the appropriate acknowledgment of that sense, the Church proceeded to complete Exclusion; and, in some extreme cases, this was made perpetual.* It was only when the sentence was that of complete Exclusion, that it was made known formally from the Church whose sentence it was, to all others likely to be concerned, that they might be on their guard against receiving the outcast.

Penance.

The formal testimony of contrition, according to the appointment of the Church, was called Penance, or Penitence. In the gradual distortions of Primitive usages, this assumed a place among the Penalties of the Church; but its original character, as the term imports, was that of a formal act of submission and sorrow.

This was always requisite before the offender could be received again into Communion; but it was not always at once considered sufficient. Excommunication varied, not only in extent, but in duration; and it was found requisite to keep some offenders under this Spiritual degradation for a long period,† while others were immediately readmitted on acknowledgment of error.

Absolution.

All was performed, as far back as we can trace any account of it, with the strictest regard to the solemnity of Christ's earthly tribunal. As the act of Penance was formal and solemn, so, too, was the act of Absolution, by which the Church restored its Member to his former rights.

This, then, was the mode of self-preservation adopted by the Primitive Church, in reference to the dangers it had reason to apprehend from its own Members. But,

* Such, at least, was the Rule retained in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, (lib. xi. c. 41.) It may be doubted, however, whether it is to be interpreted as enjoining perpetual exclusion under all circumstances —as allowing no possible readmission. This is not necessarily implied, and we know that the general principle was, for the Parent Church to receive its prodigal child, whenever it should give sufficient proof of repentance. Εἰσδέξασθε αὐτὸν ὡς γὰρ υἱὸν τὸν ἀπολωλότα, τὸν ἄφρονα, τὸν μετὰ πορνῶν μιαίνοντα τὴν πατρικὴν οὐσίαν. So, too, Ignatius, (*ad Phil.* c. 3,) "As many as repent and return to the unity of the Church, these shall be of God."

† In lib. viii. c. 5 of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, the "Hearers," whom the Deacon is ordered to exclude after the Sermon, must be interpreted of Penitents going through a probation. For St. Basil describes them as "mere hearers," and Gregory Thaumaturgus notices that their appropriate place in the Church was with the Catechumens. Canons as early as those of Nice and Ancyra are very minute and particular in the difference of the period of Excommunication, according to the offence. See Bingham, book xviii. ch. i. sec. 4. St. Paul's intercession for the offending member of the Corinthian Church, that the term of his interdiction should be shortened, proves the Apostolical establishment of the custom.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

External dangers of the Primitive Church.

besides this tendency of the Constitution to decay, and become vitiated of itself, there was another class of dangers from without. Heathen Philosophy was likely, either to assault Christianity as a rival, or to claim connection with it as a kindred system. In the Apostolic Age not many Learned had been called; and this, evidently, in order to demonstrate that the wisdom of the Gospel was from above. As the Divine gifts of Wisdom, of Knowledge, and of Utterance decayed, their loss was supplied by the talents and acquirements of men, whose names will be ever dear to Christians. Nor was it long, before a sufficient host of these was enlisted in the good cause, to form a noble defence of the true Faith. The most critical season was the period of transition,—the one to which we have now advanced; a period when the Heavenly and Miraculous wisdom was rarely, if ever, vouchsafed, and yet the propagation of the Gospel had scarcely exceeded the original limits of the unlearned and unknown. If we consider the peculiar danger to which the Faith was then exposed, we need be thankful, indeed, for the recorded form in which the whole rule of Faith was delivered and left. As the new Sect spread, Philosophers no longer disdained an inquiry into its character, and became candidates for admission. But they came with more than the prejudices of local custom and hereditary manners about them. To a certain extent, their knowledge of Heavenly things was supposed to be begun, and they only sought for more Light, not such as would make their former view seem darkness and a dream. Many must have turned away from the Christian Preachers discontented and disdainful; and theirs was not the worst case. Others would renounce their former knowledge as vain and unfounded, and apply themselves to the Minister for instruction; but the applicant was a Philosopher; the Teacher, perhaps, a plain unlettered man. The former, although he renounced his Religious errors, still could not at once renounce the habits of Thought, the mouldings of Mind, through which it had flowed. He could only learn Religious Theology, as he had once learned Metaphysical Theology. Unsuspicious of danger, and assuming among his most useful qualifications, that of being "all things to all men," the early Teacher might blamelessly convey his Holy lesson to these, by illustrations and phrases borrowed from their previous stores. In some instances no harm would ensue. In others, we might expect the Doctrine to be corrupted by the impure vessels which received it, and the poisonous effect to exhibit itself alike on Catechumen and Catechist. Out of all this would arise two distinct scenes of danger to Religion—distinct in their progress, although originally the same. From the Philosophical world which rejected the Christians' offer, all its Wisdom would be openly arrayed to crush it. From that portion which embraced it, there would be no less danger in the impurities which it introduced. The latter would be the authors of Heresy and Corruption; the former would be Sophists and Satirists—the last, defenders of the ruined Temple of Idolatry which they could not bring themselves to forsake. In what way the former were opposed, and how specific antidotes were provided for their errors and seductions, has been already considered. Against the assaults of Infidel writers and orators, too, the Church soon found an appropriate weapon of defence. *Apologies*, or formal Defences of the Faith, were circulated abroad, and even presented to the Imperial Throne. Of these, the most famous are those of Justin Martyr, addressed to the Antonini. But, many years earlier, Quadratus, Bishop of Athens, and Aristides had made similar appeals to Hadrian. The province of Learning and Eloquence was as yet, however, the weakest point of the Church; and Providence had graciously ordained, that as yet the Church should not so greatly need this kind of support.

From the Learned Infidels.

From the Ignorant Believers.

Apologies.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

It was against the *power* of the unbelieving world that its earliest efforts were required, and for this it was proportionably armed. Every son of the Church was Baptized unto a Faith, which taught him to aspire to an imitation of Christ, not only in his Holiness and Spiritual endowments, but in his earthly humiliation and his sufferings. "To me to die is gain," was echoed down from the Apostle to his meanest Convert; and elevation to a Bishopric was nearly equivalent to an appointment to Martyrdom. To read the *Epistles* of Ignatius, or generally the monuments of the Primitive Martyrs, without a preparatory knowledge of the tone of feeling, which was that of the Church and of the Age—leaves the reader with a doubt of the authenticity of the writings, or of the sincerity of the writers. Even among the Learned there are some, who fall into the vulgar error of measuring the results of ancient characters, manners, and feelings, as if those characters, manners, and feelings were still the same, and our own. Apologies have been made, and attempts ingeniously contrived, to soften down the expressions of the ambitious Martyr in his glorious thirst for death. What would Ignatius or Polycarp have said to such a dilution of their character? Surely Cranmer and Ridley understood it. Although in the quiet and gentle scenes around us, Christian heroism may seem Romance, and fervid Religion, Enthusiasm Martyrdom, the most eager Martyrdom, was an act of self-defence in the Church, through its brave and devoted champion. It was the surest, and often the only means of appeasing the awakened fury of Persecution; which, being thus spent on the eminent individual, no longer extended itself to the whole Body. Amid the jarring elements of Passions and Prejudices, with which Christ's Holy Temple was surrounded, the Primitive Martyrs were the conductors of the fatal spark whenever it flashed forth. They defied, and they received its fury, and the edifice was untouched.

Character of the Primitive Martyrs.

Persecutions not always directed against the Christians as such.

For, it is to be observed, that these early Persecutions were not altogether the result of State Policy, directed against the growth of a Political evil. Had it been so, the Roman power was competent (without the intervention of some signal Miracle) to have certainly crushed the new Sect. But Christianity was, for reasons often alluded to, unpopular; and Persecution was, generally, only a permission to indulge Popular licentiousness. Hence it happened, that the sacrifice of one or two conspicuous objects, which would have been insufficient and weak as a Political measure for suppressing the Sect, was often enough to stay Persecution.

Such, then, was the character of the Primitive Martyrs. Nor, in contemplating the immense service rendered by these worthies to the Church formerly, should we forget that to them we also are indebted, for an important link in the evidence on which we believe. The Primitive Martyrs told a tale of Miracles which they had seen performed in confirmation of that Faith, for which they therefore, died. Could they have been otherwise than sure, who held Life as a trifle, when demanded in testimony of the truth of their assertions? Surely their blood still cries from the earth.

Evidence to the Christian Miracles furnished by the Primitive Martyrs.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

It is to be regretted, although we can scarcely wonder at it, that the reverence felt by the Church for benefactors such as these were, should have displayed itself in those various bursts of feeling, which cold-hearted craft, or superstition, afterwards systematized and practised as formal duties. By Institutions, not unlike that which should bind us to weep periodically over the grave of one, whose loss drew involuntary tears from our forefathers; how many Churches, in succeeding Ages, have bound themselves to pay the same respect to the Relics of these Holy Men, as did their contemporaries and friends in the first transports of gratitude and affection! It has been worse than this. Instead of that enthusiasm of public or private regard, which naturally passed away with the generation to which they belonged, a false and formal piety was substituted. They, who like Paul and Barnabas at Lystra, lived and died to persuade mankind to turn from Idolatrous vanities, were mistaken, like their Inspired predecessors, and scarcely regarded as men of like passions with their brethren. Martyrs to the truth of that Holy Record, in which it is written, that there is one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus, they were gradually addressed as Intercessors with God; and whilst that same Record declared, that we are saved by Faith and not by Works, that the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, and that God gives not His glory to another; their lives were regarded as abounding in transferable merit, and out of their very relics virtue was supposed to go forth.

False estimate of the Early Martyrs occasioned by superstitious observances.

Legends respecting them.

Hence, too, it has arisen, that instead of that simple narrative of their deaths, which we should expect to find, whatever is true concerning them lies buried in an undistinguishable mass of fable and marvels. The most unchristianlike work in the world is a Martyrology. It would afford little gratification, therefore, to a searcher after Truth, to be presented with a series of these false pictures; and, accordingly, we shall confine our notice of the Primitive Martyrs to two, who are, perhaps, the most illustrious, and whose history is at the same time best authenticated. These are Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. With the latter of these closes the line of Apostolical Fathers, and the period within which our inquiry has been restricted.

§ *Martyrdom of Ignatius.*

Ignatius.

To connect the narrative of the Martyrdom of Ignatius, which occurred in what is called by Ecclesiastical writers the Third General Persecution, with our mention of the preceding two, it may be necessary to go back for a while to the period which embraces these. It was in the tenth or eleventh year of Nero's reign, that the first of these fiery trials of God's people commenced, which numbered amongst its victims the Apostles Peter and Paul. The interval between this and the Second General Persecution, which has also been noticed as the era of St. John's banishment, comprises a period of twenty-four years. During this time, the general security did not exempt individuals from Persecution and death; it being, as has been observed, one of the apparent motives which actuated these heroic champions of the Holy Church, to devote themselves with a nobler patriotism than that of the Decii, that on them might be spent the wrath and spleen, which, otherwise, the Church at large must have felt. Among those who are recorded in this pious service, and whose deaths may be thus supposed to have prolonged this breathing time of the Church, are the Apostles St. Bartholomew and St. Thomas; and of the worthy fellow-labourers of the Apostles, Martialis, at Ravenna, in Italy, Linus, at Rome, where he was Bishop, and Antipas, at Pergamus.

First Persecution, A. D. 64.

Martyrdoms of St. Bartholomew, St. Thomas, Martialis, Linus, and Antipas.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

The troubled state of the Roman Empire during this period, not a little contributed to the secure progress of Christianity, notwithstanding these occasional evidences of an Evil Spirit opposed to it. From the death of Nero to the establishment of Vespasian on the Imperial Throne, the whole world was kept in continual alarm and suspense, by an uninterrupted contention about the succession. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, were scarcely allowed, one after the other, to occupy the Supremacy, when they were called on to pay the usual price of their lives for it. At length Vespasian secured for himself and for his family a more permanent seat; the tumult of Political animosity gradually died away, and Christianity was destined to be one of the chief objects, on which the turbulent and bloody spirits of the Age vented those savage feelings, which, nursed amid Civil wars, no longer found their former opportunity of indulgence. During the reigns of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, the Martyrdoms above mentioned occurred. But even these acts of self-devotion, could not long divert the popular fury from the whole body of Christians. A Second Persecution commenced in Domitian's reign. Under Nerva, his successor, a brief respite was obtained; but with the accession of Trajan a fresh scene of troubles was opened. Early in this reign, Clement, Bishop of Rome, met the fate of his predecessors in that perilous station, and was cast into the sea with an anchor about his neck. The reigning Emperor, according to History, was neither cruel nor supine; but his Government becoming more and more embarrassed with the question concerning the proper management of the Christians, the established system continued to be acted on, until some better method should be devised; and, accordingly, cruelty and injustice were not less conspicuous in this than in the preceding reigns. If we may credit the Greek Martyrology, besides the distinguished individuals who suffered, on one occasion one thousand one hundred Christian Soldiers were banished into Armenia by order of the Emperor; one thousand of whom perished by Crucifixion on Mount Ararat. The account may be false or exaggerated. Trajan may have been, as he is represented, neither a bloody Tyrant nor an inert Monarch; but, if his character were really thus unspotted, his lot was at least unfortunate for his future fame. Christians cannot forget, that it was during his administration of the affairs of the world, that, separately and successively, the wanton violence of the people was gratified, with the blood of five blameless Bishops, besides numbers, most of whose names are only recorded in Heaven. The Rebellion of the Jews in Alexandria, Cyrene, and Cyprus; the wrongs which roused them to vengeance, and their dreadful acts of retribution—all this, too, contributes to make the picture of his reign such a scene of blood-shed and general inhumanity, that it is vain to plead his love of humane literature and of literary men, against the force of the powerful association.

Second Persecution, A. D. 90. Clement.

It was about A. D. 107 when the Emperor, in the full confidence of a prosperous reign of nearly nine years, came to Antioch, to prepare for a war against the Parthians and Armenians. He had already in other parts of the Empire indulged the Persecuting spirit, which was always ripe to burst forth against the Christians;

Third Persecution, A. D. 107. Arrival of Trajan at Antioch.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

and his arrival at Antioch was, accordingly, received by the Bishop, the good Ignatius, as a certain presage of distress and danger to his flock. He at once adopted the bold remedy, which before had been tried with success by others. He presented himself to Trajan, and behaved in a manner which attracted to himself chiefly, if not wholly, the attention of the Monarch; and his sentence was, to be conveyed to Rome, and there to be thrown publicly to wild beasts. The interview between the Emperor and the Saint, if faithfully related, was well adapted to produce the desired result. It presents a strange contrast between the language of a Sovereign of the world, and the simple avowal of one who felt himself beyond his grasp.

Interview between Ignatius and Trajan.

Being come into the presence of the Emperor, *Trajan* asked him,* saying, what a wicked wretch art thou, thus to endeavour to transgress our commands, and to persuade others also to do likewise, to their destruction? — *Ignatius* answered, No one ought to call *Theophorus*† after such a manner; forasmuch as all wicked Spirits are departed far from the servants of God. But if, because I am a trouble to those evil Spirits, you call me wicked, with reference to them I confess the charge; for having within me Christ, the Heavenly King, I dissolve all the snares of the devils.

Trajan replied, And who is *Theophorus*?—*Ignatius*. He who has Christ in his breast. *Trajan*. And do not we then seem to thee to have the Gods within us, who fight for us against our enemies?—*Ignatius*. You err, in that you call the Evil Spirits of the Heathens, Gods. For there is but One God, who made Heaven, and Earth, and the Sea, and all that are in them; and one Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Son, whose kingdom may I enjoy.

Trajan. His kingdom, you say, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate?—*Ignatius*. His, who crucified my sin with the inventor of it; and has put all the deceit and malice of the Devil under the feet of those who carry Him in their heart. *Trajan*. Dost thou then carry Him who was crucified within thee?—*Ignatius*. I do; for it is written, *I will dwell in them, and walk in them*.—Then Trajan pronounced this sentence against him. Forasmuch as Ignatius has confessed, that he carries about within himself Him that was crucified, we command that he be carried, bound by soldiers, to the great Rome, there to be thrown to the beasts, for the entertainment of the people.

His sentence.

When the Holy Martyr heard this sentence, he cried out with joy, "I thank Thee, O Lord, that Thou hast vouchsafed to honour me with a perfect love towards Thee; and hast made me to be put into iron bonds with Thy Apostle Paul."

He writes his *Epistles*.

It was in his journey to Rome, that the six *Epistles* were written, which comprise his genuine remains. Of that addressed to the Romans, expressing an anxiety to prevent any attempt to rescue, or even to intercede for him, some mention has been already made. On the same topic he dwells in his other *Epistles*.

It was more peculiarly, however, for his own charge at Antioch, that he had courted death; and from his *Epistle to the Philadelphians*, written from Troas, he must have had the consolation of knowing that he had not devoted himself in vain. The Persecution had, by this time, begun to abate; although its mitigation may, perhaps, have been owing to the concurrence of another cause, which deserves notice.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

The Governor of Bythinia at this period was Pliny, the elegant author of the *Letters*, which are in the hands of every scholar. That he was no ordinary favourite and friend of the Emperor those Letters testify; and the use which he appears to have made of this influence, is not the least brilliant part of his character. Finding himself daily more and more embarrassed by complaints against the Christians, he investigated their case, and sent the statement to the Emperor, with a request for further instruction for his conduct. It was no common merit in that Age, to have so far opposed the current of popular feeling, as to have given the question a patient and candid, although an imperfect investigation; and to have represented it so to the Monarch, as to remove from his mind its worst suspicions. Concerning his *Letter* it may be sufficient to remark, that it bore evidence to the Moral and orderly behaviour of the Persecuted Christians; which was the point *then* most important, because it, doubtless, mainly contributed to check the permission to Persecute. It has further placed on a Heathen Record the fact, that in that early period of the Church, one of its prominent practices, was the worship of Christ as God.*

Pliny's Letter to Trajan.

Martyrdom of Polycarp.

A. D. 167.

From the death of Ignatius to that of the last surviving Apostolic Father, Polycarp, an interval of about sixty years intervenes; during which the Church was still perpetually called on to exert all its efforts for self-preservation. Its dangers from within were kept up by the craft or enthusiasm of such men as Basilides, Valentinius, and Marcion,† together with other Sectarians, if possible, more impious and absurd—Ophitæ, Cainitæ, Sethiani. The wit and learning of the avowed Heathens were more vigorously directed against the encroaching influence of a system, the establishment of which was the overthrow of what then seemed the most sublime and important portion of Philosophy.‡ The Christians were called on to write answers to accusations, and to refute arguments. Nor was the Sword of Persecution less bloody than heretofore. Trajan's *Letter* to Pliny, which, doubtless, established the Principle by which the accusations against Christians were treated during the remainder of his reign, still gave considerable latitude to any Provincial Governor, who was either himself cruel, or disposed to indulge the malice and caprice of the Provincials. Even at Rome, and shortly after the

Heresies between the time of Ignatius and Polycarp.

Infidel attacks.

* *Martyrdom of Ignatius*, Archbishop Wake's translation.

† This name was doubtless adopted in allusion to the Christian doctrine, that we are "the Temple of the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in us."

* What the full information was which Pliny obtained respecting the Christian rites, especially from the two Deaconnesses whom he examined by Torture, we do not know. His account is only the confession of certain Apostates, in which, nevertheless, there is an obvious agreement with the truth. "They declared," he writes, "that this was the amount of their guilt, or their error;—that on a stated day they used to meet before daylight, and address to Christ, as God, a form of words broken into alternate portions; that their Sacrament was nothing to bind them to any deed of wickedness, but to preserve them from committing theft, robbery, falsehood, dishonest practices; that, when it was all over, they used to disperse, and again meet at a meal, in which there was nothing remarkable or blameworthy." This meal was, of course, the Feast of Love. For Pliny's statement and Trajan's reply, see Plin. *Ep.* x. 97, 98.

† Montanus and his followers were not yet marked as Heretics, although they were, before the death of Polycarp, sowing the seeds of error.

‡ It is quite necessary, in order to understand Aristotle's view of σοφία in his *Ethics*, to connect it with his Religious theory—that the Deity, namely, pervaded the Universe, and was the Universe.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Emperor's rule was laid down, Onesimus, St. Paul's disciple, is said to have been stoned.*

Fourth Persecution, A. D. 118.

Whatever moderation Trajan, however, may have used during the latter part of his reign, it was no longer observed on the accession of Hadrian. Persecution, severe and general, was again suffered to go on without control or mercy. At Rome, especially, it was no longer directed against the most eminent, but numbers were wantonly murdered, and still more were driven to seek shelter in crypts and caves. Their Bishop, Evaristus, was among the first Martyrs. A Letter from Serenius Granianus† to the Emperor, in behalf of the defenceless Christians, procured at length an order for mitigating the severity of the proceedings. Still, even the intervals between the avowed and authorized Persecutions abound with occasional acts, which, under existing prejudices, could not fail to be perpetually committed. Before Hadrian's reign was closed, Alexander, another Bishop of Rome, suffered; and the deaths of Getulius, Amantius, Cerealis, and others of less note, occurred nearly within the last year of it. The Antonini succeeded, and from that period to the Fifth great Persecution which preceded the death of Polycarp, two more Bishops of Rome, Telesphorus and Hyginus, besides Justin Martyr, and many of inferior note, kept up the succession of Martyrs.

Of Alexander, Bishop of Rome.

Of Telesphorus, Hyginus, and Justin.

Early life of Polycarp.

Polycarp had been permitted to arrive at extreme old age, notwithstanding his known zeal and activity as Bishop of Smyrna. He was born during the reign of Nero, and is said to have enjoyed the instruction and friendship of several of the Apostles, of St. Paul especially, and St. John. No testimony to his good use of these great advantages, can add weight to that which has been left on record by the last-mentioned Apostle in the Book of *Revelations*. "Unto the Angel of the Church of Smyrna write; These things, saith The First and The Last, which was dead and is alive. I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich,) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews and are not, but are of the Synagogue of Satan. Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer; behold the Devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days; be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

The veneration felt by the whole Christian world, for one whose character and Prophetic history had been thus made sacred by an Apostle's pen, and who was the last of those who had conversed with the Apostles themselves, may sufficiently account for his Martyrdom. He was called for by the acclamations of a mob, and sacrificed to their inhuman wantonness. Among the relics of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, few are more worthy of being generally known than the *Epistle of the Church of Smyrna*, which details, simply and sincerely, all the incidents of his fate. Scaliger has said of it,‡ that he never met with anything in Ecclesiastical History which so much affected him, and that after reading it he was no longer himself. A literal translation of the main parts of this *Epistle* then, will, perhaps, be more generally acceptable than any other narrative of the Martyrdom of the last Apostolic Father. Of his own writings we have only one *Epistle*, not unworthy of his fame. It is addressed to the Philippians, and is preserved partly in the original Greek, and partly in an ancient Latin translation. Some of it is entirely lost.

Epistle of the Church of Smyrna.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

*Extract from the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna on the Martyrdom of Polycarp.**

"Polycarp, when he first heard that he was called for, was not at all concerned at it, but resolved to tarry in the city. Nevertheless, he was at the last persuaded, at the desire of many, to go out of it. He departed, therefore, into a little village not far distant from the city, and there tarried with a few about him; doing nothing, night nor day, but praying for all men, and for the Churches which were in all the world, according to his usual custom. And as he was praying, he saw a vision† three days before he was taken; and, behold, the pillow under his head seemed to him on fire. Whereupon, turning to those who were with him, he said prophetically, that he should be burnt alive.

"Now when those who were to take him drew near, he departed into another village; and immediately they who sought him came thither. And when they found him not, they seized upon two young men that were there; one of which, being tormented, confessed. For it was impossible he should be concealed, forasmuch as they who betrayed him were his own domestics. So the officer, who is also called *Cleronomus*, (Herod by name,) hastened to bring him into the lists; that so Polycarp might receive his proper portion, being made partaker of Christ, and they that betrayed him, undergo the punishment of Judas.

"The serjeants, therefore, and horsemen, taking the young lad along with them, departed about supper-time, (being Friday,) with their usual arms, as it were against a thief or a robber. And being come to the place where he was, about the close of the evening, they found him lying down in a little upper room, from whence he could easily have escaped into another place, but he would not, saying, 'The will of the Lord be done.'‡

"Wherefore, when he heard that they had come to the house, he went down and spake to them. And as they that were present wondered at his age and constancy, some of them began to say, 'Was there need of all this care to take such an old man?' Then presently he ordered, that the same hour there should be somewhat got ready for them, that they might eat and drink their fill; desiring them withall, that they would give him one hour's liberty the while to pray without disturbance. And when they had permitted him, he stood praying, being full of the Grace of God, so that he ceased not for two whole hours, to the admiration of all that heard him; insomuch that many of the soldiers began to repent that they were come out against so godly an old man.

"As soon as he had done his prayer—in which he remembered all men, whether little or great, honourable or obscure, that had at any time been acquainted with

---

* The Martyrologies make him Bishop of Antioch. See Cave.

† He was Proconsul of Asia, and his Letter represents the Christian Persecutions as an unjustifiable indulgence of popular licentiousness. As the Emperor's Rescript was addressed to Minucius Fundanus, the Christians of that Province must soon have lost the protection of one, who deserves to be remembered as the first Heathen Governor who recommended the toleration of Christianity, as a right which could not justly be denied to Christian subjects.

‡ *In Animadvers. Eusebian. num.* 2183.

* The Epistle is addressed "From the Church of God which is at Smyrna to the Church of God which is at Philadelphia, and to all other assemblies of the Holy Catholic Church, in every place." The translation is Archbishop Wake's.

† Ἐν ὑπνοις γίγνεται. Eusebius represents it as a dream.

‡ See ENCYC. APOSTOLIC AGE, p. 751

History From A. D. 100. to 167.

him; and, with them, the whole Catholic Church over all the world—the time being come that he was to depart, the guards set him upon an ass, and so brought him into the city, being the day of the great Sabbath. And Herod, the chief officer, with his father Nicetas, met him in a chariot. And having taken him up to them, and set him in the chariot, they began to persuade him, saying, 'What harm is there in it, to say, Lord Cæsar, and sacrifice, (with the rest that is usual on such occasions,) and so be safe?' But Polycarp, at first, answered them not: whereupon they continuing to urge him, he said, 'I shall not do what you persuade me to.' So being out of all hope of prevailing with him, they began first to rail at him, and then, with violence, threw him out of the chariot, insomuch that he hurt his thigh with the fall. But he, not turning back, went on readily with all diligence, as if he had received no harm at all; and so was brought to the lists, where there was so great a tumult, that nobody could be heard.

"As he was going into the lists, there came a voice from Heaven to him, 'Be strong, Polycarp, and quit thyself like a man.' Now no one saw who it was that spake to him; but for the voice, many of our brethren, who were present, heard it. And as he was brought in, there was a great disturbance when they heard how that Polycarp was taken. And when he came near, the Proconsul asked him, 'Whether he was Polycarp?' who confessing that he was, he persuaded him to deny the Faith, saying, 'Reverence thy old age;' with many other things of the like nature, as their custom is; concluding thus, 'Swear by Cæsar's Fortune. Repent, and say, Take away the wicked.' Then Polycarp, looking with a stern countenance upon the whole multitude of wicked Gentiles, that was gathered together in the lists; and shaking his hand at them, looked up to Heaven, and groaning, said, 'Take away the wicked.' But the Proconsuls insisting and saying, 'Swear; and I set thee at liberty: reproach Christ.' Polycarp replied, 'Eighty and six years have I now served Christ, and He has never done me the least wrong; how then can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour.'

"And when the Proconsul nevertheless still insisted, saying, 'Swear by the Genius of Cæsar,' he answered, 'Seeing thou art so vainly urgent with me that I should swear, as thou callest it, by the Genius of Cæsar, seeming as if thou didst not know what I am; hear me freely professing to thee, that I am a Christian. But if thou farther desirest an account of what Christianity is, appoint a day, and thou shalt hear it.' The Proconsul replied, 'Persuade the People.' Polycarp answered, 'To thee have I offered to give a reason of my Faith: for so are we taught to pay all due honour, (such only excepted, as would be hurtful to ourselves,) to the Powers and authority which are ordained of God. But for the People, I esteem them not worthy, that I should give any account of my Faith to them.'

"The Proconsul continued, and said unto him, 'I have wild beasts ready; to those I will cast thee, except thou repent.' He answered, 'Call for them then; for we Christians are fixed in our minds, not to change from good to evil. But for me it will be good, to be changed from evil to good.' The Proconsul added, 'Seeing thou despisest the wild beasts, I will cause thee to be devoured by fire, unless thou shalt repent.' Polycarp answered, 'Thou threatenest me with fire which burns for an hour, and so is extinguished; but knowest not the fire of the future judgment, and of that eternal punishment which is reserved for the ungodly. But why tarriest thou? Bring forth what thou wilt.'

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

"Having said this, and many other things of the like nature, he was filled with confidence and joy, insomuch that his very countenance was full of grace; so that he did not only not let it fall with confusion at what was spoken to him; but on the contrary, the Proconsul was struck with astonishment, and sent his crier into the middle of the lists, to proclaim three several times, 'Polycarp has confessed himself to be a Christian.' Which being done by the crier, the whole multitude, both of the Gentiles and of the Jews which dwelt at Smyrna, being full of fury, cried out with a loud voice, 'This is the Doctor of Asia,* the father of Christians, and the overthrower of our Gods; he that has taught so many not to sacrifice, nor pay any worship to the Gods.' And saying this, they cried out, and desired Philip the Asiarch,† that he would let loose a lion against Polycarp. But Philip replied, that it was not lawful for him to do so, because that kind of spectacle was already over. Then it pleased them to cry out with one consent, that Polycarp should be burnt alive. For so it was necessary for the vision to be fulfilled, which was made manifest unto him by his pillow, when, seeing it on fire as he was praying, he turned about, and said prophetically to the faithful that were with him, 'I must be burnt alive.'

"This, therefore, was done with greater speed than it was spoke; the whole multitude instantly gathering together wood and fagots, out of the shops and baths; the Jews especially, according to their custom, with all readiness assisting them in it. When the fuel was ready, Polycarp, laying aside all his upper garments, and undoing his girdle, tried also to pull off his clothes underneath, which aforetime he was not wont to do; forasmuch, as always every one of the Christians that was about him, contended who should soonest touch his flesh. For he was truly adorned by his good conversation with all kind of piety, even before his martyrdom. This being done, they presently put about him such things as were necessary to prepare the fire. But when they would have also nailed him to the stake, he said, 'Let me alone as I am: for He who has given me strength to endure the fire, will also enable me, without your securing me by nails, to stand without moving in the pile.'

"Wherefore they did not nail him, but only tied him to it. But he, having put his hands behind him, and being bound as a ram chosen out of a great flock for an offering, and prepared to be a burnt-sacrifice acceptable unto God, looked up to Heaven, and said, 'O Lord God Almighty, the Father of Thy well-beloved and blessed Son, Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the Knowledge of Thee; the God of Angels and Powers, and of every creature, and especially of the whole race of just men, who live in Thy presence! I give Thee hearty thanks, that Thou hast vouchsafed to bring me to this day, and to this hour; that I should have a part in the number of Thy Martyrs, in the cup of Thy Christ, to the resurrection of eternal life, both of

* The reading of the Greek manuscript is ὁ τῆς ἀσεβείας διδάσκαλος, but Eusebius, Rufinus, and the old Latin Translator, read Ἀσίας, which has been accordingly adopted by Archbishop Wake.

† Not the Roman Governor, but one who was elected annually by the Provincials from themselves, to preside over the public spectacles, and other solemnities. See Usher, *in loco*.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

soul and body, in the incorruption of the Holy Ghost. Among which may I be accepted this day before Thee, as a fat and acceptable sacrifice; as Thou the true God, with whom is no falsehood, hast both before ordained, and manifested unto me, and also hast now fulfilled it. For this, and for all things else, I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, by the eternal and heavenly High Priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son; with whom, to Thee, and the Holy Ghost, be glory, both now and to all succeeding Ages.' Amen.

"He had no sooner pronounced aloud *Amen*, and finished his prayer, but they who were appointed to be his executioners lighted the fire. And when the flame began to blaze to a very great height; behold, a wonderful miracle appeared,* to us who had the happiness to see it, and who were reserved by Heaven, to report to others what had happened. For the flame, making a kind of arch, like the sail of a ship filled with the wind, encompassed, as in a circle, the body of the holy Martyr; who stood in the midst of it, not as if his flesh were burnt, but as bread that is baked, or as gold or silver glowing in the furnace. Moreover, so sweet a smell came from it, as if frankincense, or some rich spices, had been smoking there.

"At length, when those wicked men saw that his body could not be consumed by the fire, they commanded the executioner to go near to him, and stick his dagger in him; which being accordingly done, there came forth so great a quantity of blood,† as even extinguished the fire, and raised an admiration in all the people, to consider what a difference there was between the Infidels and the Elect: one of which this great Martyr, Polycarp, most certainly was; being in our times a truly Apostolical and Prophetical teacher, and Bishop of the Catholic Church which is at Smyrna. For every word that went out of his mouth, either has been already fulfilled, or, in its due time, will be accomplished.

"But when the emulous, and envious, and wicked adversary of the race of the Just, saw the greatness of his Martyrdom; and considered how irreprehensible his conversation had been from the beginning, and how he was now crowned with the crown of Immortality, having without all controversy received his reward; he took all possible care, that not the least remainder of his body should be taken away by us, although many desired to do it, and to be made partakers of his holy flesh. And to that end, he suggested it to Nicetas, the father of Herod, and brother of Alcé, to go to the Governor, and hinder him from giving us his body to be buried. 'Lest, (says he,) forsaking Him that was crucified, they should begin to worship this Polycarp.' And this he said at the suggestion and instance of the Jews; who also watched us, that we should not take him out of the fire: not considering, that neither is it possible for us ever to forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all such as shall be saved throughout the whole world, *the righteous for the ungodly;* nor worship any other besides Him. For Him, indeed, as being the Son of God, we do adore: but for the Martyrs, we worthily love them, as the Disciples and followers of our Lord: and upon the account of their exceeding great affection towards their Master, and their King. Of whom may we also be made companions and fellow-disciples."*

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.

Conclusion.

Our Lord's Promise of continuance with his Church.

It is impossible to look back on the scenes which we have been reviewing,—the efforts of the Primitive Church, to preserve the Sacred Record of the Gospel; to perpetuate its evidence; to dispense its Truths; to convey its promised Grace; and, lastly, to preserve itself as the Temple of Divine Manifestation, and the Holy of Holies, where this blessed gift has been deposited; it is impossible to look back on all this, without acknowledging the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise, that He would be with his Church always, even unto the end of the world.

How fulfilled to the Primitive Church.

For, together with the efforts of Man, the silent measures of cooperating Providence have borne a part too important and too manifest to escape notice. They are recognised in all those collateral events, which were beyond the forethought and control of Men, in the seasonable removal of the Sceptre from Judah; in the Universal Empire, permitted for a time to the Romans; and in the very struggles for the Imperial dignity, which occurred during the first era of the Gospel. These, then, have been pointed out in our progress, as the main features of that portion of the mighty work, on which the finger of God is apparent; while others more minute, but not less discernible, have continually presented themselves.

And afterwards.

Still more will the presence of Christ with His Church be apparent, as we trace its onward course, through the long lapse of time which separates the first Age from our own. In each successive period, we shall see the Church, sometimes languid and feeble in its efforts, sometimes awakened and refreshed like a Giant from sleep. We shall see, too, the successive appointments of Providence, operating to aid the efforts of Men in accomplishing the great scheme of the Gospel. As the distance has increased between the events recorded in the New Testament, and those whose best hopes rest on the faithfulness of the Record of those events, a new Art has been given to the world, and Printing has furnished additional and ample security against all danger of corruption. Other instruments, more important than this, may be even now in action, in scenes and measures which we are imperfectly surveying, or may be reserved for a future Age.

Future progress of the Church.

Meanwhile, did the Primitive Church, has any Church, arrived at all that Spiritual eminence on Earth, for which the Gospel seems to have designed us? There are two scruples, by which Men are commonly deterred from candidly meeting this question. Some look back with blind admiration on the Past; others regard all improvement, not yet made, as chimerical, and not con-

* From the narrative itself, there is good reason to think, that the friends of the Martyr mistook for a Miracle what was the effect of accident. The same may be observed of the voice which encouraged him. For the proper estimate of accounts of Miracles given by Uninspired writers. See ENCYC. APOSTOLIC AGE, p. 761.

† Ἐξῆλθε περισσεία καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος. The translator has omitted the word περισσεία, which, indeed, can hardly be the genuine reading; for a circumstance so remarkable must have been noticed by Eusebius and Rufinus. Perhaps we should read ἐξῆλθε περὶ σπίρα καὶ ••• πλῆθος αἵματος.

* This, then, is the indignant avowal of those very persons, whose authority is insisted on for the Primitive custom of worshipping Relics! St. Augustin has nearly the same sentiment, *Non sit nobis Religio cultus hominum mortuorum; quia si piè vixerunt, non sic habentur, ut tales quærant honores; sed Illum a nobis coli volunt, quo illuminante, lætantur, meriti sui nos esse consortes. Honorandi ergo sunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter Religionem. De vera Relig.* lib. v.

History. From A. D. 100. to 167.

templated in the Gospel Scheme. That the provisions made—not indeed for the salvation of Christians—but for the perfection of the Christian Body, the Church, have been hitherto gradual and progressive, there can be no denying; and if so, the Primitive Church itself is not to be regarded as the exact counterpart of that Holy pattern, which God in his last Revelation has given us, for this mysterious workmanship,—his Church. The purest Church will hardly abide the test of such an admeasurement. It may, perhaps, be called chimerical, to look for a more perfect realization of those glorious visions, which the Holy Spirit has left with us; but if it be fanciful, let us at least pause, and candidly confess in what the illusion consists. It is, to dwell on a scene, where every man shall be a Christian, and every Christian shall live, as if the Son of God were his daily companion, at home in his family, abroad in his intercourse with the world. It is, to hope for a period, when that awful feeling which deterred the Israelitish worshipper from profaning the Holy Vessels of the Temple, and from polluting its Altar, shall be even more strongly felt by the Christian in his use of himself, that Vessel made unto honour, the living Temple of the Holy Ghost; when every Member of Christ's Church, feeling that he belongs to a Society with which God is mysteriously united, shall shudder to do ought that may be sacrilege therein. And, if all this be indeed fanciful and unfounded, be it excused for the sake of Him, who set no boundary to our hopes of improvement, bidding us purify ourselves even as He is pure, be perfect, even as our Father who is in Heaven is perfect.

Age of the Apostolical Fathers. From A. D. 100. to 167.